Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_________________ _________________

Dana Drew Irwin Date

Revolutionary Histrionics:
Violence and the Creation of Bourgeois Masculinity in Post-Napoleonic France, 1815-1848

By

Dana Drew Irwin
Doctor of Philosophy

History

____
Professor Judith A. Miller
Advisor

____
Professor Kathryn Amdur
Committee Member

____
Professor Paul Kelleher
Committee Member

____
Professor Brian Vick
Committee Member

Accepted:

____
Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

____
Date

Revolutionary Histrionics:
Violence and the Creation of Bourgeois Masculinity in Post-Napoleonic France,
1815-1848

By

Dana Drew Irwin
B.A., University of California, Los Angeles, 2003
M.A., Emory University, 2010

Advisor:
Judith A. Miller, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in History
2013

Abstract

Revolutionary Histrionics:
Violence and the Creation of Bourgeois Masculinity in Post-Napoleonic France, 1815-1848
By Dana Drew Irwin

A standard image of nineteenth-century bourgeois men consists of a coldly rational business man in a black suit. The emphasis on the faculty of reason, formulated by Enlightenment philosophers, however, shrouds the aggression contained within the definitions of maleness. Becoming a man required displays of bravado, often embodied in actions such as duels, fistfights, or brawls. This ideology of gender drew upon the aggressiveness of the warrior and the introspective interiority of the priest. This vision of man, which was elaborated by elites in Europe in the nineteenth century, stressed both the rational mind and the "natural" affinity for violence men possess. The army no longer provided the privileged space for the attainment of masculinity for young men after Napoleon's defeat, and these young men experienced alienation and uncertainty because of the lack of a culturally defined path to manhood. They became devoted members of the political opposition and sought distinction from their cohorts through acts of brutal passion. The goal of those professing this type of masculinity, which became the dominant conception of the male gender system by the end of the nineteenth century, was to constrain aggressive sets of traits in order to create a nation of rational and non-combative citizens. This definition of masculine violence would have severe social, political and cultural ramifications for the rest of the nineteenth century. Women became mere victims and only perpetrators of hostile behavior when they had devolved into madness or become overly masculine by abandoning the hearth and home. The beginning of academic disciplines in the 1820's gave "scientific" weight to these assumptions, while cultural products, including novels, artwork and plays, reinforced these notions. The French colonial enterprise in Algeria after 1830 became a crucial laboratory for French men to understand their masculinity and to profess their dominance over native Algerians. The dream of a utopian society that was supposed to be ushered in with the Revolution of 1848 failed because of conflicting visions of violence, and the fear that workers would be unable to constrain their thirst for bloodshed and destroy the nation.

Revolutionary Histrionics:
Violence and the Creation of Bourgeois Masculinity in Post-Napoleonic France,
1815-1848

By

Dana Drew Irwin
B.A., University of California, Los Angeles, 2003
M.A., Emory University, 2010

Advisor:
Judith A. Miller, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
In partial fulfillment for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in History
2013

Dedicated in loving memory to my parents:

Edward Albert Irwin
1918-2003

Shannon Stack Irwin
1939-2010

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments serve not only as a place for extending gracious thanks to those who have guided, advised, and suffered through a dissertation, but simultaneously to place oneself within a network of scholars, influences and friendships. My list of thanks is long, too long for such a structure as this. First, there are institutional thanks. Emory University and its Department of History have provided me with funding and support for the many years that this research and writing took. The staff of the Archives Nationales, Bibliothèque Nationale, the Centre des Archives d'Outre Mer, and several municipal and departmental archives across France aided me in locating numerous documents and pointing me to files that I had not even considered.

This dissertation has been profoundly influenced by a group of scholars that spreads far and wide. Patricia Tilburg, while she was at UCLA, helped me frame some of my original questions surrounding French Romanticism for a senior thesis I wrote with her. Sheryl Kroen, Jennifer Sessions and Denise Davidson answered a variety of arcane questions with unwavering vigor. A group of professors at Emory have had a profound impact on my thinking and have continually shaped my interests. Clifton Crais insisted on the primacy of innovative writing and broad theoretical concerns in the crafting of

historical research. Jonathan Goldberg provided willing ears for a historian attempting to master queer theory. William Beik stressed the need, even when doing cultural history, of placing social concerns at the forefront of any historical investigation. I have learned at the feet of Robert Wohl, Kathryn Norberg, Geoffrey Symcox, Perry Anderson, Saloni Mathur, Sharon Strocchia, Marina Rustow, Jonathan Prude, Mark Ravina, Astrid Eckert, Walter Adamson, and Gyan Pandey; their collected wisdom touches each of the following pages.

I have had the benefit of mentorship from a committee chair with undying ardor for the historical project, passing that along to each of her students. Judith Miller has afforded me inordinate amounts of time, patience and energy in order to bring this piece to fruition. Her enthusiasm was always present, even if mine seemed to be slipping. Her gentle prodding forced me to consider different avenues, questions and formulations, until she had to finally shove and shake me. Each of these instances transformed my work.

The professors that composed my committee provided ceaseless support and attentive audience members when I clumsily felt my way around the points that I wished to make. Kathryn Amdur always had a list of books that she believed would be helpful and constantly cautioned me on dangling modifiers. Brian Vick with only a brief response could help conceptualize the entire dissertation. Paul Kelleher constantly kept me abreast in the new developments in queer theory. Their dedication and interest has been unflagging over the years.

A group of friends and colleagues formed an intense cohort of graduate students at Emory. Leah Weinryb-Grohsgal and Jane Hooper became my dearest friends on the

first day of school and have remained so ever since. Katherine Fidler and I shared many meals (and drinks) across the nation and in international waters, often worked up over theoretical or political concerns (but always in agreement). Living with Rebecca Kumar, I learned much about Indian cuisine, Bollywood renditions of Shakespeare, and trashy reality television. Ross Fenimore and I often took breaks from writing to imbibe vodka tonics and discuss in detailed musicological analysis the latest singles of Britney and Madonna. Over the course of the last several years, I have collected Adam Rosenbaum, Jonathyne Briggs, Christina Léon, Randy MacDonald, Doug Charles, Alex Borucki, and Sienna Brown, completing my roster of comrades in intellectual arms. My non-academic friends, as intellectually rigorous as my ivory tower colleagues, presented other topics and questions that helped to formulate this project and the direction it took. Diana Fry Wise, Edward Holzer, Jo Torrijos, Jennifer Au, Erin Lee-Chin, Tom Jensen, and Melanie Perricone now know much more about French Romantic theater than they could have ever imagined. My godparents, Val and Maryamber Villa, have done much to support and prod me in these past several years. Finally, Justin Baldridge has listened to rants and raves, only then to patiently query, “Are you done?” It was the grounding I required through this process.

My parents sustained and supported me throughout my life; their deaths have bored a deep hole. Although neither is still living to see the completion of this milestone, their influence upon this project is noticeable in every line. My father with his long career as a journalist emphasized clear, direct writing. My mother, with her flair for the dramatic, always demanded the most profound work possible. I hope this culminating work honors their legacy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ……………………………………………………………………1

Chapter One: The Aggressive Self:

Cultural Discourses of the Violent Male in Post-Napoleonic France …...40

Chapter Two: The Erotics of the Duel:

Farce and Fantasy in Romantic France …………………………………72

Chapter Three: Raucous Performances:

Student Unrest in French Theatres, 1818-1830 ………………………..103

Chapter Four: Staged Combats:

Theater and the Consolidation of Bourgeois Masculinity ……………..133

Chapter Five: Blistering Sands:

Brutality and Manhood in Colonial Algeria, 1830-1848 ………………165

Chapter Six: Utopian Vistas:

Working-Class Violence and the Failed Dream of Socialism,

1830-1848 ……………………………………………………………….. 198

Conclusion ……………………………………………………………………. 226

Bibliography ………………………………………………………………….. 241

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AN	Archives Nationales (CARAN)
AP	Archives Parlementaires
AHR	*American Historical Review*
BNF	Bibliothèque Nationale de France
CAOM	Centre des Archies d'Outre Mer
FHS	*French Historical Studies*
JMH	*Journal of Modern History*

INTRODUCTION

Théophile Gautier, born to a minor government official in 1811, rose to prominence in French literary circles as a noted critic and writer of prose works. While still a teenager, he formed a circle of friends that included some of the most famous writers of nineteenth-century France: Alexandre Dumas, père; Gérard de Nerval; and Victor Hugo. He dallied with liberal politics and took part in both a cultural and political revolution in 1830 when Hugo's play, *Hernani,* triumphed at the Comédie-Française and when Charles X was deposed by the confluence of an economic depression and broad dissatisfaction with a government crippling the rights of publishers, the press, and free speech. His novel, *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, published in 1835, opened with an excoriating preface blaming the banalities of modern life upon the bourgeoisie, who had now raised themselves to the level of national tastemakers. Gautier, in his early years, fused fashionable exuberance with a keen eye for the hypocrisies of Parisian society; his sartorial choices were as famous as his early literary works. He composed his most notable work, the libretto for *Giselle* (1841), to celebrate his infatuation for the dancer,

Carlotta Grisi. When Carlotta would not accept the physical affections of the young writer—they shared only one kiss but corresponded romantically for three decades—he married her sister. By the 1850's, Gautier had turned to criticism, becoming the same type of bourgeois critic against whom he had railed in his previous youthful manifestos. By 1872, upon his death, Gautier was recognized as one of the great literary critics of his time.[1]

Martin Nadaud, born five years after Gautier, lived a far different life. He was born a peasant in the Creuse. His parents, who maintained a small farm, could not afford to send him to school. At the age of 16, he left his home to begin a treacherous journey towards Paris, where he hoped to make a living as a stonemason. As he traveled throughout the country as a journeyman apprentice, Nadaud suffered long hours, little to no pay, near starvation, and injuries, including a fall that broke both of his arms. When he did arrive in Paris, he became enamored with left-wing politics and the idealism of utopian socialists, who promised the amelioration of the life of workers. After the Revolution of 1848, he was elected to the Legislative Assembly, but with the coup d'état of Louis Napoléon, he was forced into exile. He lived in England under an assumed name and worked as a schoolmaster. He returned to France after the Franco-Prussian War, and in 1876, he was elected to the French Parliament. His senatorial bid failed in 1894, and he devoted his remaining years to writing, publishing *Mémoires de Léonard, ancien garçon maçon*, a semiautobiographical novel about the travels and travails of a boy mason. He died in 1898, in the same village of the Creuse where he was born and raised. Nadaud's

[1] The first full-length biography to treat Gautier was that of Joanna Richardson, *Théophile Gautier: His Life and Times* (London: Coward-McCann, 1959). Gautier's private correspondence has been tightly guarded since his death, making much scholarly investigation into his life difficult.

life was one of the more remarkable narratives of nineteenth-century French political history: a lifelong laborer entered the highest echelons of power.[2]

How are these two seemingly disparate men linked? They seem to inhabit entirely different worlds. Historians and literary scholars often treat Gautier and Nadaud as hermetically sealed individuals of completely incompatible cultural milieus. Their lives, however, were contingent (in the sense of touching) and not only because of their similar chronologies.[3] Both men did operate largely on the margins fighting an establishment that banished them or condescended towards them, but they both ended their careers neatly ensconced within the institutions against which they had fought so strenuously. Of particular concern, they shared a similar sense of what defined masculinity. Nadaud and Gautier came of age in a period when the masculine self was being refashioned. A new vision of the self cut across the various lines of politics, class and race. At the heart of this revolutionary shaping of manhood lay violence. For both the dandies and the laborers, becoming a man required displays of bravado, often embodied in actions such as duels, fistfights, or brawls. This ideology of gender drew upon the aggressiveness of the warrior and the introspective interiority of the priest. This vision of man, which was elaborated by elites in Europe in the nineteenth century, stressed both the rational mind and the "natural" affinity for violence men possess. The goal of those who professed this type of masculinity, which became the dominant conception of the male gender system

---

[2] On Nadaud, see Gillian Tindall, *The Journey of Martin Nadaud* (London: Chatto, 1999) and Daniel Dayen, *Martin Nadaud: Ouvrier, maçon, et député* (Paris: Souny, 1998).

[3] This notion of contingency is derived from numerous pieces of queer theory that are interested in the construction of a "queer history:" see Carolyn Dinshaw, *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999); Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities and Queer Histories* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008); Heather Love, *Feeling Backwards: Loss and the Politics of Queer History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009).

by the end of the nineteenth century, was to constrain aggressive sets of traits in order to create a nation of rational and non-combative citizens. This definition of masculine violence would have severe social, political and cultural ramifications for the rest of the nineteenth century.

Class, Gender and the Question of Violence

Martin Heidegger once wrote of the nineteenth century that it was "the most obscure of all centuries of the modern age up to now." [4] This seems counter-intuitive since the state bureaucracies of that time oversaw the largest expansion of archives and written records to that point in western history, thus making large quantities of paperwork available to the scholar, but Heidegger's words point to the fundamental notion that historians have not adequately sought to understand the core issues, both philosophical and social, of change during the course of those fateful hundred years. Narratives of the history of the nineteenth century often celebrate or denigrate the progress of science and industry, or the rise of a new urban elite. [5] On both sides of the ideological divide,

---

[4] Martin Heidegger, "The Age of the World Picture" in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1977), 153.

[5] For European-wide treatments of the middle class, see Jonathan Barry, "The Making of the Middle Class?" *Past and Present*, no. 145 (Nov., 1994): 194-208; Peter Gay's five-volume, *The Bourgeois Experience: 1815-1914* (published between 1984 and 1998), or his final summation, *Schnitzler's Century: The Making of Middle-Class Culture, 1815-1914* (New: York Norton and Co., 2002); Jürgen Kocka, "The Middle Classes in Europe," *JMH* 67, no. 4 (Dec. 1995): 783-806; Charles Morazé, *The Triumph of the Middle Classes*; Pamela Pilbeam, *The Middle Classes in Europe, 1789-1914: France, Germany, Italy and Russia* (London: Macmillan, 1990). For France, see Maurice Agulhon, *Le cercle dans la France bourgeoise, 1810-1848: Etude d'une mutation de sociabilité* (Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences, 1995); Adeline Daumard, *La Bourgeoisie parisienne de 1815 à 1848* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1963); Carole Harrison, *The Bourgeois Citizen in Nineteenth-Century France: Gender, Sociability, and the Uses of Emulation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Guy Chaussinard-Nogaret et al, *Histoire des élites en France du XVIe au XXe siècle* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1991); Roger Magraw, *France, 1815-1914: The Bourgeois Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986). For the British context, see E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Vintage, 1963); Dror Wahrman, *Imagining the Middle Classes: The Political Representations of Class in Britain, 1780-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (Oxford: Oxford

Marxists and conservatives alike tell of the rise of ingenious (or, in the case of Marxists, crafty) entrepreneurs who spur on industrialization and urbanization, forcing their nations into the tempest of modernity. Yet the very notion of scientific or industrial modes of progress seeks to naturalize key developments that occurred during this time. This pattern of naturalization has been incredibly effective in the area of gender and sexuality. The academic discourses emerging from institutions of research in the early part of the century set forth sets of binaries as naturally occurring phenomena: male and female biological sex; masculine and feminine gender identity; and, later on in the century, heterosexual and homosexual sexual orientation. By positing these set of differing traits as natural, they became self-evident and had the powerful cultural discourses of Romanticism and liberalism to enforce them. What this narrative achieved, in effect, was the erasing of history and the radical changes that transpired in this field of social discourse in the period of 1780 until 1850.

The men (for women were excluded from the world of commerce) who drove these processes described themselves, and have been described by subsequent generations of historians, as cool, calm, and rational. They embodied the ideals of free-market capitalism and Adam Smith's invisible hand guided them in their reasoned choices. What this narrative fails to tell is the undercurrent of violence that lay at the heart of it. Postcolonial scholars have noted that the rise of nineteenth-century capitalism came with the cost of exploiting lands, laborers, and materials through a brutal system of

---

University Press, 1973). For the Prussian middle class (or lack thereof), see David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley, *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).

colonialization across Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America.[6] Feminist scholars have analyzed the rates of sexual violence and the force of patriarchy that occurred in every social sector.[7] Aggressive behavior lay at the very heart of how these men conceived of themselves.

Besides the obvious political upheaval that enveloped the Atlantic world from the American Revolution to the Napoleonic Wars, changes occurred in the relations of sexes, the role of ideology, and even the sense of time. As Peter Fritzsche has written, "historians have not said this clearly, but one of the major consequences of the French Revolution was to create out of many inhabitants of the territories of Europe the modern species 'contemporaries.'… gave [contemporaries] a specific temporal identity not unlike the feeling of generation, and separated or decoupled them from their forebears two or three generations earlier."[8] Due to the concentration of events that followed in the wake of the Fall of the Bastille, Europeans—and by conceit of their shared background, white Americans, as well—saw the world as a different place ordered by a new sense of time. Those born in a certain time were believed to have a shared mentality or sensibility. For young men of the early nineteenth century, this was a burden. Young men born in the

---

[6] See for instance, Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1998); Gyan Pandey, *Routine Violence: Nations, Fragments, Histories* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005); Gayatri Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

[7] Classics of the feminist canon include: Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second* Sex, trans. H.M. Parshley (New York: Vintage, 1989); Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1993); Betty Friedan, *The feminine Mystique* (New York: Norton, 1963); Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

[8] Peter Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 53.

opening years of the century could not enjoy the great events of the Revolution or the Napoleonic Wars. One in five Frenchmen born from 1790 until 1796 would die in the last decade of the Napoleonic Wars (1806-1815).[9] The military glory accorded to this generation was denied to the men born between 1800 and 1820. Those who came of age in the 1820's experienced their own sense of displacement, and they expressed a new form of generational social cohesion in the face of a social order being redefined.[10] After the destruction of these wars, Europe experienced several decades of relative peace, but on the other hand, this relative peace created a restless and tormented set of young men, who were unable to attain status as men within the framework of military violence that their fathers and grandfathers experienced.

In the mid-nineteenth century, historians like François Guizot, Jules Michelet, and Adolphe Thiers in France, and Thomas Macaulay and Henry Hallam in Britain helped construct a narrative of the triumph of the middle classes and capitalism. Even a writer such as Macaulay, suspicious of the rise of commerce, dubbed the times in 1829, "the Age of Machinery."[11] The bourgeoisie had erased the odious forms of slavery embodied in feudalism and brought greater freedom and prosperity to their respective nations. They applauded the liberty of modern representative governments, but also bemoaned and

---

[9] Jacques Houdaille, "Pertes de l'armée de terre sous le premier Empire, d'après les registres matricules," *Population* 27 (1972): 27-50.

[10] On the history of generations, see Annie Kriegel, "Generational Differences: The History of an Idea," *Daedalus* 107, no. 4 (Fall 1978): 23-38; Lenore O'Boyle, "The Problem of an Excess of Educated Men in Western Europe, 1800-1850," *JMH* 42, no. 4 (Dec. 1970): 471-495; Alan Spitzer, *The French Generation of 1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), introduction; Robert Wohl, *The Generation of 1914* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979).

[11] Thomas Carlyle, "Signs of the Times," *The Collected Works of Thomas Carlyle* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1858 [1829]), vol. III, 3.

feared the violence of the masses.[12] For nascent socialists, the same narrative was told but without the celebratory tone. Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Proudhon envisioned utopias that would end economic inequality. But only the keen analysis of Marx about the mystification at hand in bourgeois society and the alienation of workers from their labor would hold power over the historical profession for the next century.

For Karl Marx, France held a central place in his historical theory because, he believed, the French Revolution brought a new capitalist mode of production into being through the machinations of the bourgeoisie, who acquired the means of production and suppressed the rights of workers.[13] Revisionist historians in 1960's, of both the left and the right wing, noticed that the middle class, in Marx's sense, were not the agents behind the events of 1789. Some argued that if they did not make the Revolution, "the bourgeoisie was made by it."[14] Other scholars were not even sure of this. Historians influenced by linguistic methods claimed the Revolution was a political event brought on by competing ideologies, not by social forces.[15] Many still believed that the July

---

[12] For liberal treatments of the middle class, see François Giuzot, *Cours d'histoire moderne* (Bruxelles: Société Belge de Librairie, 1850); Charles Morazé, *The Triumph of the Middle Classes* (New York: Anchor, 1967). See also, Christian Nique, *Guizot: L'école au service du gouvernement des esprits* (Paris: Hachette, 2000). For British liberal historians, see Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1965). See also Edmund Wilson's engaging *To The Finland Station* (New York: The Noonday Press, 1940).

[13] On influential Marxist models of the French Revolution, see Alphonse Aulard, *Etudes et leçons sur la Révolution française* (Paris: Alcan, 1893); Georges Lefebvre, *Quatre-vingt-neuf* (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris, 1939); Albert Soboul, *Les Sans-Culottes* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1968).

[14] On revisionism, see Alfred Cobban, *The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964); George V. Taylor, "Non-Capitalist Wealth and the Origins of the French Revolution," *AHR* 72 (1967): 469-496; Colin Lucas, "Nobles, Bourgeois and the Origins of the French Revolution," *Past and Present* 60 (Aug. 1973): 84-126. Notice how much of this early work was carried out by Anglo-American historians.

[15] On political culture, see François Furet, *Penser la Revolution française* (Paris: Gallimard, 1983); Keith Michael Baker, *Inventing the French Revolution: Essays on French Political Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Baker, et al., ed., *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture*, 4 vols. (London: Pergamon, 1991-1994).

Revolution was an event perpetrated by members of the liberal bourgeoisie, but even the "three glorious days" under closer scrutiny could not maintain this image.[16] Historians turned to culture and language to plumb the depths of political action.[17]

Feminist history revised the history of modernity by injecting the subjection of women as a crucial component to the creation of modern society. The liberal social contract was dependent on the enslavement of women, and industrial society could not be understood without reference to the attempts of women to break free from oppression.[18] These early attempts to recuperate the female experience throughout history gave way to new methodologies that privileged the relations between the sexes and culture. Gender, as the cultural understanding of how the concepts of male and female determine behavior, became a predominant strain of historiography in the 1980's.[19] New subfields arose

---

[16] On the July Revolution, see David Pinkney, *The French Revolution of 1830* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972); John Merriman, ed., *1830 in France* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1975); Pamela Pilbeam, *The 1830 Revolution in France* (London: Palgrave, 1994). Alain Corbin has remarked recently that the July Revolution and the ensuing regime has been the domain of mainly Anglo-American scholars.

[17] On the linguistic turn in discussions of class, see Gareth Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working-Class History, 1832-1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). William Sewell, *Work and Revolution: Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). For a discussion as to whether class is even a viable means of analysis, see William Reddy, *Money and Liberty in Modern Europe: A Critique of Historical Understanding* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[18] For the definitive analysis, see Carole Pateman, *The Social Contract* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988).

[19] For the links of gender and class in the nineteenth century, see Kathleen Canning, *Languages of Labor and Gender: Female Factory Work in Germany, 1850-1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996); Anna Clark, "The Rhetoric of Chartist Domesticity: Gender Language and Class in the 1830s and 1840s," *The Journal of British Studies,* 31, no. 1 (Jan. 1992): 62-88; Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987); Gabrielle Houbre, *La discipline de l'amour: L'education sentimentale des filles et des garçons à l'âge du romantisme* (Paris: Plon, 1997); Joan Wallach Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *AHR* 91, no. 5 (Dec. 1986): 475-502; Laura Strumingher, *Women and the Making of Working Class: Lyon, 1830-1870* (Alban, VT: Eden Press, 1979); Bonnie Smith, *Ladies of the Leisure Class: The Bourgeoises of Northern France in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980); Victoria Thompson, *The Virtuous Marketplace: Women and Men, Money and Politics in Paris, 1830-1870* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000); Amanda Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A

investigating sexual identity and the politics of the body, charting new approaches to the study of sexual difference. While feminists had studied female imagery, masculinity remained neglected. Social scientists and cultural theorists determined that one could not speak of one form of maleness, but only a plurality of forms.[20]

Queer theorists of the 1990's questioned assumptions about the relation between sex and gender, opening new ways to understand not only deviant sexualities but the deployment of what is often considered the stable and heterosexual ideal as well.[21] This provided new and exciting ways to understand how gender works in differing temporal and regional societies.[22] Influenced heavily by Michel Foucault's theory of discourse, subjectivity, and sexuality, scholars came to see that one's gender identity was not necessarily linked to one's sex, and new ways of thinking about the male and female

---

Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *The Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (1993): 383-414.

[20] Many of the first works to analyze masculinity were published in the early 1990s. Some of these works were often part of a general "backlash" against the feminist movement. Robert Bly's bestselling, and often ludicrous, *Iron John* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1991) bemoaned the existence of "soft males," and he hoped to assuage men injured by powerful women through the creation of a "mytho-poetic" archetypal vision of manhood. More scholarly works, inspired by and not frightened by feminism, included David Gilmour's *Manhood in the Making* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), which provided a cross-cultural ethnographic study of the meanings of masculine imagery. Sociologist Robert Connell's *Masculinities* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995 [second edition 2005]) provided a framework to analyze the varieties of manliness that were placed between the poles of hegemonic masculinity and subversive masculinities. Although admittedly "sparse" (p. 81), this structure has provided researchers with tools to see the multiple strains of gender performance, even within particular subcultures or class formations. In the popular press, Susan Faludi delineated what she saw as a crisis of masculinity in *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man* (New York: Vintage, 1999), bringing much of the research of social scientists to a broad audience.

[21] The foundational texts of queer theory were: Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1991); David Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (London: Palgrave, 1990); Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *The Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). For queer theorists' studies of masculinity, see Joseph Bristow, *Effeminate England: Homoerotic Writing after 1885* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Alan Sinfield, *The Wilde Century: Effeminacy, Oscar Wilde and the Queer Moment* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Judith Halberstam, *Female Masculinity* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999).

[22] For a rousing manifesto of the combination of Queer Theory and historical practice, see Jonathan Goldberg and Mahdavi Menon, "Queering History," *PMLA* 120, no. 5 (Oct. 2005): 1608-1617.

could be imagined and performed. [23] As C.J. Pascoe wrote, "we should view masculinity as a process rather than a social identity associated with specific bodies."[24] Noting the "abject position" of homosexuals as constitutive of gender practices, Judith Butler saw gender as " a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being."[25] The performative aspects of femaleness and maleness are elided in an attempt to make heteronormativity seem like the natural order of the social world. History is erased in this configuration of relations between the sexes, privileging biological difference and naturalizing gendered inequality. The insights that a range of scholars as diverse as Judith Butler, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Lee Edelman, Michael Warner, and Jonathan Goldberg have provided over the course of the last two decades offer to scholars new and innovative ways of analyzing concepts that contribute to the lived experience of gender.[26] Their prescient work on the deconstructing of binaries (e.g. man/woman, gay/straight, and sex/gender) has supplied new theoretical foundations for the analysis of systems of gender in historical eras and global cultures. This work has shown that masculinity is not

---

[23] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, trans. The order of things. For summaries of Foucault's life and work see Lynn Huffer, *Mad for Foucault*, and David Halperin, *Saint Foucault.* For an argument about Foucault's influence over the American academy, see Francois Cusset, *French Theory*.

[24] C.J. Pascoe, *Dude, You're a Fag* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 5.

[25] Judith Butler, *Bodies that Matter*, 43.

[26] The foundational texts of queer theory were: Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1991); David Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (London: Palgrave, 1990); Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *The Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991). For queer theorists' studies of masculinity, see Joseph Bristow, *Effeminate England: Homoerotic Writing after 1885* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Alan Sinfield, *The Wilde Century: Effeminacy, Oscar Wilde and the Queer Moment* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Judith Halberstam, *Female Masculinity* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999).

necessarily tied to a man's body and the lines that divide heterosexuals from homosexuals or men from women are never immutable.[27]

By the end of the 1990s, articles arrived announcing the "return of the social" to the discipline.[28] These scholars acknowledged the linguistic and cultural turns but wanted to see how these methodologies informed older social questions. William Reddy has argued that sentiment and honor defined nineteenth-century society more than class, while Sarah Maza has placed the emergence of the middle class during the 1820's as a product of the "social imaginary," not economic placement.[29] Historians often dismissed the Restoration and July Monarchy as reactionary, but more recent literature has posited that this period was paradoxically both a period of intense political instability and the beginning of a stable "emotional regime."[30]

Throughout this historiography, violence was discussed as a manifestation of workers' discontent or as a tool to subjugate women and racial others, but few historians have sought to understand how the discourse around violence and its understanding has evolved over time. By violence, I mean the use of force to exert injury on objects or

---

[27] See for instance Susan Bordo's *The Male Body* and Anne Fausto-Sterling's *Sexing the Body.* An historical inquiry into this was conducted by Joanne Mayerowitz *How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004).

[28] On the return of the social, see Jack Censer, 'Social Twists and Linguistic Turns: Revolutionary Historiography a Decade after the Bicentennial," *FHS* 22, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 139-167; and Suzanne Desan, "What's After Political Culture? Recent French Revolutionary Historiography," *FHS* 23 (Spring 2000): 163-196.

[29] Reddy, *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Maza, *The Myth of the French Bourgeoisie: An Essay on the Social Imaginary, 1750-1850* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).

[30] See, Sarah Maza, *The Myth of the French Bourgeoisie,* 12-25; Denise Davidson, *France After Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007); Sheryl Kroen, *Politics and Theater: The Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France, 1815-1830* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); on emotional regimes, see William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

people. The Romantics did not confine aggression to the realm of human actions. They believed that the most exemplary forms of this manifestation of power were found in nature—think of Caspar David Friedrich's *The Wanderer*. Debate continues to rage among psychologists and behavioral scientists as to whether humans are inherently hostile (cf. Konrad Lorenz's *On Aggression*) or whether belligerence is the result of social interactions and development of technology (cf. Jared Diamond's *Guns, Germs and Steel*). Hannah Arendt's *On Violence* has remained a touchstone on the philosophy of destructive elements in humanity. She argued that violence—as distinct from force, power or strength—is instrumental, seeking to substitute itself for strength.[31] "Power," she wrote, "can never grow out of violence because, in fact, the two are opposites."[32] Although she has been criticized for her dismissive discussion of the Black Panthers, her work has remained the foundation for many recent studies of violence.[33] Historians have investigated the early modern period and its relationship to violence, with a long-running debate as to whether Norbert Elias' "civilizing process" is applicable.[34] Studies of the

---

[31] Hannah Arendt, *On Violence* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 46.

[32] *Ibid.,* 52.

[33] Walter Benjamin's "Critique of Violence" was conspicuously absent from Arendt's discussion, probably because of its indebtedness to the conservative antiliberalist Carl Schmitt, but this text has been equally influential. For recent philosophical treatises of violence, see Randall Collins, *Violence: A Micro-Sociological Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), which stressed a study of "violent situations not violent individuals"; Beatric Hanssen, *Critique of Violence: Between Postructuralism and Critical Theory* (London: Palgrave, 2000); Martin Jay, *Refractions of Violence* (New York: Routledge, 2003); David Riches, *The Anthropology of Violence* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986) in which he argues that violence is mainly "a poor man's strength;" Slavoj Zizek, *Violence* (New York: Picador, 2008). Michel Wieviorka, *Violence: A New Approach,* trans. David Macey (London: Sage, 2009), 10-11, has argued in this theoretical piece that conflict "tends to be the opposite of violence." Frantz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* is the classic account of colonial violence.

[34] On the early modern period in France and violence, see Stuart Carroll, *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Arlette Jouanna, *Le devoir de révolte: La noblesse française et la gestation de l'Etat moderne, 1559-1661* (Paris: Fayard, 1989); Julius Ruff, *Violence in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Brian Sandberg, *Warrior Pursuits: Noble Culture and Civil Conflicts in Early Modern France* (Baltimore: Johns

senses, empathy, quotidian devices, and romantic love have posited that seemingly banal things or eternal qualities have their own history, but change continually because of social and political pressures.[35] The variety of adjectives ascribed to the noun is staggering (domestic, sexual, gang, symbolic and epistemic, to name only a few), but scholars have resisted theorizing the meaning of the base term. Numerous works can begin with a sentence, such as: "in all places and at all times in human history men have been more far more likely to murder than have women, and men have been far more likely to kill other men than women have been to kill other women."[36] Human aggression has been noted across time and space, leading many to believe that violence is natural and universal. This, however, avoids the major question as to why it happens at certain moments and not others, and most importantly, what the meaning of the violence is to the people at a certain historical moment. When acts of hostility are described as irrational, or metaphors of illness are used to describe the "pathology of riots," we avoid analyzing the significance of acts of belligerence. Within the dominant Marxist framework of social history in the 1960's and 1970's, scholars searched for moments of slave rebellions, proletarian unrest and revolt in order to celebrate the agency of the oppressed. The power and force of the state proved victorious against these upstarts.

Hopkins University Press, 2010); Ellery Schalk, *From Valor to Pedigree: Ideas of Nobility in France in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

[35] See for instance, Reddy, *Navigation of Feeling*, Roche, *A History of Everyday Things;* Carolyn Dean, *The Fragility of Empathy.*

[36] David Levinson, *Aggression and Conflict: A Cross-Cultural Encyclopedia* (New York: ABC-Clio, 1994), 4. Also note Martin Wiener's *Men of Blood: Violence, Manliness, and Criminal Justice in Victorian England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1, where Levinson is quoted: "for it would appear that all settled societies, past and present, have been faced with the twin tasks of putting to use and reining in these male propensities [of aggression and risk-taking]."

Sociological inquiry, exemplified by Talcott Parsons in the mid-twentieth century stressed normative behaviors within reified gender roles, determined through biological sex. Sociologists, such as Neil Smelser and Charles Tilly, following Parsons, were interested in how moments of collective action occurred, and they sought to construct models that could predict the emergence of such outbursts.[37] Tilly proposed understanding collective violence through placing the state as a crucial agent in the unfolding of collective violence.[38] States with undemocratic regimes (defined through civil participation and enfranchisement) and low capacity (defined as the inability of a state to exert itself in the face of crime) are the most prone to collective violence. The value of Tilly's work comes with his inclusion of violent rituals as an instance of collective violence, defined by its high salience of short-term violence and high coordination between actors. By including violent rituals, such as duels, Tilly has implicated the role of the state within this definition. The state allows, condones, or refuses to prosecute these rituals. The political philosopher John Keane has argued that "the belief that violence is 'natural'—a deep-seated predisposition in every individual, or generative of either the body politic or of the species as a whole—is both historically specific and profoundly anti-democratic."[39] Although his model of democracy being the panacea to confrontations may be simplistic and utopian, Keane has pointed to viewing violence as "contingent and erasable," rather than a genetic trait of human beings.[40] But even these studies have failed to incorporate gender into their understandings of violence

---

[37] Neil Smelser, *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution: Application of Theory to Lancashire Cotton Industry, 1770-1840* (London: Routledge, 2006 [1972]).

[38] Charles Tilly, *The Politics of Collective Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[39] John Keane, *Violence and Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 8-14.

France and the Return of the Bourbons

Almost twenty-five years of warfare had dominated the lives of the citizens of France. The mass mobilization for war that occurred with the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars created a large veteran class. Much has been written about the demi-soldes, who were given half pay after returning from war battered and bruised mentally and physically. Their payment was often not enough to make ends meet. The militarization of masculinity that occurred under Napoleon had some surprising and unintended consequences for the next generation.[41] The children of these soldiers could not participate in the acts of warfare that accorded such a prized gendered performance to their fathers. With a continent at peace and a drastically reduced armed force, young men coming of age after 1820 saw their chances of engaging in "martial masculinity" greatly reduced. These men, often born between 1800 and 1810, experienced a similar set of circumstances and often found themselves alienated from their society. Their politics were often in opposition to the state, and the authorities kept a guarded eye over these young men. These men were too young to vote and many would die before they reached the age of forty, the age of enfranchisement.[42]

With Napoleon's final defeat at Waterloo, the nation, newly restored under the remnants of the Bourbon family for a second time after Napoleon's Hundred Days, faced a number of economic, social and political crises, shifts that would have a significant

---

[40] *Ibid.,* 14.

[41] For more on the militarization of masculinity under Napoleon, see Michael Hughes, *Forging Napoleon's Grande Armée: Motivation, Military Culture, and Masculinity in the French Army, 1800-1808* (New York: New York University Press, 2012), ch. 4.

[42] Alan Spitzer has dismissed Lenore O'Boyle's argument of an "excess of educated men" as pat and applicable to nearly every situation that includes universities and a free-market economy. Spitzer has placed much more emphasis on oppositional politics. See Spitzer, *French Generation,* 230-236.

impact on the course of political and social change over the course of the nineteenth century. Louis XVIII, the eldest surviving brother of Louis XVI and grandson of Louis XV, reigned over a time often dismissed as purely reactionary in form to the revolutionary crises of the 1790's and imperialism of Napoleon. Louis was far more moderate than many of the other exiled nobles returning to their homeland after 1815, many of these called for executions and reparations for land and lives lost. Louis saw many of these as politically unfeasible in a nation so torn by its own recent history that any such debates could threaten to reopen festering, unhealed wounds.

The king and his parliament were constrained further by the terms of the treaty signed by the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The "Final Act" had been signed nine days previous to Napoleon's defeat on the battlefield of Belgium. The terms of France acknowledged the settlement terms of the First and Second Peace of Paris, and the main punishment was containment, with Prussia gaining lands in the Rhineland, Switzerland's neutrality affirmed, and Austrian gains in northern Italy.[43] The victorious European powers determined in September of 1815 that France would have to make annual payments. Tsar Alexander I was against territorial annexation of French lands, including Flanders, Lorraine and Alsace, but favored the notion of punishing the French in monetary form and restricting the growth and use of their military force.

These disparate tendencies led to a re-evaluation within France of its role in greater European politics. Although Wolfgang Schivelbusch does not include post-

---

[43] For the Congress of Vienna, see Adam Zamoyski, *Rites of Peace: The Fall of Napoleon and the Congress of Vienna* (New York: Harper, 2008), for a general overview intended for a mass audience. Two older works by Harold Nicolson, *The Congress of Vienna: A Study in Allied Unity* and Gugliemo Ferrero, *The Reconstruction of Europe: Talleyrand and the Congress of Vienna* (New York: Putnam's, 1941) offer a standard diplomatic view, stressing the role of Talleyrand, of the proceedings. The coming bicentennial promises to bring more volumes to the market, including one from Brian Vick.

Napoleonic France in his work, *The Culture of Defeat*, it appears that France after Waterloo fits his schema of a nation that has been emasculated by military loss and reacts through the imposition of a new paradoxical identity founded on the moral superiority of the defeated over its enemies.[44] This sense of deflated national pride contributed to a search for new meanings in the realms of art, politics, and social policy. Scholars of French history often dismissed the Restoration and the July Monarchy as a reactionary and conservative pendulum swing to the right after the radical excesses of the Revolution, an uninteresting pause between Napoleonic Wars and the Revolution of 1848. Historians, especially scholars attentive to gender, now view these periods as moments of contradictory urges and policies, and the beginning of separate gendered spheres, new forms of popular politics, honor culture, and even class.[45] Historians have now stressed the flexibility and emergence of new forms of consumerism, gender expression and politics (or even in the words of Jennifer Sessions, "a moment of relative cultural openness") emerging in this supposed return to the Ancien Régime.[46] This period is crucial for understanding how sex and gender (not yet understood as separate categories) were being constructed in new ways. Ideas of companionate marriages and love helped to

---

[44] Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat*.

[45] See for instance, Jean-Yves Mollier, Martine Reid and Jean-Claude Yon, *Repenser la Restauration* (Versailles: Nouveau Monde Editions, 2005). Also, Sheryl Kroen, *Theater and Politics*(Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001) and Denise Davidson, *France after Revolution: Urban Life, Gender, and the New Social Order* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007). British scholars are more interested in why the constitutional monarchy failed, while that of Britain persisted through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see, for instance, Pamela Pilbeam, *Constitutional Monarchy in France, 1814-1848* (New York: Longman, 1999) and Munro Price, *The Perilous Crown: France between Revolutions, 1815-30* (London: Macmillan, 2007).

[46] Jennifer Sessions, "Review of Ian Coller, *Arab France: Islam and the Making of Modern Europe, 1798-1831,*" *H-France Forum* 7, no. 2 (Spring 2012): 7. See also Jennifer Terni, "Elements of Mass Society: Spectacular Identity and Consumer Logic in Paris, 1830-48," Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 2002; Victoria Thompson, *The Virtuous Marketplace: Women and Men, Money and Politics in Paris, 1830-70* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).

reinvent the relationship between the sexes.[47] The growing consensus among scholars across many fields and disciplines is that the early part of the nineteenth century saw profound and influential changes in politics, gender, science, cultural forms, and even the underpinnings of modernism.[48] I would add to this rather expansive list: the understanding of violence.

The Generation of 1820: Students, Violence and the Ideology of Aggression

The young men who came of age in 1820, most born around 1800, dubbed the generation of 1820 by Alan Spitzer, faced a France that had changed radically from the nation as experienced by their fathers and grandfathers when they reached adulthood in the Revolutionary period or during the days of Napoleon's Empire.[49] The monarchy had been restored to a vast bureaucracy, operating under a new legal code and a highly expanded police force. The greatest symbol of the Ancien Régime, the king, was newly atop the throne, but beneath operated a new state. The military under Napoleon had become an avenue to create a new elite based on merit, as exerted on the battlefield. By 1820, this new elite had become fiercely protective of their position in the military's

---

[47] See for instance, Niklas Luhmann, *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy,* trans. Jeremy Gaines (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998); Suzanne Desan, *The Family on Trial in Revolutionary France* (Berkeley: Univresity of California Press, 2006); Jennifer Heuer, *The Family and the Nation: Gender and Citizenship in Revolutionary France, 1789-1830* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007); Alan Pasco, *Revolutionary Love in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century France* (London: Ashgate, 2009);

[48] See Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer*; Mary Gluck,*Popular Bohemia: Modernism and Urban Culture in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005) .

[49] On the generation of 1820 and Victor Cousin, see Alan Spitzer, *The French Generation of 1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975); Jacques Goblot, *La jeune France libérale: le Globe et son groupe littéraire, 1824-1830* (Paris: Plon, 1995); Jan Goldstein, *The Post-Revolutionary Self: Politics and Psyche in France, 1750-1850* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005). Lucien Jaume, *La liberté et la loi: Les origines philosophiques du libéralisme* (Paris: Fayard, 2001); William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 219-228.

highest ranks.[50] A path that many young men in the opening decade of the nineteenth century had traveled in order to achieve newfound status in French society was closed to a new generation, as these families began to monopolize this trajectory by sending their children to occupy the highest officer positions and seats at France's most prestigious military academies, such as the Ecole Polytechnique.[51] The political scene in the opening years of the Restoration was occupied by returning nobles and those who professed undying allegiance to the royalist position. The Church had offered to young men a problematic but beneficial opportunity for sons excluded from inheritance in the Ancien Régime. With a turn to the right after Napoleon's fall, the Gallican Church became more rigid, now following Catholic orthodoxy more closely than at any point in the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century, after several decades of anti-clerical politics, the Church had lost much of its luster among young men.

The visibility of armed combat has emanated from Romantic theater and historical novels—seen most vibrantly in Dumas' swashbuckling sagas and Victor Hugo's plays—but men, and almost exclusively males, engaged in fisticuffs in bars, cafes, and even theaters. Most affairs did not have the codified behaviors of the duel, but this group of men was often an unruly and insolent mob. What was it about coming of age in Romantic France that led so many young men to act aggressively? How was the performance of violence understood politically, socially and culturally? These are the questions that will frame this study. Men born around 1800 were too young to have

---

[50] This is roughly the conclusion of Rafe Blaufarb's *The French Army, 1750-1820: Careers, Talent, Merit* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2002).

[51] On French higher education, see Christophe Charle, *La République des universitaires* (Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1994); Robert Gildea, *Education in Provincial France, 1800-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983). On the Ecole Polytechnique, see Patricia Lorcin, *Imperial Identities*, ch. 5.

experienced the French Revolution or to take arms for Napoleon during the wars. The tales they heard from fathers, uncles and older brothers told of an era when masculinity was obtained through combat and battle. The world of nineteenth century France seemed far removed from the world of the ancien regime or even the Revolution. Recent works by Anne-Marie Sohn and François Guillet have analyzed dueling and masculinity, yet both seem to assume an essential definition of maleness.[52] Sohn does not seem to believe that masculinity changed over the course of the nineteenth century, rather only the institutions that helped to foster it (e.g. the educational system or the military) were transformed. Guillet treats the many changes that the act of dueling underwent from the revolutionary period to the present, but does not link dueling to how men conceived of themselves as men. In both of these books by prominent French historians, masculinity is treated as a given rather than cultural construct undergoing the same systems of changes as the other institutions they treat.

The politics of the opening years of the Restoration revolved around an ultraroyalist faction who battled with more moderate royalists, and a left-leaning faction of Liberals and Doctrinaires, centered around Lafayette and Benjamin Constant. With a series of crises, the government saw an increasing number of conspiracies set to destroy the throne yet again. The liberal faction often saw these conspiracies as the product of an overripe imagination of a paranoid regime. Furthermore, the liberals claimed that there was a vast conspiracy on the right, indeed an "occult government," combining priests and

---

[52] François Guillet, *La mort en face: Histoire du duel de la Révolution à nos jours* (Paris: Aubier, 2008); Anne-Marie Sohn, *Sois un homme! La construction de la masculinité au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Seuil, 2009).

the fervent supporters of the monarchy.[53] In 1820, with the assassination of the Duc de Berri, the son of the presumptive heir of the throne, the ultras saw an opportunity to exploit the fear of the populace and blame the Liberals. Although the right found no evidence linking the assassin, a disgruntled stable hand of the royal family, named Louvel, to any secret society with Napoleonic or anti-royalist sentiments, the right railed for days on the floor of the parliament's chambers about the threat posed by conspiracies, *complots*, operating under the very nose of the police.[54] The "moderate" ministry of Decazes fell within months, and the politics of the nation took a reactionary turn, prompting increasing levels of dissatisfaction among young men, who found themselves excluded from the political process and debates becoming more suspect and censorship laws increasing the reach of the state in matters of publishing.

What were young French men to do in 1820? They found the military inhospitable, the priesthood unattractive. Those in power saw many young men housed in the universities of the nation as highly susceptible to Napoleonic nostalgia. In Weimar the previous year, Karl Ludwig Sand, a student of theology, stabbed the playwright August von Kotzebue to death, after Kotzebue had attacked in print a number of the liberal positions about the freeing of a number of German institutions.[55] The murder of the popular writer of melodramas prompted Metternich to pass a series of draconian laws, the Carlsbad Decrees, limiting the powers of the press and the abilities of students to

---

[53] *Pétition adressé à la Chambre des Députés par Madier de Montjau suivie de considerations constitutionelles par M.-A. Jay* (Paris, 1820).

[54] For a recent study of the assassination of the Duc de Berri, see David Skuy, *Assassination, Politics, and Miracles: France and the Royalist Reaction of 1820* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003).

[55] On Kotzebue, see George Williamson, "What Killed August von Kotzebue? The Temptations of Virtue and the Political Theology of German Nationalism, 1789-1820," *JMH* 72, no. 4 (December 2000): 890-943.

fraternize. The French government saw such decrees as within their best interest to institute and the following years saw a number of attempts on the part of the ultraroyalist government to instill such policies. Voting was limited to those over the age of thirty with a substantial holding of property. Holding office was restricted to men over the age of forty.

The political frustrations of young men in the university system rendered them impotent. They felt themselves trapped in a circumspect environment, where few movements were permitted. Some students, as the government feared, turned to secret societies. Some of these clandestine groups were formed with former officers from napoleon's army who were decommissioned from service and placed on half-pay, the famous *demi-soldes*, others took their inspiration from the Italian Carbonari. The French version of the Carbonari, the Charbonnerie, functioned from 1821 to 1823, before a brutal suppression by the forces of the state.[56] As Paul Dubois remembered his participation in these clandestine groups: "The carbonarism of 1820 to 1823 rose up before me complete with its youthful purity, its somber mysteries, its idealistic follies, its generous or covetous ambitions, above all with its victims swept off by the storm."[57] For those who participated, including a young François-Vincent Raspail, the noted chemist and failed candidate as president of the Second Republic in 1848, the Charbonnerie functioned as an entry into the world of adulthood with its concomitant violence and intrigue.[58]

---

[56] For the definitive study on French Charbonnerie, see Alan Spitzer, *Old Hatreds, Young Hopes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard university Press, 1971).

[57] Quoted in *Ibid.,* 300.

[58] For more on Raspail, see Dora Weiner, *Raspail, Scientist and Reformer* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968).

University students attended the theaters of Paris, both state-run and independent venues, frequently. Some men even attended many times a week.[59] They emulated the characters of the Romantic plays and novels they read: they dueled, fought with one another, and performed the behaviors of a tormented genius they aspired to be.[60] Their fashions were devised in a way to shock their elders and the statesmen and commercial agents of urban centers. Dandies wore ensembles, often parodied by critics, that focused attention upon their stiff necks, tight pants and small waists.[61] They wore Van Dyck beards, velvet coats and bore opulent accessories from canes to elaborate "Oriental" garb. They were often ridiculed in the popular press, but they were devising new ways of performing masculinity that would be visually discernible. They focused their fascination on mysterious and exotic faraway places. In the 1820's, a fad for Scottish tartans and kilts went hand in hand with "Egyptomania," leading to bizarre juxtapositions of fashion.[62]

---

[59] For nineteenth-century French theater, see Marvin Carlson, *The French Stage in the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1972); Gérard Gengembre, *Le théâtre français au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1999); F.W.J. Hemmings, *Theatre and State in France, 1760-1905* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Hemmings, *The Theatre Industry in France during the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Michèle Jones, *Le théâtre national en France de 1800 à 1830* (Geneva: Klincksieck, 1975); Odile Krakovitch, *Hugo Censuré: La liberté au théâtre au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1985); Florence Naugrette, *Le théâtre romantique: Histoire, écriture, mise en scène* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2001).

[60] One shocking instance of emulation is noted by Georges Vigarello in *A History of Rape: Sexual Violence in France from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, trans. Jean Birrell (New York: Polity, 1998), 151. A group of young men raped two teenaged girls while staging a recreation of a scene from Dumas' *La Tour du Nesle.* See also, Jerrold Seigel, *Bohemian Paris,* 45-66.

[61] On dandies, see Leora Auslander, "The Gendering of Consumer Practices in Nineteenth-Century France," in *The Sex of Things*, ed. Victoria de Grazia and Ellen Furlough (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); Ellen Moers, *The Dandy: Brummel to Beerbohm* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1960); Susan Fillen-Yeh, ed., *Dandies: Fashion and Finesse in Art and Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 2001).

[62] For the Scottish fad in France, see Marie-Hélène Thevenot-Totems, *La Découverte de l'Ecosse du XVIIIe siècle à travers les récits des voyageurs britanniques*, 2 vols. (Paris: Didier Erudition, 1990). For Egyptomania, see James Curl, *Egyptomania: The Egyptian Revival, A Recurring Theme in the History of Taste* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994); Jean-Marcel Humbert, et al. *Egyptomania; Egypt in Western Art, 1730-1930* (Montreal: National Gallery of Canada, 1994).

These sites were constructed as ideal battlefields for men demonstrating their status as men. Romantic artists embraced this insight.

The linking of violence to this type of gender was necessary to establish their alternative vision as the successor to the ideal men of the medieval past. Manuals advising young men on civilized behaviors paradoxically accepted the hostility of men but often warned against its use, as Isaac Taylor wrote in 1820: "Manliness is power and superiority certainly, but it is power and superiority of character, not of vociferation."[63] Dueling held a privileged place in nineteenth-century France, for it was a ritualized practice where honor was accorded and rewarded based on strategy, skill, and strength. For the generation of 1820, dueling was a convenient way to prove one's manhood, when options within the military were foreclosed to them. The legal maneuvers around the act from 1820 represented the privileged but troubled place it represented. Debates centered around its legal status, whether it was legal or illegal.

The July Revolution and the Consolidation of the Individual

During the 1820's, a radical shift occurred in the understanding of violence's relation to gender. The notion of female aggression became a veritable oxymoron, but belligerence of the males of the species was viewed as the natural order of things. With the rise of anthropology and natural sciences as institutionalized disciplines, the investigation into so-called "primitive" cultures seemed to support notions that violence was a natural part of human interaction and the sole possession of the male sex. The rise of Romanticism further supported the notion of the aggressive self through its celebration of the passions. The foundational texts of Romantic literature, from Wordsworth's

---

[63] Isaac Taylor, *Advice to Teens: or Practical Helps Toward the Formation of One's Character* (London: Fenner, 1818), 93.

Prelude to Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther*, both the natural and the passionate were valorized and equated.

The July Revolution of 1830 confirmed to many the high liberal hopes of the 1820's. Those who participated in the riots, some students, many artisans, a turn away from the repressive policies of Charles X seemed in due order. Although many of his most severe policies were overturned, the regime of Louis-Philippe failed to fulfill the promise of many of those whom took part in the act. Many Bonapartists, who had been excluded from positions in the government, were able to return, but a greater liberalization of social and economic policies was only tentatively granted.[64] By 1835, censorship and a solidified law against associations had been reinstituted. The frustrations of these young men continued unabated.

Louis-Philippe's reign sparked intense criticisms from the opposition of the perceived ruling elite of the bourgeoisie. As this class was beginning to be formulated economically, the attacks upon them were coming from all sides of the political spectrum, and this social grouping's greatest image was the king himself. Louis-Philippe dismissed the majority of the Court, a group that had disdained him during the reign of the Bourbons, both before and after the Revolution.[65] The famous caricatures of Honoré Daumier depicted the portly monarch as a pear, devoid of humanity, and his reign as more interested in profits than humanity. Novelists and playwrights mocked him endlessly for failing to live up to the character and actions of previous monarchs.

During the 1830's, under the reign of the "bourgeois monarch," the inchoate patterns of urban life, bemoaned by writers like Balzac and Stendhal, saw new firm

[64] David Pinkney, *The Revolution of 1830*.

[65] See Philip Mansel, *The Court of France*, 120-135.

boundaries coalescing around class.[66] Silk revolts in Lyon in the early part of the decade, gave fears to conservatives that society was being upended in a repetition of the events of the Terror. The status of one's labor and one's possession of wealth became a defining marker of one's social standing. These social changes, however, had the unforeseen result of transforming the meaning of masculinity—the cultural script that defines the ideal of manhood through a prescription of roles, behaviors and even thought processes. A new form of bourgeois masculinity arose in the nineteenth century as rates of urbanization and industrialization began to increase. Centered among the elite of sprawling metropolises, this form of gendered identification rested on a notion of intellect and reason, but under this veneer of calm rationality roiled the unpredictable passions of human nature. In the eighteenth century, scientists and philosophers had plumbed the depths of reason and found that it was not as intelligible as once believed, as witnessed by the flurry of excitement around mesmerism in the 1770's. The passions of sex and violence led to insanity and depravity, but were they so far separated from rationality? The writers grouped together as Romantics thought not. Across Europe, writers, as diverse as Wordsworth, Keats, Thomas de Quincey, Goethe, Blake, Hoffmann, Germaine de Stael and Benjamin Constant, constructed narratives of the soluble line between sobriety and passion, lucidity and lunacy.

As science became institutionalized in the major academies of Europe in the beginning of the century, a new basis of this understanding of maleness received the

---

[66] On cultural studies of the bourgeoisie, see Manuel Charpy, "L'ordre des choses: Sur quelque traits de culture matérielle bourgeoise parisienne, 1830-1914," *Revue d'histoire du dix-neuvième siècle* 34 (2007): 52-75; Gabrielle Houbre, *La Discipline de l'Amour: L'éducation sentimentale des filles et des garçons à l'âge du Romantisme* (Paris: Plon, 1997); Philippe Perrot, *Fashioning the Bourgeoisie: A History of Clothing in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Richard Bienvenu (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994); James Johnson, *Listening in Paris: A Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Daniel Roche, *A History of Everyday Things: The Birth of Consumption in France, 1600-1800*. Trans. Brian Pearce (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

support of the greatest intellects across the continent. Practitioners of ethnography, natural observation, medical science and the bourgeoning discipline of psychology sought basic truths of human behavior that held across time and space. Results of these quests included Auguste Comte's positivism and Victor Cousin's elements of psychology. Early anthropological works celebrated the noble savages in the vein of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, but in the nineteenth century few intellectuals or government officials celebrated the primitive. In fact, philosophy and science in the nineteenth century warned that instances of uncivilized behavior were symptoms of disease, ripping apart the social fabric. In an imperial context, just as progress was defined as proceeding through the primitive tribal societies to an enlightened civilization, the inhabitants of colonized lands were seen by their conquerors as inferior beings, who were prone to voracious appetites of sex and blood. Whether discussing the formation of primitive tribes or the national differences of European groups, the basic assumption of masculine bellicosity was assumed and never questioned.

Rousseau famously remarked that 'the education of women should always be relative to that of men. To please, to be useful to us, to make us love and esteem them…"[67] Rousseau's limited view of women would come to dominate the ideological position around women's rights in the nineteenth century and come to be seen as a self-evident truth. Women came to be defined in complete opposition to men: a man's physical and intellectual attributes were never in the possession of women. Resting on the extension of the metaphor of the woman's lack of a penis, men were considered rational, violent, and strong, in comparison to a woman's supposed weakness, passivity and

---

[67] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile*, Book V, Part 1. For more on Rousseau and his effect on modern French views on gender, see Jennifer Popiel, *Rousseau's Daughters: Domesticity, Education, and Autonomy in Modern France* (Lebanon, NH: University of New Hampshire Press, 2008).

meekness. This separation became the basis of a further metaphorical approach to gender where the spheres of public life were secluded from the private, closed-off world of the hearth. Tocqueville, writing in *Democracy in America* in 1840, stated eloquently: “In no country has such constant care been taken as in America to trace two clearly distinct lines of action for the two sexes and to make them keep pace one with the other, but in two pathways that are always different.”[68] The same ideology held true over much of Western Europe, although its practice never achieved the absolute rupture for which it called.[69] Although women had been represented as warriors and Amazons in times past, by the middle of the nineteenth century, aggressive women were represented as masculine through power, such as Romantic renderings of Marguerite de Valois, Catherine de Medici, or Lucrezia Borgia, or as victims of insanity, such as the madwoman of the attic in *Jane Eyre*.[70]

Defining man as a violent animal in contrast to virtuous, passive woman had severe implications for the rest of the century. Although tales of violent men can be found across time and space, in earlier ages they contained a different understanding of the origin of aggression. In the pardon tales that Natalie Zemon Davis has analyzed in detail, male violence does not arise naturally, but rather from the imbalance of the body’s humors. The famous “mad blood stirring” of Shakespeare’s Montagues and Capulets

---

[68] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ch. XII,

[69] For the debate about uneven developments, see Rosalind Rosenberg, *Beyond Separate Spheres: Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism* (1982); Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, *Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women in the Old South* (1988); Amanda Vickery, “Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women’s History.”

[70] For the seventeenth century, see Joan DeJean, *Tender Geographies:Women and the Origins of the Novel in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993). See also, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic: the Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979).

demonstrated the humoral understanding of an imbalance of blood within the body. This mad blood would drive a man to violence by the impetus of dishonor, drink, or sexual frustration. In the nineteenth century, the nascent discipline of psychology and the trope of the tortured soul of Romanticism would point to an interior understanding of the origin of bellicosity. The male self became, at its very core, a trigger ever-ready to erupt into rage. If all men were violent, the state had to take an increased role in ensuring the safety of the populace from the pent-up belligerence within each citizen of the male sex. Who was allowed to be violent? The poor and working class without any education were deemed dangerous and unable to control their passions. Any eruption among them, it was believed, would lead to "a return to the days of [17]93," as one government official wrote in 1822.[71] John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor would note later in the century that "the very first essential" to be included in "the education of the people is to unbrutalise them."[72] The memory of the Revolution and its mob mentality was seen as a product of the laborers of France, manipulated by demagogues, like Danton and Robespierre. The elites, however, were seen, with their civility and politesse, able to control their impulses. Although the duel was outlawed, many young men during the nineteenth century engaged in the ritual and rarely faced prosecution, even if the result was death. Commentators have posited that the bourgeoisie is non-violent, relegating aggression to the "dangerous and laboring classes," but young men of similar socioeconomic backgrounds, who were now attending boarding schools and universities in ever-increasing numbers, created

---

[71] Archives Nationales (hereafter AN), F7 6693, Report to Minister of the Interior. 7 March 1823.

[72] J.S. Mill and Harriet Taylor, *Remarks on Mr. Fitzroy's Bill for the more effectual Prevention of Assaults on Women and Children 1853* contained in John Robson, ed., *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume XXI* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 108.

homosocial sites where their interactions could often topple into aggressive behavior.[73] The Romantic plays they preferred were rife with violent scenes, encouraging an understanding of masculinity as linked to brutality.[74] Several recent edited collections have identified the varieties of male imagery found in modern France, but few have pondered the question: how is violence incorporated into conceptions of manliness that stress rationality and constraint?[75]

The search to attain a sure sense of self resulted in the exploration of new landscapes: both in the literal sense of new places and the figurative of creating utopias ordered on new systems. The conquest of Algeria in 1830 allowed many dissatisfied youth to leave France and explore a territory about which they had read in plays and novels in the 1820's.[76] This marked an expansion of the colonial impulse of French

---

[73] Louis Chevalier, *Laboring and Dangerous Classes in Paris during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Frank Jellinek (New York: Howard Fertig, 1973). See also Barrie Ratcliffe's severe criticism of Chevalier's book: "Classes laborieuses et classes dangeureuses à Paris pendant la premiere moitié du XIXe siècle? The Chevalier Thesis Reexamined," *FHS* 17, no. 2 (Fall 1991): 542-574.

[74] Two recent studies have noticed the Romantic fascination with violence; however, both have avoided discussions of the actual violence committed in the streets, focusing solely on representations. Ian Haywood, *Bloody Romanticism: Spectacular Violence and the Politics of Representation, 1776-1832* (London: Palgrave, 2001) and Gina Marie Trigiani, "*Livrets de Mise en Scène* from Nineteenth-century Productions of Romantic Drama: Staging Violence in Dumas' *Henri III et sa cour* and Hugo's *Marie Tudor*" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001). In psychology and art history, a growing number of studies have approached the "aestheticization of violence." Debates rage as to whether violence portrayed in art and film is cathartic or desensitizing, but several works have analyzed the different portrayals of murder in high culture versus more popular forms. See, for in stance, Joel Black, *The Aesthetics of Murder* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Margaret Bruder, "Aestheticizing Violence, or How to Do Things With Style," *Film Studies* 3 (2001): 123-144.

[75] Christopher Forth and Bertrand Taithe, ed., *French Masculinities: History Culture and Politics* (New York: Palgrave, 2007); Régis Revenin, ed., *Hommes et masculinités de 1789 à nos jours* (Paris: Editions Autrement, 2007); Katherine Astbury, et al., ed., *Le Male en France, 1715-1830: Representations de la Masculinité* (Paris: Keene, 2004). On French masculinity, see Robert Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); William Reddy, *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France, 1815-1848* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); André Rauch, *Le premier sexe: Mutation et crise de l'identité masculine* (Paris: Hachette Littératures, 2000); Christopher Forth, *The Dreyfus Affair and the Crisis of French Manhood* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001); Judith Surkis, *Sexing the Citizen: Morality and Masculinity in France, 1870-1920* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

foreign policy and granted many young men a new terrain to conquer and reshape. Many young men, disillusioned by life in the metropole, traveled to the new colony to experience something exotic and unknown to them. Gautier, Flaubert, and other Romantics imbibed narcotics, patronized brothels, and floated down the rivers of Northern Africa, hoping to attain a primordial sense of manhood. Others without the financial means journeyed to the Maghreb in order to fulfill their entrepreneurial dreams or join the officer corps of the army. By doing so, they hoped to establish their status as men through experimentation with different forms of violence. On their return home, they noticed that the Algerian inhabitants they encountered resembled the lower classes of Parisian society. Even those who wanted to reform society or violently transform it were apprehensive of allowing the working class to be aggressive.[77]

The Political and Social Imaginary: Romantic Landscapes, Colonial Holdings, and the Laboring Classes

The setting of the Romantics' violent passions was often the medieval past, but a second favored landscape of the sublime was North Africa. The Orient was a blank

---

[76] The beginnings of colonial Algeria have remained largely unstudied. What exists are introductory chapters of books more interested in the decolonization of North Africa and one important monograph on race and an important dissertation. On Algeria, see Charles-Robert Ageron, *Modern Algeria: A History from 1830 to the Present*, trans. Michael Brett (New York: Africa World Press, 1992); Patricia Lorcin, *Imperial Identities: Stereotyping, Prejudice and Race in Colonial Algeria* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1995); Jennifer Sessions, "Making Colonial France" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2005); Benjamin Stora, *Algeria, 1830-2000: A Short History*, trans. Jane Todd (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004).

[77] On class, I follow Gareth Stedman Jones, who treated class "as a discursive rather than an ontological reality" in *Languages of Class* (p. 8), but keeping in mind Joan Scott's criticism and reformulation of this view in "On Language, Gender and Working-Class History," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 31 (Spring 1987): 1-13, where she argues that languages of class must take into account gender relations, not politics alone.

canvas where "excess dominated."[78] Novels, plays, and paintings depicted the sands of the desert and the local inhabitants with customs and dress considered exotic by audiences and readers. Artists and authors portrayed the men of North Africa and the Levant as depraved barbarians, or as noble savages.[79] The forbidding setting of the Orient and the sensual pleasures contained within fueled the imagination of European writers for a fantasyland of strong men and lascivious women. "In the century of Louis XIV, we were Hellenists," Hugo wrote in 1829, "but now we are Orientalists."[80] The study of "Oriental" languages, everything from Sanskrit to Arabic and Egyptian hieroglyphics, helped spur on a popular romanticization of the Middle East in the decade before French possession of Algeria. Furniture and fashion began to incorporate motifs and themes from Indian prints to Persian rugs. The vogue for all things Oriental soon coincided with the French possession of its own colonial holdings in North Africa.

The French invaded Algeria in the spring of 1830 after a breach of masculine honor occurred when the Dey of Algiers slapped a French diplomat.[81] When the initial invasion was achieved, many of the initial grumblings by Charles X's detractors gave way to the excitement of a renewed French empire.[82] After the July Revolution, major changes were effected on the North African coast. A diplomatic and consulary corps was

---

[78] Laforgue, *1830: Romantisme et histoire*, 229. He has written further that there is not a dialectical relationship between the Orient and the Occident but rather something more similar to Derrida's notion of the supplement.

[79] Angela Pao, *The Orient of the Boulevards: Exoticism, Empire and Nineteenth-Century French Theater* (Philadelphia: Univresity of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 12-15. For the British context, see Edward Ziter, *The Orient on the Victorian Stage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[80] Hugo, "Preface to *Les Orientales*," in *Oeuvres Complètes: Poésie*, tome I, 580.

[81] Ageron, *Algeria*, 12; Sessions, "Making Colonial France," 27.

[82] Edgar Newman has argued that the crowd in the July Revolution of 1830 demanded an even stronger foreign policy. "What the Crowd of the July Revolution Wanted," in *1830 in France*, 124.

created and the French Foreign Legion, created by royal decree in 1831, was deployed throughout the region.[83] For many young men, a sense of adventure and the chance to tour the region encouraged them to travel to the region or take a job as a diplomat, consul or in the officer corps of the Legion. They sought to fulfill the image of the male warrior and attain a greater sense of masculinity in a so-called exotic setting, but many of them instead found a difficult terrain and much hardship. General Thomas-Robert Bugeaud was sent to Algeria in the 1830's to consolidate the conquest of the area and to help put down the resistance of Abd al-Qadir and his troops. His tactics in the Maghreb were brutal. He wrote to François Guizot in 1836 that France should send its "anarchists" and other disruptive elements to North Africa.[84] Bugeaud had been inflexible as a member of the Chamber of Deputies in extending the vote, and his time in North Africa affirmed this stance. He drew many comparisons between the lower classes of Algeria and those of France, and for him, both groups would have to be treated in the same harsh manner.[85] In 1848, Bugeaud and his colleague, Léon-Eugène Cavaignac, were given this chance when they applied their strategies developed in Algeria on the revolutionaries in Paris during the June Days.[86] The "manly ideal" of the warrior did not create a utopia of men regardless of class, but rather it defined precisely where civility and barbarism were divided. Experiences in Algeria would come to define, in the coming decades, how many young men understood their violence and their status as males.

---

[83] Douglas Porch, *The History of the French Foreign Legion* (New York: Harper, 1990), 7.

[84] Anthony Thrall Sullivan, *Thomas Robert Bugeaud: France and Algeria, 1784-1849* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1983), 58.

[85] Comte d'Idéville, *Marshal Bugeaud* (Paris: E. Didier, 1882), 154.

[86] Sullivan, 125; David Harvey, *Paris: The Capital of Modernity*, 78.

While experiences in Algeria reified the concept of civility, back in France, clandestine republican societies emerged across the country after the July Revolution that hoped to break free from the structures that dictated the growing economic inequality between classes. Such associations were illegal and the police hoped to break these nascent groups. Many of the founding members were university students from colleges of medicine and law.[87] In the 1830's, a series of silk workers' revolts struck Lyon, events that Marx would later cite as the "first outbursts of the French proletariat."[88] The result of these strikes and the successive newspaper coverage was the emergence of a dichotomy between workers and the bourgeoisie that lasted throughout the century.[89] Although many students had helped in mutual-aid societies and republican societies, a growing number of the bourgeoisie found that the laboring classes could be equated with the dangerous ones, and hence they needed to be firmly controlled.

The failure of the early societies to aid workers can be blamed in great part on their conception of gender. The intellectuals and activists that headed this mission faced a quandary in their communication to workers. Should workers recreate the bourgeois family and hope to change society through emulation? For radical thinkers, the structure of patriarchy was another troubling symptom of capitalism. Then, should workers seek to

---

[87] On French republicanism in the nineteenth century, see Ronald Aminzade, *Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); François Furet, *La Gauche et la Révolution française au milieu du XIXe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1986); John Merriman, *The Agony of the Republic: The Repression of the Left in Revolutionary France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978); Pamela Pilbeam, *Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France, 1814-1871* (London: Macmillan, 1995); Georges Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain en France, 1814-1870* (Paris: Resources, 1980 [1928]).

[88] Karl Marx, "Critical Remarks on the Article: The King of Prussia and Social Reform," in *Karl Marx: Early Texts*, trans. David McClellan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 219. Robert Bezucha, *The Lyon Uprising of 1834: Social and Political Conflict in the Early July Monarchy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974).

[89] Jeremy Popkin, *Press, Revolution and Social Identities in France, 1830-1835* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 175.

overthrow society violently and create a better one from its charred remains? Aggressive laborers inspired fear in many and many intellectuals were uncomfortable with such a prospect, certain it would lead to a second Terror. Some artisans even accepted this notion and celebrated the Convention of 1793.[90] With the writings of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Proudhon in the 1830's and 1840's, intellectuals analyzed the oppression of the workers. Artisans often took the lead in speaking for the working class, and their entwined concepts of labor and manhood were appreciated by bourgeois intellectuals; however, many laborers found these conceptions of labor as bestowing status and power on a man incomprehensible. Many men who toiled on a daily basis held ambivalent feelings towards, if not outright abhorrence to, their work.[91] Both intellectuals and artisans deemed the alternative masculinities of the dandy and the Romantic, emulated often from aristocratic behaviors, as inappropriate for the lower classes to model themselves after. Utopian socialists provided a model they hoped would be successful among workers, with notions of free love and communal life, but in the end many workers sought to reproduce the vision of bourgeois life and the family, much to the chagrin of radical thinkers like Marx, Engels, and Fourier.[92]

---

[90] Jill Harsin has argued in *Barricades: The War of the Streets in Revolutionary Paris, 1830-1848* (New York: Palgrave, 2002) that the strain of the republican movement she analyzed, montagnardism, "was unquestionably a working-class movement" (p. 14), but she has conflated mutual-aid societies with republican movements and misconstrued a large section of the literature, which argues contradictorily about the importance of "bourgeois" republicanism.

[91] Jacques Rancière, *La nuit des prolétaires* (Paris: Fayard, 1981), 125.

[92] On early French socialism, see Maurice Agulhon, *La république au village* (Paris: Seuil, 1979); Jonathan Beecher, *Victor Considerant and the Rise and Fall of French Romantic Socialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Edward Berenson, *Populist Religion and Left-Wing Politics in France, 1830-1852* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); David Owen Evans, *Social Romanticism in France, 1830-1848* (London: Clarendon Press, 1951); Frank E. Manuel, *The Prophets of Paris* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962); Pamela Pilbeam, *French Socialists Before Marx: Workers, Women and the Social Question in France* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).

By 1848, the dreams of transforming the nation seemed unattainable. Republicans had faced a dramatic defeat in the June days of that year's revolution. Classicists had managed to chase the Romantics off the stage of the Comédie-Française in 1843, when Hugo's *Les Burgraves* was a commercial and critical failure.[93] By this point, many artists had taken a new turn in the politics of aesthetics: "art for art's sake" became the credo of writers like Théophile Gautier. For Gautier, art should maintain a privileged and exalted place in the world, far from the harming effects of quotidian politics. This was a drastic turn for a man like Gautier who had been so enthusiastic over the political meanings of Hugo's poetry and prose, but it allowed for bourgeois bohemians to experiment with their masculinity as poets, where they would not need to think of the disdainful duty of running society. In 1847, the conquest of Algeria was complete, as all resistance fighters had been defeated soundly. North Africa remained one of the key holdings of the French Empire and a place where fantasy and masculinity were linked. The possession of the Maghreb, however, led to a further hunger for more colonial possessions across the world, from Mexico to Southeast Asia. Most importantly, by mid-century, even though bohemians and Romantics widely reviled the bourgeoisie as "tasteless philistines," the links between these groups seemed more certain than those between workers and the bourgeoisie.

This dissertation will argue for the linkages between the varied practices and understandings of violence in the post-Napoleonic period, demonstrating that the notion of the perceived innateness of masculine anger had far-reaching social and political

---

[93] On Hugo, see Bernard Degout, *Le sablier retouné: Hugo et le débat sur le "Romantisme"* (Paris: Honoré Campion, 1998); Christian Jensen, *L'evolution du Romantisme: L'année 1826* (Geneva: Droz, 1959); Graham Robb, *Victor Hugo* (New York: Norton and Co., 1997); André Maurois, *Olympio: A Life of Victor Hugo*; Anne Ubersfeld, *Le roi et le buffon: Etude sur le théâtre de Hugo* (Paris: Colin, 1989); Odile Krakovitch, *Hugo Censuré*.

implications. Romantic conceptions of violence were born from understandings of aggression as the product of latent impulses within all men. The first chapter will analyze both the cultural and scientific discourses of male anger. The second chapter will analyze judicial and political debates around the place of the duel as a celebrated ritual for men to claim their manhood, even if the practice was illegal. The third and fourth chapters will turn to the world of theater. In the former, I will analyze a series of theatrical "revolts," where young male audience members would disrupt performances, often through brawls. The latter will analyze a set of contemporary plays and the portrayal of male violence. In chapter five, we will turn to the world of colonial Algeria, where so many young men could turn to escape their past, experience new adventures, and embrace the manhood from which many men felt alienated in the 1820's. The last chapter will study the place of working-class violence and how the unease with revolutionary traditions created a group of bourgeois intellectuals unwilling to extend their conception of aggressive masculinity to thos e whom they claimed to represent.

The *Symphonie Fantastique* of Hector Berlioz brought together much of the cultural and scientific thinking of madness, violence and masculinity into musical form, and it serves as an instructive example of how closely tied together young men in France of the nineteenth century understood their aggressive impulses. As one of the most famous pieces of program music, the five-movement piece was accompanied by an explanation that Berlioz wrote, extolling the passions and hallucinations that marked this watershed moment in Romantic music. When the work premiered on December 6, 1830, audiences were baffled by the excesses of Berlioz's style and his inconsistencies and seeming inability to adhere to classical forms of concert work, but to younger supporters,

this music represented a new way to place into musical notation the irrational impulses of the self.[94] The first movement is marked by the *idée fixe* of the young beloved, whose very image torments the artist. This notion of an obsession leading to the unraveling of the rational mind was taken up by psychologists in France and given the name monomania. His fixation on the ideal beauty leads to delusions in a pastoral field where thunderous timpanies give way to rumbling strings in an evocation of rolling, thunderous clouds, speaking to the great Romantic passion for stormy weather. In one of Berlioz's most famous passages, his artist falls into a dream where he believes that he has murdered his beloved for refusing to return his love. In a rumbling cart, the artist is taken to the guillotine, where the fall of the gruesome blade ends this movement. Finally, the orgy of the witches' Sabbath ends the symphony in a cacophony of sound. Within this seminal work, Berlioz has evoked the peculiar passions of his age: a belief in the fragility of the male self, the effect of violence lurking always in the back of one's mind, and the parallel movement of a natural world that embodies the base instincts of the human animal. The male self is forged through violence and obsession, and it can be as easily undone by these very constitutive elements. Berlioz's masterpiece points to the transformative shifts at work in how young men aspired to become men in the chaos after the Napoleonic Wars.

---

[94] For an excellent discussion of the premiere of the *Symphonie Fantastique*, see Thomas Forest Kelly, *First Nights* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), ch. 2. See also Marianna Ritchey's article on Berlioz that tries to save him from the condescension of Charles Rosen, who dismissed the young Romantic as "an incompetent genius," "Echoes of the Guillotine: Berlioz and the French Fantastic," *Nineteenth-Century Music* 34, no. 2 (Fall 2010): 168-85.

CHAPTER ONE:
THE AGGRESSIVE SELF:
CULTURAL DISCOURSES OF THE VIOLENT MALE IN POST-NAPOLEONIC FRANCE

In Théophile Gautier's *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, the protagonist, D'Albert, finds his male valet to be increasingly attractive. When he comes across the young man asleep on the couch, he pulls the boots off the youth and proceeds to suck his toes.[1] "The young man, always on his knees," the anonymous narrator relates to the readers, "contemplated these two little feet with loving admiration and attention; he bent down took the left one and kissed it, and then the right and kissed it as well, and then with kisses and kisses moved up the leg to where the material [of his pants] began."[2] The page awakes and allows this to continue. He falls asleep and D'Albert watches him sleep: "The only sound

---

[1] Théophile Gautier, *Mademoiselle de Maupin* (Paris: Flammarion, 1966). For literary criticism revolving around this work and its sexual politics, see Pierre Albouy, "Le mythe de l'androgyne dans *Mademoiselle de Maupin,*" *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France,* no. 4 (July-August 1972): 600-608; Rosemary Lloyd "Rereading *Mademoiselle de Maupin,*" *Orbis Litterarum* 41, no. 1 (March 1986): 19-32; Kari Weil, *Androgyny and the Denial of Difference* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992), ch. 4; Nathaniel Wing, *Between Genders: Narrating Difference in Early French Modernism* (Cranbury, NJ: Rosemont Publishing Group, 2004), ch. 1; Rajeshwari Vallurt, *'Surfacing' the Politics of Desire: Literature, Feminism and Myth* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), ch. 6. Many of these works are more interested in the representation of the eponymous character, rather than the semiotic field of gender proposed by Gautier.

[2] Gautier, *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, 162.

that one heard from the room was his regular breathing and the tick tock of the pendulum." Of course, the young valet is actually a woman in drag (*en travesti*), hoping to break through the limits imposed on her female contemporaries of seventeenth-century France. D'Albert, therefore, can state that his attraction to his young male employee arose because he suspected that the true sexual identity of this individual was disguised.

This scene constitutes a significant break in the narrative structure of the novel. The novel heretofore consisted of epistles from D'Albert to a dear friend, confiding his love for a woman who has spurned him. From this first-person style, Gautier inserted a third-person narrator to relate this tale of foot worship. Did Gautier believe that those participating could not speak of such an incident? This distancing allows for an exploration of masculinity and for its opposition to femininity to blur and fall apart. In the preface to the novel, Gautier relished the ability to shock the mores of his elders and the general French bourgeoisie. He explained—in a most condescending manner—that art existed above all utility, while "everything useful was ugly," mocking the utilitarian desires of many bourgeois business owners.[3] The scene of same-sex toe-sucking seemed to play such a role in his endeavor to elicit outrage from his audience. A scene where a fetishistic encounter between two men is interrupted by the narrator's philosophy of beauty reached back to an example set by the Marquis de Sade in his controversial *Philosophy in the Bedroom* (1795).

Gautier's novel (1835) and the more famous tale by Balzac, *Sarrasine* (1830) represent important moments in nineteenth-century French literature. In Balzac's work a sculptor becomes obsessed with an opera singer. He woos her and convinces her to allow

[3] Gautier, *Maupin*, 17.

him to immortalize her body in marble, yet she is revealed to be a castrato, a castrated man who sings within the range of the soprano. [4] For two such works to explore similar themes of "gender trouble" during the 1830's demands analysis of the functions of gender in this period. Why were the boundaries so seemingly porous but always being reinforced and made to seem immutable? Novelists, artists, journalists, and scientists within early nineteenth-century France were invested in a new definition and bifurcation of the senses. What defined one necessitated its other to be the diametric opposite. For a man, violence was his possession alone, and, for a woman, any form of aggression marked her with insanity or the masculinizing effects of power. This linkage between maleness and belligerence was a fundamental shift in the understanding of how men performed their own gender. With the general support of cultural discourse and science, this connection created a lasting legacy of gender relations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The Study of the Self, 1780-1820

The two reigning symbols of manhood, the priest and the warrior, seemed unattainable and unattractive to the men who came of age around 1820. "When the equation of man and soldier is in question," wrote Leo Braudy in his study of masculinity and war, "then male sexuality and the relative meaning of male and female are in question as well."[5] Stendhal famously dramatized this dilemma in *The Red and the Black* (1830), where Julian Sorel agonized over his search to find a meaningful place in society.

---

[4] Honoré de Balzac, *Sarrasine* (Paris: Livres de Poche, 1991). The most famous analysis of Balzac's work is, of course, Roland Barthes' *S/Z*, trans. John Howard (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980).

[5] Leo Braudy, *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* (New York: Knopf, 2003), 224.

These competing archetypes became less viable for men who did not find lifelong service to the Church attractive, and who could not achieve a place in the officer corps with the imposition of a new hierarchy since Napoleon's control of the institution.[6] A growing number of young men entered universities, which had been reorganized under Napoleon. They attended the *facultés* of medicine and law, but this route did not seem to confer on them the manly ideal of the warrior.[7] As Montaigne wrote in the seventeenth century, "the only proper and essential form of nobility in France is the profession of arms (*la vocation militaire*)."[8]

The notion of violence as a natural instinct goes as far back as Aquinas, stating that revenge is rational, while blind anger was a mere passion devoid of thought. Montaigne would become an important theorist of belligerence, going as far to say that: "Vengeance is a sweet passion ingrained in us by our nature."[9] Pardon tales of the sixteenth century, as Natalie Zemon Davis has argued, are replete with instances of individuals crafting narratives to explain an outburst of anger, yet all of these pleadings are based on an understanding of anger arising from an imbalance of the humors. Red blood would become inflamed from passion, alcohol, or jealousy causing one to react violently to a perceived wrong.[10] Women were not devoid of such passions in much

---

[6] For the military, see Rafe Blaufarb, *The French Army, 1750-1820: Careers, Talent, Merit* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

[7] On French higher education, see Christophe Charle, *La République des universitaires* (Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1994); Antoine Prost, *L'Enseignement en France (1800-1967)* (Paris: Colin, 1968); Robert Gildea, *Education in Provincial France, 1800-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

[8] Montaigne, "Des récompenses d'honneur," *Les essais* (Paris: Folio classique, 1999), ii, ch. 7, 381-402.

[9] Montaigne, *Essays*, iii, 4.

[10] Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987).

writing before the eighteenth century. Brantôme wrote a popular tome on the *femmes galantes* in the sixteenth century and novels of the seventeenth century showed a variety of women engaging in familial feuds and waged battles.[11] These notions, however, shifted in the nineteenth century when science began to theorize a natural propensity of violence solely among men.

This idea of the aggressive male was complemented by the new *mentalité* of love that emerged at the end of the eighteenth century. New ideals of affectionate love and marriage gave way to all-consuming passion towards the end of the Ancien Régime.[12] The understanding of individuals composed of base, natural desires and passions paved the way for radical understandings of the role of civility and the roles of the different sexes. The new understanding of men and women divided into different and opposing systems, studied so importantly by Thomas Laqueur, forced the creation of men and women into natural beings who were diametrically opposite.[13] Aggressiveness played a role in the division of the sexes.

In fact, the cultural and scientific work of the period 1780 until 1830 sought to fix notions of gender into an immutable binary. After the fall of Napoleon at Waterloo in France, the culture of defeat within the battered nation forced many to come to grips with

---

[11] Brantôme, *Des dames galantes* (Paris: Frères Garnier, 1872). On women in seventeenth-century novels, see Joan DeJean, *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

[12] A number of scholars have touched on this paradigmatic shift. See for instance, Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex*; Niklas Luhmann, *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy*, trans. Jeremy Gaines (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986); William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: Towards a Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Allan Pasco, *Revolutionary Love in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century France* (Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2009); Philip Stewart, *L'invention du sentiment: roman et économie affective au XVIII siècle* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2010).

[13] Laqueur, *Making Sex,* ch. 5.

an entire nation emasculated by militaristic loss. The work of philosophers enacted a separation of sexes more forceful than any accomplished by the creation of disparate spheres of the public and the private, gendered by their respective occupants.[14] A prominent treatise from German philosopher, J.G. Fichte (1762-1814), *Foundation of Natural Right* (1796) proposed a system for understanding all human freedoms from emerging from the proper creation of a state working from a social contract. Like Rousseau, Fichte also saw the importance of speaking about the roles of women and gender in such a system. Although Rousseau was not explicit in his philosophical treatises about the role of marriage (as he was in his novels), Fichte composed an entire section of his text devoted to marriage and the relation of the sexes. For Fichte, the basis of sexual difference relied on the inability of women to "acknowledge the drive of men" to fulfill their sexual demands.[15] This inability to be sexual leads to feminine modesty and male magnanimity. The expression of the moral potential of men embodied itself in their desire to be first and foremost master (*Herr*).[16] Men who are unable to control themselves and engage in sexual violence are nothing more than "raging animals."[17] The

[14] The historiography on "separate spheres" is vast. Some key works include: Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes* (London: Hutchinson, 1987); Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988); Amanda Vickery, "Golden Age of Separate Spheres? A Review of the categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (1993): 383-414; Victoria Thompson, *The Virtuous Marketplace: Women and Men, Money and Politics in Paris, 1830-70* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000); Denise Davidson, *France after Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007).

[15] Fichte, *Foundation of Natural Right*, 268. Many treatments of Fichte's work have ignored these "outdated" components of gender that run through the piece, as the introduction to this translation notes. Fichte's notion of the functioning of the state, however, is based upon a notion of a smoothly functioning familial unit, necessitating a closer examination of these gendered politics. See also Isabel Hull, *Sexuality, State and Civil Society in Germany, 1700-1815* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), 314-323.

[16] *Ibid.,* 271.

[17] *Ibid.,* 276.

eighteenth-century fascination with "natural right" theory led itself to the nineteenth-century theories of science, race, progress, gender and nation.[18] Only a simple step existed from delineating the liberties of men to determining what his (and her) "natural capabilities" were.

This professionalization of the sciences consisted of a concerted attempt by practitioners of respective disciplines to set down standards, philosophies and practices. The thoughts codified by science in these decades represented a radical break with a dominant strain of Enlightenment thought that saw the "noble savage" as weakened (and crucially made effeminate) through the processes of civilization. Rousseau's celebration of Native Americans, further expounded by literary figures on both sides of the Atlantic from Chateaubriand to James Fenimore Cooper, stressed the sophisticated intelligence and honor of groups often dismissed as brutes. The emerging professions of medical science, often tied to the judicial state through expert testimony in cases, reversed this notion of society weakening mankind from a privileged primordial state, instead focusing on lunacy, criminality and deviance as aspects in the break of the social fabric.[19] Such digressions needed to be stopped in order to preserve the nation.

Both ethnography and psychology benefited from travel accounts of faraway lands regaling readers with the seemingly deviant ways of primitives.[20] The use of these

---

[18] For Dan Edelstein, eighteenth-century natural right theory laid the groundwork of the violence of the Terror. See Edelstein, *The Terror of the Natural Right: Republicanism, the Cult of Nature, and the French Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

[19] On the professionalization of medicine, see Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine* (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Goldstein, *Console and Classify*; Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *A Midwife's Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard, Based on Her Diary, 1785-1812* (New York: Vintage, 1991).

[20] See, for instance, C.W. Thompson, ed., *French Romantic Travel Writing: From Chateaubriand to Nerval* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

works helped buttress the supposed authority of the forming institutionalized disciplines. Academics used these examples to generalize a hierarchy of European dominance. Whether narrating the lives of the aborigines of Australia, the tribes of Native Americans, or kinship networks of Africa, these writers found telling evidence to support the assumed dominance of the Caucasian race and of the seemingly natural state of human instincts towards blood and sex. The notion of the aggressive male was seemingly confirmed by the comparative methods of early ethnographers who read the memoirs of those who traveled to the newfound corners of the world.[21] Captain Cook's adventures in the South Pacific, which ultimately led to his violent death; the fantasies of Mandeville; and the novels of Chateaubriand set in the wilderness of Louisiana expressed the nature of savages as honorable, noble and most importantly as devoid of the controls of civilization which impeded belligerence. This extended into the study of natural history, where scientists saw animals as the lowest order of cognitive beings. As the rungs of the ladder proceeded upward, the skin color of humankind whitened, with the darkest skin of Africans occupying a place very close to the primates of Asian and African jungles. As a character in Balzac's "A Passion in the Desert" said in order to edify a young woman he seeks to woo: "Do you believe then that animals are entirely devoid of passions? … Let me tell you that we can attribute to them all the vices that are due to our state of civilization."[22] Balzac's story points to the popularization of these early scientific studies of race and zoology.

---

[21] Comparative methods of French thought similarly contributed to understandings of trade and the natural world. See Paul Cheney, *Revolutionary Commerce: Globalization and the French Monarchy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010).

[22] Honoré de Balzac, "A Passion in the Desert," in *Sarrasine*, trans. David Carter (London: Hesperus, 2007), 49.

The search for the natural proclivities of the human species gained further ground in the field of natural history. The great chain of being that existed with God at the head and the terrestrial kings as the Creator's appointed rulers had given way to the scientific search for racial hierarchies. Theories derived from the travel literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth century began to assert that darker skin tones denoted inferior beings with Africans at the bottom of this chain. In the eighteenth century and nineteenth centuries, the placement of great apes in this scheme proved problematic. As Saartjie Baartman, the so-called "Hottentot Venus," was paraded through the streets of Paris before her death in 1816, natural scientists proposed that orangutans "resembled," in the words of the prominent naturalist, Georges Cuvier, "the negro race."[23] For them, Baartman was more closely related to a great ape than a white man.[24] Numerous tales emerged from this literature relating stories of large apes carrying off women to rape, some of which went back to Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality*. In the depths of the African jungles, the pure crucible of human nature was seen. The base instincts and desires of man were thought to be sexual and violent in nature. For many within the European scientific community, human nature devoid of the strictures of civilization was visible in what these writers thought to be the uncivilized natives.

Within this discourse, the figure of an aggressive male was always assumed. The medical work of the 1820's further justified the acceptance of masculine belligerence. When women were spoken of as violent, they had either strayed into the sphere of business and power becoming masculinized and hence aggressive, or they had simply

---

[23] Cuvier, *Le règne animal,* (Paris: n.p., 1817), 95.

[24] On Baartman, see Clifton Crais and Pamela Scully, *Saara Baartman* (Pricneton: Princeton University Press, 2009). A more romanticized account of her life can be found in Rachel Holmes.

become insane. Romantic authors, such as Hugo and Dumas, represented early modern female members of royal families, such as Lucrezia Borgia and Marguerite de Valois, as power-hungry psychopaths or deviant nymphomaniacs. They had lost feminine virtues by working within the realm of politics. Bertha, from Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre,* is the quintessential "madwoman in the attic," a racial other whose violence arises from her mental instability. Women's natural affectations consisted of purity and virtue, attributes that were considered outside the purview of the instinct towards destruction. For many of these men, it was civilization that constrained the violent instincts of the human species. If these were lost, society was doomed.

Monomania and Insanity: The Destruction of the Self

The study of lunacy prompted questions of what defined the norms of behavior and reason. In 1810, Jean-Etienne Dominique Esquirol coined the term monomania, setting forth a popular diagnosis in the first half of the nineteenth century.[25] There were various forms of monomania, from erotomania to kleptomania, all obsessions leading to abnormal, even psychotic, behaviors. Esquirol wrote in the key summations of his life's work: "The moral affections provoke insanity."[26] His focus on the nervous system's malfunctions as the source of insanity paved the way for much psychiatric thought of the nineteenth century. His own work was based on the quasi-scientific research into the sentiments of the eighteenth century that sought to impose a boundary between reason

[25] On Esquirol, see Goldstein, *Console and Classify*, 128-146; Rosario, *The Erotic Imagination,* 50-55.

[26] Etienne Esquirol, *Mental Maladies: A Treatise on Insanity,* trans. E.K. Hunt (Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1845), 25.

and feeling, but instead determined that the two were intricately connected. The passions are "the most essential symptoms, and the most therapeutic agents, in insanity."[27]

Early nineteenth-century France was the home of much of the innovative thought in medicine and science. While Germany's hold on the discipline of philosophy was assured by the placement and prestige of Kant and Hegel in the same period, German universities could not boast the same prestige in the field of medical thought. The tracts of Pinel, Broussais and Cousin set new standards for envisioning how man conceived of his world and deviated from the norm. The invention of the norm and its standard deviation occurred in this period. As Georges Canguilhem noted over sixty years ago, these norms were crucial to understanding how a heart functioned under normal circumstances, and laid the foundation for scientists to begin treatment of bodily aberrations, but there were insidious ramifications for this thought.[28] Social behaviors could similarly be placed on a spectrum of normal and abnormal, thus beginning an intellectual tradition culminating in racial thinking and finally eugenics at the end of the century.

At the Collège de France, Victor Cousin, a veritable "youth guru," instructed his students in an amalgam of philosophy and crude psychology.[29] Cousin was not an original thinker; he simply compiled the works of others. His classes, however, teemed

---

[27] Ibid., 45.

[28] Georges Canguilhem, *The Normal and the Pathological,* trans. Carolyn Fawcett and Robert Cohen (New York: Zone Books, 1991 [orig pub. 1966]).

[29] On the generation of 1820 and Victor Cousin, see Alan Spitzer, *The French Generation of 1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975); Jacques Goblot, *La jeune France libérale: le Globe et son groupe littéraire, 1824-1830* (Paris: Plon, 1995); Jan Goldstein, *The Post-Revolutionary Self: Politics and Psyche in France, 1750-1850* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005). Lucien Jaume, *La liberté et la loi: Les origines philosophiques du libéralisme* (Paris: Fayard, 2001); William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 219-228.

with young men eager to hear his exciting lectures, where Cousin argued that a stable *moi* interpreted sensory data and centered each individual. Rationality defined this self, but the introspection required to discover the character of oneself was available only to men, who were in better control of their emotions than women, and only to men of the educated classes, who had the intellect and leisure time in order to perform these acts of contemplation. "The exercise of reason, necessarily accompanied by that of the senses, the imagination, and the heart," wrote Cousin, "which, combining with the direct illuminations of animalism, dyes life with its colors."[30] The sense of self that Cousin proposed became a dominant feature of early French psychology, as his pupils, who taught in the *lycée* system across the country, propounded it.[31]

Cousin's philosophy posited that rationality was paramount to masculinity, but the base instincts of mankind fought to prove dominance. The role of civilization helped shape male behaviors to ensure the functioning of society and the control of such desires as violence and sexuality. The force of the law, dating back to Moses and the Ten Commandments, sought and attained this containment. He devoted decades to laying out a revision to Lockean thought that had dominated in France, thanks to writers like Condillac in the eighteenth century. He saw Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding* as providing a dangerous path towards materialism and even atheism.[32] In this period, anti-Lockean thought proposed there was something beyond the sensations that made us human. The work of Lockeans of the eighteenth century, such as Condillac and Helvétius, proved too dangerous with its attempts to eradicate cultural hierarchies and

---

[30] Victor Cousin, *Cours de l'histoire de la philosophie* (Paris: Didier, 1841), 44.

[31] Goldstein, *The Post-Revolutionary Self,* 134.

[32] Victor Cousin, *Elements du Psychologie*, ch. X.

propose the equality of all men and the "omnipotence of education."[33] This aim framed much of what Cousin published and lectured on during his famed tenure at the Collège de France. Cousin's writings did not set out a systematic analysis of aggression, but in a telling passage in the preface to his work of 1826, *Philosophical Fragments*, he laid out his vision of the self (which he termed *le moi*), that showed its own heroic component that contained bellicosity.

> It is a fact that even now we often act without having deliberated, and that rational perception spontaneously making known to us the act to be performed, the personal activity also spontaneously enters into operation and resolves at once not by a foreign impulse but by a kind og immediate inspiration, prior to reflection and often superior to it. The *Qu'il mourût!* of the old Horatious, the *à moi, Auvergne!* of the brave d'Assas, are not blind impulses and in consequence destitute of morality; but neither is it from reasoning or reflection that they are borrowed by heroism.[34]

Cousin was convinced that "reflection and spontaneity comprise[d] all real forms of activity." By placing battles of heroism, and thus manly, virtuous violence, in a space outside of rationality, he structured a naturalization of such rituals as the duel. Systems of such gendered distinctions operate outside of reason and within what he considers the most important form of human purpose. This philosophy, however, marked a turn towards viewing all lower classes as devoid of logic and in possession only of the basest of impulses. As he concluded the preface to his collection of *Fragments*, Cousin wrote:

> Now, in my opinion, humanity as a mass is spontaneous and not reflective; humanity is inspired. The divine breath which is in it, always and everywhere reveals to it all truths under one form or another according to place and time. … Spontaneity is the genius of human nature; reflection is the genius of a few individuals. The difference between reflection and spontaneity is the only difference possible in the identity of intelligence.[35]

[33] Helvétius, *De l'homme*, (Paris: Serviere, 1795), ch. XXIV, 390.

[34] Cousin, *Eléments du psychologie*, ch. X, 281.

Cousin ended his discussion of the hierarchy of man with a Saint-Simonian view of humankind around the globe: the "Oriental world" represented spontaneity "as the point of departure" for progress, while ancient paganism and then Christian thought formed the apotheosis of civilization.[36] Cousin had earlier motioned to the heroic violence contained in his notion of spontaneous human action, but later he relegated this process to the masses with the more intelligent philosophers and scientists to reflect upon the meaning of these patterns. Cousin's philosophy would come to dominate much of French education in the nineteenth century and these biases contained in his thought continued to shape generations of young French men who studied nascent psychology.

The study of madness in the nineteenth century saw insanity as a descent into the violence that civilization was unable to control. François-Victor-Joseph Broussais published the most famous tract on madness in the early nineteenth century, *De l'irritation et le folie* (1828). In this work he saw those who suffered from mental illness would often "refuse to fight, and kill themselves in order to avoid a duel."[37] Investigations into madness in the early nineteenth century transformed the profession of psychiatry, as Jan Goldstein has demonstrated. The social anxiety of psychiatrists parlayed itself into studies of bourgeois "monomania," single-minded obsessions, such as

---

[35] Ibid., Appendix 1, 394.

[36] *Ibid.,* 397.

[37] Broussais, *De l'irritation et la folie* (Paris: Chez Delaunay, 1828), 47.

for wealth or occupational achievement.[38] Yet by the end of the century discussions of monomania had disappeared, replaced with a new fascination with female hysteria.

Broussais, a rival of Cousin, viewed the functioning of the mind in far different ways. For Broussais the structure of the brain had much more to do with pathological disturbances than the sensationalism of Condillac and Locke that formed the bedrock of Cousin's thought. Broussais in his 1828 text. *De l'irritation et de la folie*, argued that insanity was derived not from the inappropriate understanding of sensory data, as Cousin and the early psychologists argued, but as the irritation of certain sections of the brain. The swelling of the brain created a fervent of folly. For example, greater desires towards self-destruction were created by "an irritation in the trisplanchnic apparatus (great sympathetic nerve), and above all, in the stomach… acting upon the brain," thus "render[ing] ideas of murder predominant in spite of reason."[39]

Neither Broussais, nor Cousin ever mentioned aggressive behavior as a cause of insanity. Certain forms of violence were acceptable in society and not found to be aberrations. Part of the rationale as to why so many duels were considered to be licit was founded on the *rationality* of those acts. Philosophes of the eighteenth century had speculated on reason and the passions being contained under the rubric of *sensibilité,* but men of the scientific establishment in the Restoration and July Monarchy saw passions and reason as two polarized opposites in the make-up of individuals. Although insanity

---

[38] Goldstein in a recent afterword to *Console and Classify* has compared the prevalence of monomaniacal diagnoses in early nineteenth-century to diagnoses of Attention Deficit Disorder in late twentieth-century America. Goldstein, *Console and Classify,* 397-403.

[39] Broussais, *De l'irritation et la folie*, 194.

would result in exacerbated violence, Broussais and Cousin saw all men as capable and prone to violence.

The "Mal du siècle" and the turn to violence

The men who came of age in the France of the 1820's were not born early enough to have witnessed the cataclysmic events of the French Revolution, and they were too young to have participated in the Napoleonic Wars.[40] During the Bourbon Restoration (1814-1830), they were excluded from politics by a government that did not allow men under the age of forty to serve; beyond this, no men could vote without substantial holdings of property. These young men were in search of a "mythic present" that would alleviate what luminaries of the age, like Benjamin Constant and Alfred de Musset, termed the "*mal du siècle*." This "sickness of the century," according to Chateaubriand in *The Genius of Christianity*, resulted from the discordance between the desire for the infinite and the mundane goals humans could achieve.[41] His hero René elaborated the symptoms of this malady: "The disgust for life I had felt since childhood came back with renewed force. Soon my heart no longer provided food for my mind and the only thing I felt in my existence was a deep ennui."[42] Due to this general malaise, many men began to

---

[40] Scholars have utilized to varying levels of success this generational approach. Most importantly, Alan Spitzer set forth a persuasive sociological study of the "French Generation of 1820;" Jean-Claude Caron has carried further research on this group of young men with extensive archival research. My approach has been influenced by Robert Wohl's seminal *Generation of 1914* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979). His model of a three-tiered system of generations creating a collective memory influenced by experiences unique to that generation has proven to be highly influential. I see a similar approach as a generation of 1790, 1800 (Spitzer's generation of 1820: using their date of maturation rather than their date of birth as I do) and 1810 formed the bulwark of French cultural discourses in the early nineteenth century. Robert Gildea's *Children of the Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2008) is a far less successful attempt of constructing such a generational framework.

[41] Chateaubriand, *Le Génie du christianisme*, vol. II, 213.

[42] Chateaubriand, *Atala-René* (Paris: Flammarion, 1964), 149.

ponder their own manhood. They noticed that the images of men of the past did not resemble what they saw in a world dominated by commerce.

These notions of faltering male performance were tied to the performance of the French army during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. The call to arms of the entire French nation created a new militarization of civilian society. As Michael Hughes has argued:

> To sustain the motivation of its soldiers, the Napoleonic regime promoted a masculine ideal in the French army that transferred the military skills ascribed to the aristocracy to the entire population of France. It identified a set of warlike attributes as the defining characteristics of the French man. They included natural military skills, bravery, audacity, honor, a love of glory, patriotism, toughness and an innate desire for war and combat.[43]

Although Hughes does not extend his argument to the years following Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo, the type of martial masculinity that he has identified persisted after the cessation of hostilities. The endurance of this type of male identity in peacetime begs a central question: If war is over, where do violent attributes find their objects? For Romantics, such as Musset, this "innate desire for war and combat" manifested themselves as a melancholy for a manhood that he cannot achieve.[44] For others, it resulted into a turn to reinvented rituals, like the duel, or to private forms of aggression within domestic space.

Musset's articulation for the malaise that seemed to infect much of French culture in the nineteenth century best encapsulated the fears and passions of many like-minded young men of his age. The "mal du siècle" effected a new understanding of how

---

[43] Michael Hughes, *Forging Napoleon's Grande Armée: Motivation, Military Culture, and Masculinity in the French Army, 1800-1808* (New York: New Yok University Press, 2012), 135.

[44] My understandings of mourning and melancholy are indebted to Freud and to Elissa Marder's *Dead Time: Temporal Disorders in the Wake of Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002).

disillusionment cut through a generation. A novel of 1835, which actually predated the more famous work of Musset, by Edouard Alletz, a diplomat and essayist, *Les Maladies du siècle* labeled three sicknesses as indicative of the nineteenth century: isolation, disenchantment and seduction. Each illness received a novella outlining the downfall of a man who has become infected with these feelings.[45] In his semi-autobiographical novel, *La confession d'un enfant du siècle* (1836), Musset expressed the torment that so many men felt being born out of synchrony with the times, unable to experience the glory their fathers and grandfathers witnessed during the Revolution and Napoleonic Wars. "Behind them a past forever destroyed, but with the still smoldering ruins of centuries of absolutism," he wrote in the introduction, "before them the aurora of an immense horizon, the daybreak of the future; and between these two worlds something like the ocean… something vague and floating, a rough sea full of wrecks."[46] The search for masculine victory embodied in those remarkable days, these Romantics fervently believed, was unattainable in a world run by the bourgeoisie with their attention to conformity and morality.

Numerous coming-of-age narratives spoke of stages of violence through which one passed on the road to manhood. This conceit of growth as a journey with obstacles and roadblocks is seen in such narratives from the works of Goethe and literary lions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries down to philosopher-workers. As one floor-layer wrote: "The craft bends this man under violent hardships that must be experienced to be

---

[45] Edouard Alletz, *Les maladies du siècle* (Paris: Gosselin, 1836). The novel was successful enough to warrant a second edition a year after its initial publication.

[46] Musset, *La confession d'un enfant du siecle* (Paris: Gallimard, 1973), 21.

appreciated."[47] Novelists, politicians, journalists, and even medical doctors often voiced support for the ordeals (*épreuves*) of manhood as healthy and necessary to the development of one's fortitude. Classic narratives of the eighteenth and nineteenth century invested the *bildungsroman* as the framework by which many European men saw their personal evolution. From Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther* to Alain-Fournier's *Le Grand Meaulnes* (1913), boys became men through torment. Werther's psychological pains drove him to suicide, while the boys of Alain-Fournier's works fought vicious battles to declare their dominance over their peers.

The memoirs of the Prince de Joinville affirmed the desired need to attain manhood through violence. At an early age, he reminisced decades later, Joinville remembered sitting on the knee of General Druout and fantasized of being an artilleryman. He began his military training by firing shots with a twelve-pound howitzer in the park of Vincennes.[48] Joinville narrated his exploits as a young boy engaging in fisticuffs with other boys, including an instance at a gala thrown by the Duchesse de Berri when he was still a child. "I had a quarrel with a Cossack of my own age, young de B--, about a partner. In my fury, I drew my sword; he did likewise, and we were just falling on each other when the Duchesse rushed up crying, 'Stop you naughty children! Take their swords away, M. de Brissac."[49] This amusing anecdote is recounted in the guise of the dismissive notion that boys will be boys, but it points to the banality and quotidian nature of violence among males at all echelons of French society.[50] The civilized

---

[47] Gauny qtd. In Jacques Rancière, *The Nights of Labor*, trans. John Drury (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 80.

[48] Prince de Joinville, *Memoirs*, trans. Mary Lloyd (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1895), 22.

[49] *Ibid.,* 10.

demands of the aristocracy fail to be heeded by a member of the royal family. Unlike many of his contemporaries (such as his "somewhat affected" schoolmate Alfred de Musset), Joinville was able to engage in the privileged path towards masculinity through the armed forces thanks to his birth within the house of Orléans. Joinville would spend much of his adolescence training in the army and serving within in Algeria.

By the mid-1830's a new vision of the sexes was firmly in place. The Romantics had constructed a cultural discourse that demonstrated the violence of the passions and the troubles to which all men could fall susceptible. The nascent disciplines of psychology, physiology, and ethnography created a pseudo-scientific buttress to the notion of the aggressive male.[51] Musset's portrait of Octave in *Confessions* spoke to the problems of passionate masculinity. After his father's death, Octave does "not shed a tear or feel anything," but behind this numb exterior a sea of torments lay dormant. Any emotional anguish could bring on a fit of insanity. When Octave then meets a young widow, his obsession with her almost drives him to the monomaniacal pursuit of his jealous suspicions about her fidelity to him, resulting in his almost killing his mistress with a knife to the heart.[52] The philosophy associated with bourgeois elites of rational individuals with an intense streak of destruction buried shallowly beneath the surface became the model for many young men. It became so ingrained in cultural discourse that it became the unnamed cultural icon of manhood. This mode of maleness, however, held

---

[50] A point accepted and stressed by the first chapter of Anne-Marie Sohn's *Sois un homme!* (2009).

[51] The relation of science to general scientific discourse is complex and dismisses the notion that science exists outside of culture in pursuit of the truth. See Bruno Latour's discussion of the "factish," a notion where thoughts become reified into fetishized facts. Latour, *On the Modern Cult of the Factish Gods* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010).

[52] Musset, *Confessions,* Part V, ch. VI.

unintended consequences that would be forceful over the course of the nineteenth century. If all men could succumb to violence, how would the state control it? Who was allowed that violence? These questions framed much policy and cultural work of the century, sparking conflicts around race, class and gender.

For many of these young men a turn to new forms of violence or old rituals reinvented for a new time represented the best ways to achieve some semblance to the maleness they sought to exhibit. Metaphors of infection showed passions eating through one's body, turning placid, contemplative men into monsters. "[Sensuality]," Sainte-Beuve wrote in the opening paragraphs of his 1834 novel, *Volupté*, "has broken out of the bonds that kept it restrained in lower and unknown parts of your body. It has seized your flesh. It courses through your blood, a serpent in your veins, swimming and flashing in your field of vision. One glance exchanged where it has the ability to undo the most austere of resolutions."[53] Alfred de Vigny, far more conservative than many of his generation, celebrated the military ethos, and fought against any attempt to discredit the warrior ideal:

> Far from displaying its traits and its language, the excess of force that the passions give, each studies itself to contain within it the violent emotions, the profound sorrows or the involuntary élans… I love the character contained in our époque. In this apparent coldness, there is shame, and the true sentiments need it. There is also disdain, good money to pay for human things.[54]

The malaise that struck many young men was not only confined to France. Georg Büchner's play, *Woyzeck*, recounted the tale of a lowly soldier who beset by insanity when he discovers his girlfriend is carrying on an affair with a drum major, drives him to

---

[53] Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, *Volupté* (Paris: Flammarion, 1976 [1834]), 3.

[54] Vigny, *Souvenirs de Servitude Militaire* (prig. Pub. 1835), in Vigny, *Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1948), 564.

stab her to death.[55] The play based on an actual case in the 1830's allowed Büchner to dramatize the ineffectual ways that men (especially of lower classes) had of attaining any sense of masculine meaning. When Woyzeck confronts the drum major about his lady's infidelity, the Drum Major responds, "I'm a man. A man, I said. Who wants some, eh? Unless you're the Lord Almighty and pissed as well, keep away from me—I'll stick your nose up your arse! You (*to Woyzeck*)! Shall I pull your tongue out of your throat and tie it around your neck?"[56] The two men then brawl, with the drum major soundly defeating Woyzeck. His shame at this act of emasculation causes Woyzeck to consider suicide, but ultimately he turns the knife on the mother of his child, for she was the true root of his cuckoldry and humiliation. In Germany, however, young men searching for grandeur were able to consolidate their energy towards German nationalism and unification, while the centralization of France precluded this type of political action.[57] Socialism and republicanism were rife with conflicts among its members, forcing many of these movements the inability to unify in action or ideology.

Cultural productions benefited from new understandings of the world, either from ethnographies, travel literature, or scientific treatises, reflecting new models of thought. For instance, Balzac's novels are filled with references to the fads of physiognomy. These works, however, simultaneously reified, shifted and created new understandings of

[55] Although *Woyzeck* was virtually completed in 1837 (some scenes were left unfinished at the time of Büchner's death), the play was not published until 1879 (with a variety of mistakes, including a misspelling of the title itself, becoming *Wozzeck*), while its first performance was not until 1913. In the early twentieth century, Büchner's play became an important touchstone for European modernism, especially German expressionism. Allan Berg's operatic adaptation of the piece appeared in 1925 to general acclaim. On Büchner, see Maurice Benn, *The Drama of Revolt* (1976).

[56] Georg Büchner, *Woyzeck*, trans. Gregory Motton (London: Nick Hern Books, 1996), 35.

[57] Alan Spitzer, *The French Generation of 1820*, 275. See also, Brian Vick, *Defining Germany: The 1848 Frankfurt Parliamentarians and National Identity* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Unviersity Press, 2002).

social interaction or individual psychology. These pieces fed and were fed by current assumptions. To separate cause and effect in the reception of science and literature is well nigh impossible, but the relationships between these seemingly separate worlds in forming a shared discourse are undeniable.

A cursory examination of paintings that won the coveted Prix de Rome from 1800 until 1850 demonstrates this same fascination with masculine heroism and violent action.[58] The award garnered a young artist a term of study in Rome and was awarded by the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture. Although many of those who won have been forgotten—Jacques-Louis David contemplated suicide after losing three consecutive years—the prizewinners do point to what was considered the most acceptable and noteworthy new art being produced in France. The historical paintings, all drawn from classical or biblical narratives and given as the subject for young painters to interpret, place belligerence as the main subject. Many of these pieces are downright gruesome, such as Pallière's *Ulysse massacrant les prétendants de Pénélope* (1812), La Rivière's *La Mort d'Alcibiade* (1824), or Lenepveu's *La Mort de Vitellius* (1847). Those that do not foreground murder or war often still portray an event of trauma haunting the subjects of the piece, such as Priam begging Achilles to honor his dead son, Hector, or Antigone burying her brother. Even the few years that a prize was awarded for landscape painting, bucolic images were often marked by bloodshed. For instance, the winner of 1821 was a pastoral image by Rémond (1795-1875), where in the foreground is the kidnapping of Proserpina (Persephone). This institution of the French art world that was funded by the state found that masculine ethos of hostility benefited the nation.

---

[58] A remarkable catalog of the Prix de Rome winners does exist. Philippe Grunchec, *Le Grand Prix de Peinture: les concours des Prix de Rome de 1797 à 1863* (Paris: Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux Arts, 1983).

The concomitant anxieties produced by a society returning to peacetime after decades of warfare and a newly repressive regime calling for a return to order produced a generation of men unsure of how to claim manhood. The possibility of attaining the masculine ideal on the battlefield was removed, but civilian society did not seem to provide the assurance that they would reach this pinnacle. For many of these men, their sense of self was imbued with a mourning for a past where men could posses more confidence in their maleness.

The July Revolution: The Disdained Bourgeoisie and the Consolidation of the Individual

The July Revolution has received the scorn from most historians and even many of those who played a part in its completion. By the end of five years of Louis-Philippe's reign, most political radicals understood that little had changed in French society since the usurpation of the Bourbon throne. No great social problems were solved. The rich remained ensconced in their wealth; the poor wallowed in an ever-increasing sense of dank despair. The Revolution of 1830, however, did effect change. These shifts were not those desired by radicals on the left or reactionaries on the right; rather, commercial interests gained favor within the French parliament and began a long and rocky road towards construction of railroads and the breaking of workers' groups in France.

Stendhal's greatest creation, Julien Sorel in *Le Rouge et le noir*, embodies the masculine disillusionment in early nineteenth-century France. The novel first appeared in 1830 bearing a subtitle, "a chronicle of the nineteenth century," charting the struggles of the young Sorel to achieve some semblance of success in a France born anew of political

and social conflagrations. Similar to protagonists in other novels of the period, such as Balzac's *Père Goriot*, the intrepid hero fights against the suffocating social mores of a world caught in flux, to triumph cautiously in the end. The ambiguity of these novels lies in their inability to confirm to the reader the assured victories of their main characters. Are these truly happy endings for Rastignac and Sorel? Sorel dallied with the priesthood and the army in the novel, finding neither capable of granting to him the heroic glory of the gory days of the Terror or the apotheosis of maleness experienced in the wars of Napoleon.

The July Revolution of 1830 created a short-lived sense of euphoria among its participants. By the middle of the 1830's, many people had found that the ideals of those "three glorious days" had worn off and given rise to a society more socially hierarchical than under the Bourbons. Theophile Gautier, in his preface to *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, wrote a blistering excoriation of the regime and a searing critique of a revolution in which he took part when he wrote: "By ordering the suppression of the newspapers, [Charles X] did a great service to arts and civilization."[59] This reference to the "Ordinances of Saint-Cloud," enacted by the king and his chief minister Polignac, undermines the general themes of liberalism for which the revolution was fought. This tongue-in-cheek provocation on the part of Gautier, thus, attacked the political virtues of freedom of the press and speech for which he and his circle of Romantic writers fought for and that the regime of Charles X hoped to extinguish in the July Revolution.

The remainder of the preface to the novel sets forth a bruising and reductive diatribe against the bourgeois values that Gautier is convinced has destroyed French artistic culture. Within this framework, the theatrical representation of violence becomes

[59] Gautier, Preface, *Mademoiselle de Maupin*, 44.

indicative of the moves of a fiercely puritanical group, hoping to quell any innovative impulses of creativity. "One would have thought," he writes in a derisive and dismissive tone apparent throughout the piece, "that the journalists had become Quakers, Brahmins, Pythagoreans, or bulls, they had taken such a horror to redness and blood."[60] Critics had now "deemed the dagger extravagant, poison monstrous, and the axe without excuse," rendering the "fifth act impossible" to stage.[61] Gautier makes no explanation as to why he believes violence to be integral to stage pieces, or in what way stage representations of physical force relate to his novel of seventeenth-century intrigue, but he creates a dizzying and humorous denunciation of groups seeking to find virtue and moral lessons in theater. He goes on to state that, because of this atmosphere of aversion to bellicosity, he has destroyed manuscripts where his "heroes were quartered and boiled in the middle of the stage, an incident which would have been very jovial and somewhat unprecedented." This move to celebrate the role of aggression in literature and the arts demonstrates the belief that drive to kill and destroy was valued as a prime and natural passion of the human spirit. By forbidding its place within the arts, "for it is recognized that the end of all tragedy is to kill," one has surrendered the power of drama.

The close to two decades of rule by a king presumed to represent the "bourgeois class" consolidated an image of the French social structure as one reigned over by money and artifice. As Sarah Maza has demonstrated powerfully, at the very moment that class in France was beginning to form around economic abilities, outrage was often heaped upon the middle class, unlike in England, Germany, or the United States, where the enterprising ingenuity of shopkeepers and inventors promoted a national image of self-

[60] Ibid., 23.

[61] Ibid., 22.

reliance.[62] In fact, Maza has argued, the French bourgeoisie has never existed. Yet the image of money-grubbing urban elites colored much of French social relations throughout the nineteenth century. The 1830's, became a crucial moment for the forging of an anti-bourgeois attitude and demeanor among artists, writers and intellectuals. In this adversarial position, however, something new was created: namely, a vision of gender relations supporting the state. The separate spheres of the sexes became a radical revision of the social order, yet were constructed in terms of nature. Male violence was accepted, if not celebrated. The period of the Bourbon Restoration had proffered a conservative approach to returning France to its supposed pre-revolutionary glories, but in doing so, authorities prompted a pervasive and successful resistance. The culture of defeat after Waterloo and a country facing economic and social concerns over the decade prompted the 1830's to become a decade of searching for "essential" truths of human behavior.

Victoria Thompson has argued that Balzac and Gautier served as some of the most vocal critics of the bourgeois morals dominant in the 1830's and 1840's. "Ambiguous gender and sexual identity," Thompson has written, "functioned as a metaphor for a society in which social and economic boundaries were perceived as permeable."[63] A Romantic liberal, such as Gautier, sought to shock the bourgeoisie with their adoration of money and morality, but for politically conservative writers, like Balzac and Alfred de Vigny, these novels pointed to the need for new social categories, the desire to make legible all within the social order. Legibility was far easier during the

---

[62] Sarah Maza, *The Myth of the French Bourgeoisie: An Essay on the Social Imaginary* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).

[63] Victoria Thompson, "Creating Boundaries: Homosexuality and the Changing Social Order in France, 1830-1870," in *Homosexuality in Modern France*, ed. Jeffrey Merrick and Bryant T. Ragan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 105.

Ancien Régime, when members of the aristocracy and the clergy held the power and wealth, while those beneath in the third estate toiled for money and sustenance. Those who argued against luxury (*luxe*) in eighteenth-century France proposed sumptuary laws which would keep non-titled members of the urban elite from taking the airs of the nobility.[64] The stark differences between those social orders had been erased with the Revolution. During the Restoration and July Monarchy, bourgeois families could possess more wealth and luxury then even the most distinguished noble families. Balzac and Gautier, in their novels where genders become indecipherable, always provided endings where those operating outside of normative sexual roles were punished or coerced into muting their queerness. Gautier's Mademoiselle de Maupin ended with the main female character declaring her status as a woman and living happily with her male lover, while Zambinella in *Sarrasine* and "la fille aux yeux d'or" did not meet happy fates.

The literary works of French realism point to the mutability of gender in the early nineteenth century. The homosexual did not yet exist, a subjective position, to which Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Judith Butler have pointed as an abject place where heterosexual masculinity can be posited as the opposite.[65] Those who seemed to inhabit some liminal position, where biological difference could not be read, became the specters haunting these novelists. They were attractive to Balzac and Gautier for their strangeness, but how they could call into question the ability to order the world socially became a frightening presence that demanded fixation.

---

[64] See for instance, John Shovlin, *The Political Economy of Virtue: Patriotism and Politics of Luxury in Eighteenth-Century France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

[65] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men*; Sedgwick, *The Epistemology of the Closet,* 1-5; Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble.*

These cultural pieces were part of a wider discourse within nineteenth-century France—and even Europe. Novelists, artists, intellectuals, doctors, and scientists began to ask questions about gender, sex and biology. What was a woman? What was a man? What were their roles? A woman came to be defined as simply the lack of a man, and the rhetoric of separate spheres came to preoccupy many in the nineteenth century as a way to protect women from the outside world of power-hungry men. Within this standard narrative of women's history, which dates back to the 1960's and exemplified in Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall's influential work *Family Fortunes*, violence rarely makes an appearance. Often, domestic violence is discussed in the relation of patriarchy, but questions of why men are always gendered powerful and aggressive with weak, passive mates have rarely been pondered. In fact, some of this scholarly work can further the notion that masculinity and aggression are always already implicated with one another as a reified, universal category. This connection made so prevalent in the nineteenth century was forged over a peculiar period through early science (often pseudo-scientific thought) and general discourses that furthered these notions of violence and gender.

The dictionary of the Academie Française of 1835 in its definition of woman even incorporated some of this cultural thought by including the statement: "women are naturally timid" in its usages of the word *femme* in common parlance.[66] While the word *mâle* was deemed by these same writers to confer on those nouns to which it is attached "having the appearance of the force suitable to the masculine sex."[67] In a much longer entry than the ones devoted to *femme*, the compilers of this work stated that the word

---

[66] *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, (Brussels: Meline, 1835), 6th ed., vol. I, 803.

[67] *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française* (Paris: Imprimeur de l'Institut, 1835), 6th ed., vol. 2, 154.

male had moral connotations in regards to courage, virtue, and male resolve (*résolution mâle*). Clearly, the cultural discourses contained Classical models of virtuous and heroic deeds in a list of the qualities of male identity, but with it was a new understanding of these values being reliant upon violence. Heroism as the constitutive marker of manhood hoped to forge an unbroken line of glorious men going back to Achilles and Hector. This naturalization, however, had many unforeseen consequences.

Sexual dimorphism changed the landscape of how science and society viewed the development of male and female bodies. The treatises of Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire best exemplified this line of reasoning. His views on monsters and hermaphrodites proposed a model of seeing the normal functioning of male and females and the "monsters" that made the normal more easily noticed. He was able to conclude in his three-volume study (published between 1832 and 1837) that all individuals necessarily belonged to one sex because they belonged to "nearly *inverse* functions in the family and in society. In that sense there are no intermediaries; our laws do not admit their existence or foresee their possibility."[68] The polarization of the sexes resulted in a search for what defined a male, which thus had to inherently be what a woman lacked. This construction of masculine possession and feminine deficiencies became the norm of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, buttressed with the institutional support of science and the academy and disseminated through cultural discourses that translated these "findings" into novels, arts and newspaper articles. Musset's *Confession* constructed a fitting image of this separation of the sexes into incommensurate beings when he wrote:

---

[68] Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, *Histoire générale et particulière des anomalies de l'organisation chez l'homme et les animaux, des monstruosités, des variétés et vices de conformation, ou traité de teratology*, 3 vols. (Paris: J.B. Ballière, 1832-37), vol. 3, 573.

> But it is certain that a unprecedented thing suddenly happened: in all the salons of Paris the men passed on one side, and the women on the other; and thus, the one clad in white like brides, and the other in black like orphans, began to take measure of one another with the eye.[69]

In Émile Zola's famous preface to *Thérèse Raquin* (1867), the author stated his intentions in writing a book that many critics, whom he believed to be among the churlish bourgeois, would deem to be pornographic. Much like the prefaces of Gautier and Hugo of the 1830's, Zola's piece dismissed the criticisms from these journalists on the grounds that their narrow-minded views could not comprehend the enormity and value of his work.

> "I wanted to study temperaments and not characters… If the novel is read with care, it will be seen that each chapter is a curious physiological case. In a word, I had only one desire: given a powerful man and an unsatisfied woman, to uncover the animal side of them and see that alone, then throw them together in a violent drama and note down with scrupulous care the sensations and actions of these beings. I simply applied to two living bodies the analytical method that surgeons apply to corpses."[70]

In this rather snide account, Zola has placed his admirable skills as a novelist on equal footing with that of science. In a nod to Balzac, he refers to his chapters as "curious physiological cases," placing it as the progeny of the realist movement of Balzac and Stendhal but charting its own new course of naturalist study of human behavior. Of course, Zola is convinced of the novelty of his work, but fictions such as *Germinal* and *L'Assommoir* emerged in the Third Republic out of the cultural discourses ubiquitous in Restoration and July Monarchy France. Zola's notion of the author as scientist harkens back to ideas developed in the 1830's that placed the power of observation as the foremost method of analysis, the eye of the doctor was no more powerful than that of the

---

[69] Musset, *Confession,* 28.

[70] Zola, *Thérèse Raquin* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952), vii.

sociological commentator. But Zola's work points to how novelists helped construct, along with the work of the physical sciences, the cultural discourses around human nature in post-revolutionary France.

Charles Baudelaire's novella of 1847, *La Fanfarlo*, exposed the Romantic and dandy fear of giving in to the bourgeois world, forcing one to renounce his mastery of the sartorial sublime. A man seeking to become a great writer falls in love with a beautiful ballerina. He woos her and they eventually marry, but in wedlock the couple is transformed into a disillusioned bourgeois pair. The once beautiful dancer "grows fatter by the day" and the supposed great writer does nothing than pen criticism and mediocre potboilers—"one whose title I have desire to recall."[71] This was the fear of many young men of the Generation of 1820: would they become mediocre individuals who had not conquered the horizon of a future and instead succumb to the mal du siècle? For many, nostalgia around their adolescent years and their exploits that often turned around violent actions became the constituent events of their biographies. Although dueling continued for many men far past their youthful indulgences, many of the acts of their adulthood were refracted through their experience of violence and the discourse that surrounded it in the nineteenth century. They may have become bourgeois saps but they had their memories to sustain themselves.

---

[71] Baudelaire, *The Prose Poems and La Fanfarlo*, trans. Rosemary Lloyd (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 29.

CHAPTER TWO:

THE EROTICS OF THE DUEL:

FARCE AND FANTASY IN ROMANTIC FRANCE

Évariste Galois had proven himself to be a man with a formidable intellect when in his teenage years he was able to explain a long-standing conundrum of abstract algebra: how to determine a necessary condition for a polynomial to be solved with a radical.[1] His mathematical studies were often diverted by his wide-ranging political activities. After the July Revolution of 1830, this young republican was expelled from the Ecole Normale and sent to prison for illegally wearing a military uniform after the National Guard regiment with which he was enlisted was disbanded. His relationship with a young woman, who was the daughter of a physician lodging at the same hostel, resulted in Galois waging a duel with a man who may have scorned her in May of 1832.

The fog hung low in the trees in the Parisian suburb of Gentilly when Galois met his adversary. Dawn was breaking, with shards of light piercing through the leaves and mist. Two men walked with their backs to one another. With twenty-five yards between

---

[1] Évariste Galois, "Analyse algébrique. Démonstration d'un théoreme sur les fractions continues périodiques," *Annales de Gergonne* 19 (1828-29): 294-301. In this article he takes his early discoveries and extends them into algebraic groups and connections, which formed major branches of abstract algebra later in the century named Galois theory. See also, Alexandre Astruc, *Evariste Galois* (Paris: Flammarion, 1994).

them, the armed men fired a single shot respectively. The noise shattered the silence, sending birds from their arboreal perches. Galois was injured. With the victim left bleeding on the ground, the assailant and his seconds departed by carriage. With blood on the ground, Galois' second and witness ran to search for medical help. A bullet was lodged in Galois' abdomen and he died from infection, resulting in (most likely) peritonitis the next day. The details around the duel remain murky, but the afterlife of this duel carried Galois to newfound fame among his cohort, and this demise valorized his masculine glory.[2]

Soon after his demise, rumors began to circulate that royalist supporters with the collusion of the police conspired against Galois and ensured that his death would result from a staged duel.[3] Speculations from men such as Alexandre Dumas asserted that the authorities knew Galois would be unable to refuse a duel because of his sense of personal honor.[4] Legends of Galois' last night grew over the course of the 1830's, celebrating his genius. These stories claimed that he sat through the night composing his last mathematical proofs by candlelight and sending them to his friend, Auguste Chevalier, to secure his legacy as a great mathematician. With his great theorizing complete, Galois

---

[2] For accounts of the duel, see Amir Alexander, *Duel at Dawn: Heroes, Martyrs and the Rise of Modern Mathematics* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010), ch. 1; Leon Chai, *Romantic Theory: Forms of Reflexivity in the Revolutionary Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 133-137.

[3] At least one biography of Galois treats these rumors as fact with no other supporting evidence. Eric Temple Bell, *Men of Mathematics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986).

[4] Alexandre Dumas, *Mes Mémoires*, ch. CCIV.

supposedly penned his last letter to his brother demanding: "Do not cry, Alfred! I need all of my courage to die at twenty years of age."[5]

This image of the romantic duel pervades much of the cultural memory of post-revolutionary France. Novelists, playwrights, and visual artists depicted moments of armed contests in their work. Dumas, Balzac and Hugo wrote of slighted honor and recourses to violence as part of an ideology of masculinity that required the use of force. Characters in these works often watched family members, lovers or themselves die in the final moments of these works. Memoirs penned by the likes of Berlioz and Juste Olivier mentioned duels in which they and their friends participated. Although the presence of dueling in cultural products of the nineteenth century is undisputed, what was the social reality of these battles?[6]

The duel represents the most visible aspect of a new bourgeois masculinity in early nineteenth-century France. The duel was a mainly urban phenomenon that enforced social boundaries, including those of gender. It was a tense and complex social ritual that allowed for the state to turn a blind eye to a form of violence that authorities felt was necessary for the smooth functioning of society. This steam-valve release theory of controlled violence from such a ritualized social interaction ignored an enduring cycle of violence. Unlike the duels of the early modern period, fought mainly among aristocratic

---

[5] This final letter does not exist in the private archives of the Galois family, and this may be simply conjecture often presented as fact.

[6] Works on dueling run the gamut from scholarly investigations into the politics of the act to popular romanticizations of this violence that was at the heart of a now lost masculinity. For instance, see Richard Cohen, *By the Sword: A History of Gladiators, Musketeers, Samurai, Swashbucklers and Olympic Champions* (New York: Random House, 2002); V.G. Kiernan, *The Duel in European History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); Robert Nye, *Masculinity and Masculine Codes of Honor in Modern France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); William Reddy, *The Invisible Code* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). For the American context, see Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982). On early modern France, Billacois' *Le duel dans la société française des XVIe-XVIIe siècles* (Paris: EHESS, 1986) is the authoritative text.

rivals, these new competitions for masculine prowess in the early nineteenth century (the most famous incident of a female duelist did not occur until the Third Republic) were fought by an expanded sector of society between men of the military and men from urban backgrounds and non-noble families. This expansion of available aggression to young men of differing class backgrounds reinvented the duel in the nineteenth century.

A growing body of scholarship from historians and anthropologists alike has enriched our knowledge of the meaning and history of honor. Whether studies of the circulation of respect among Bedouins or analyses of aristocratic revenge in early modern Italy, this work has produced new, richer understandings of the links between shame and aggression. These scholarly endeavors, however, have treated, at times, honor and violence as transhistoric certainties, not paying heed to the changing modes and uses of social credit. Honor has a varied history and one of its most intriguing chapters occurs in the early nineteenth century in Western Europe, especially in France.

What does the duel have to say about changes in the concept of masculinity? Edward Muir has argued vigorously for the civilizing effect of aristocratic pamphlets regarding decorum that shifted Renaissance Italy from vendettas to the more easily contained duel.[7] This new vision of masculinity embodied itself in the courtier, exemplified by Castiglione. The chivalric court member of this period reappeared in the cultural discourse of the nineteenth century, especially among the Romantics, searching to recreate a storied past of honor and prestige. The traditional narrative of bourgeois society in the nineteenth century has emphasized the separation of spheres that placed women in a domestic, private sphere disconnected from the masculine, public sphere of

---

[7] Edward Muir, *Mad Blood Stirring: Vendetta in Renaissance Italy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), ch. 6.

work and politics. Feminist historians have troubled this tidy storyline, showing the inconsistencies of this separation and the incompleteness of this division.[8] The ideal of separate spheres, however, mandated that men embody a form of maleness that proved the diametric opposite to women, regardless of social boundaries. Much to the chagrin of legislators and polemicists, class happens, to use the formulation of E.P. Thompson, and these ideals of the sexes had far-reaching implications for the nineteenth century.[9] The duel in nineteenth-century France strained the notions of civility but within a framework that stressed the noble origins of the act. In the post-revolutionary nation, this ritual became a tool for young men to assert their maleness in a time when credos of individualism accentuated the tormented status of many.

Sexuality and the Duel: Theorizing Male Practice

The duel represented to these men an act of homosocial desire, famously defined by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick as a hypothesis about "the potential unbrokenness of a continuum between homosocial and homosexual."[10] Homosociability has revealed itself over time in various situations the need to cement the relations between men to the complete exclusion of women. A male-only space, such as the sites of duels, served in the nineteenth-century world to define hierarchies of maleness. For many, the supreme importance of military service dictated that young men of the armed forces uniquely

---

[8] See for instance, Mary Poovey, *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes,* Introduction; Amanda Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres?," *The Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (June 1993): 383-414.

[9] E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York: Vintage, 1963), 9.

[10] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 1-2.

possessed the superiority of the ideal of the warrior over those young men of urban professions such as journalism, banking, medicine and law. Few males, however, would submit to such emasculation at the hands of soldiers. An unbreakable pattern of honor, shame and violence enveloped much of post-revolutionary French society.

The duel itself possessed an erotic quality. The armed weapons symbolized phalluses, while the swordplay of men meeting for battle represented the homoerotics of male sociability. In addition, many duels were fought for or on the behalf of women. Many young men hoped to court the attention of an attractive woman by demonstrating his prowess in the realm of masculine violence. To follow Jean Baudrillard, the duel also represented "simulated violence," where the act contained the legible symbols of aggression but did not result in actual bloodshed.[11] Most dueling in France did not result in death, partly due to the inefficacy of pistols and the admonition that duels should "never be fought to the death."[12] Many university students battled with men of the military in these battles, exhibiting the hierarchies of maleness in post-revolutionary society. The ideal of the warrior continued to hold sway but the limits to how many young men could become officers resulted in dueling becoming a favored way for men outside of the military to prove his male mettle. Although many examinations of duels have been written, an investigation of the duel and its politics of gender, understood through the lens of queer theory, has not been attempted.

The duel also represented an instance of the ability to dominate other men. As one psychologist of violence has written: "Men will often kill or assault each other in the

---

[11] Jean Baudrillard, trans. Sheila Glaser, *Simulacra and Simulation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), see introduction.

[12] Chatauvillard, *Essai sur le duel*, 5.

struggle to avoid being in the submissive position."[13] The idea of submission and dominance leads inevitably to sexual positions, and the idea of submitting to another man is loathe in most western cultures. Dominating in a sexual encounter with a man was deemed far more socially acceptable than submitting to one in the age before the medicalization of the homosexual in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[14] For men in nineteenth-century France, the insult that would cause a duel was such an attempt on the part of one man to dominate another, an untenable position for any man to occupy.

The duel in post-revolutionary France represented a masculine appeal to order and honor, but its formulation and practice had historical specificity in the early nineteenth century. Those who engaged in these ritualized fights harkened back to the days of duels in Richilieu's Paris, as represented in the vogue of Romantic literature from Alexandre Dumas and Victor Hugo, who celebrated the honor of medieval and early modern men. Crucially, works such as *Bug-Jargal* (1826) and *The Three Musketeers* (1844) universalized a notion of male status gained through such battles. They wrenched the historical specificity of such swordfights from the era of the Wars of Religion, and they stressed the violence that accorded to men special social standing in France. It became integral to the identity of many young Frenchmen. For many of these men, their national pride and self knowledge was predicated in a belief of the uniqueness of the French duel. As Jules Janin, the noted literary critic, wrote in 1837:

---

[13] James Gilligan, *Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic* (New York: Vintage, 1997), 152.

[14] On this topic, see the foundational text, Michel Foucault, *A History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1990), esp. 35-45; George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture and the Making of the Gay World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1995), esp. ch. 11; David Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), ch. 1.

> I would not want to live for twenty-four hours in a society constituted without the duel. The duel makes out of each of us a strong and independent power; it makes out of each life the life of the whole of society; it takes up the cause of justice the moment the law abandons it; alone it punishes what the laws are unable to punish, scorn, and insult. Those who have spoken against the duel are either cowards or imbeciles; he who spoken both for and against it lies out of both sides of his mouth. We are still a civilized people today because we have conserved the duel.[15]

Janin's words evoked a firm belief in the power of the duel to regulate breaches of honor and in forging the role of violence in the development of boys into men.

The Return of the Repressed: The Duel in post-Napoleonic France

The duel had first received royal support under Henri II, but when a favorite of the king's perished in such a duel, he prohibited its continuing presence in the kingdom while he sat on the throne.[16] Henri IV was forced to issue an edict further forbidding the duel when almost five thousand French men perished due to its usage in a ten-year period. Dueling had been outlawed in France under Cardinal Richilieu in 1628, after the deleterious effects during the religious wars, where upwards of a thousand men were killed a year during such acts following the Saint Bartholomew's Massacre of 1572. When Richilieu issued yet another edict that forbade dueling in 1628, over 350 people had been killed per year in swordfights in the preceding three decades.[17] Neither the penal code of 1791, nor the Napoleonic Code of 1810 explicitly outlawed the duel,

---

[15] Jules Janin, *Journal des Débats*, 1837. from an article outlining Liszt's duel with Thalberg. Also quoted in Nye, *Masculinity,* 146.

[16] Sabine, *Notes on Duels*, 6; Kiernan, *The Duel in European history,* ch. 5; Billacois, *The Duel*, 46. On the early modern period and dueling, see Jennifer A. Low, *Manhood and the Duel: Masculinity in Early Modern Drama and Culture* (New York: Palgrave, 2003).

[17] Billacois, *The Duel*, 34; Carroll, *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France,* 258.

creating an issue of jurisprudence of how to prosecute its practitioners. During the wars of the Empire, soldiers often settled disputes between themselves through the ritual, but it was not widely utilized among civilians.[18]

The noted gastronomist and author of *La Physiologie du Gout* (1826), Jean-Anthelme Brillat de Savarin, penned *Essai historique et critique de duel* in 1819.[19] The jurist who became famous for his essays on Epicureanism played an extensive part in legal debates surrounding the duel. His work, along with many others of the period, set forth a view of the duel as a problematic but necessary part of the French national fabric. "The duel contributes to maintaining the respect [*des égards*] that we need in society," he wrote, and not just because of "the fright it causes," but because it somehow (inexplicably) "extinguishes hatreds."[20] In citing an 1818 duel between two noblemen, one of whom died in combat, Brillat de Savarin mocked the judges of the royal court of Toulouse for convicting the surviving member of the duel for premeditated murder.[21] For Brillat de Savarin, the reason why no law existed against the duel explicitly was because legislators realized that the duel would always endure. This notion of Brillat de Savarin served as an early vision of the "hydraulic theory" of violence, often linked to Freud—so-called because of the metaphorical image of a container of boiling water that without a steam-valve release will erupt in a great explosion. This contradicts much of the social

---

[18] Joseph Conrad romanticized the never-ending cycle of revenge between two Napoleonic soldiers in "The Duel: A Military Story" (first serialized in 1908), made into a feature film by Ridley Scott in 1977.

[19] J.-A. Brillat de Savarin, *Essai historique et critique de duel, d'après nos moeurs et notre legislation* (Paris: n.p., 1819).

[20] *Ibid.,* 88-89.

[21] *Ibid.,* 55-63.

psychology work done in the twentieth century that seems to show that aggressive behavior often begets more aggressive behavior.[22]

In 1819, Brillat de Savarin could write that "duels are more numerous in England than in France, and they are crueler [there], because they are carried out with pistols."[23] The English began a campaign in the 1830's to eradicate the duel, and ironically, the last recorded duel in the country took place in 1852 between two Frenchmen.[24] The rates for dueling rose throughout the 1820's and 1830's in France, but nothing in comparison to the rates during the Third Republic, especially during the crisis of the Dreyfus Affair.[25] The Ministry of Justice kept records of duels reported to the authorities between 1826 and 1834, and during this period, when plays, novels and art, invariably represented dueling, the highest yearly rate of death 39 in 1826 and 32 in 1833. For this period, over 370 duels took place with a median rate of fatality equaling 36%.[26] The Ministry knew of 57 duels, which did not result in death in 1828 and 58 in 1833, but other years, authorities only knew of 21 (1830) or 29 (1834).[27] Historians, most notably Robert Nye and Ute Frevert, have disputed some of these numbers, saying that many duels occurred in "private" outside of the domain of the state. But the reach of the state, through its ministers, police and gendarmes, was far and wide, so Nye's and Frevert's insistence that the numbers are

---

[22] See Eliot Aronson, *The Social Animal,* eighth edition (New York: Freeman, 2004), 209-213, for a summary of this work.

[23] Brillat de Savarin, *Essai Historique et critique du duel* (Paris: n.p., 1819), 73.

[24] Martin Wiener, *Men of Blood,* 73.

[25] Christopher Forth, *Crisis of Manhood*.

[26] Jean-Claude Chesnais, *Les morts violentes en France depuis 1826: Comparaisons internationales* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1976), 29.

[27] *Ibid.,* 30.

"the tip of the iceberg" for the century seems unsubstantiated.[28] Numerous regional studies in France have shown few regions having few documented duels over the nineteenth century.[29] For the period of 1839 until 1843, rates of dueling fell even more with an oscillation of death rates between three and seven casualties per year.[30] These numbers would increase under the Third Republic, after the French defeat at the hands of the Prussians. Although these acts occurred during the nineteenth century and they could often be deadly, they did not happen at the same rates as in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. But in France, the practice still retained far more attraction to young men throughout the century in comparison to England, where by mid-century it was virtually eradicated (the last publicly reported duel was in 1852).[31] Why did young Frenchmen find meaning in a practice that was being ridiculed and condemned in other parts of Europe?

This ritual was so pervasive that it invaded all corners of the French imagination being immortalized in numerous plays, novels, paintings of the early nineteenth century. Gabriel Tarde, the prominent French sociologist, wrote in 1892, regarding duels: "If one counted the duels contained in novels, comedies, dramas, which one saw everyday for ten years in France, one would certainly find the number twenty to forty times greater to the

---

[28] Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France,* 135-140. Ute Frevert, "Bourgeois Honor," 75.

[29] Raymond Duplantier, "Les duels à Poitiers et dans la Vienne au cours de la première moitié du dix-nouvième siècle," in the proceedings of the *Société des antiquares de l'ouest*, 22. Jan. 1950: 1-18; Yves Baron, *Les Duels dans le Calvados au XIXe siècle,* mémoire de maitrise, Caen, 1982.

[30] Guillet, *La mort en face*, 110. Guillet uses reports from the Minister of Justice, Nicholas Martin, to establish these numbers.

[31] James N. McCord, "Politics and Honor in Early Nineteenth-Century England: The Dukes' Duel," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 62, no. 1 (1999): 88-114; Donna Andrew, "The Code of Honour and Its Critics: The Opposition to Duelling in England, 1700-1850," *Social History* 5 (1980): 409-434.

number of duels that really took place in the French public."[32] For the period from the Battle of Waterloo until the revolution of 1848, the duel's practice was far lower than the opening decades of the Third Republic.

Who was allowed to partake in duels? This thorny question often divided those of rank and privilege who understood rules and proper procedures and those who did not. Yet this simple proposition did not mark a clear boundary in the post-revolutionary world. Charles Cotlesworth Pinckney (1746-1825), a sometimes candidate for the American presidency during the years of the early republic and an ambassador to France (1796-97) during the Directory, had little respect for the usage of the duel, a view confirmed to him with the death of Alexander Hamilton in 1804. Likely referring to his own experience in France, he wrote after Hamilton's murder: "That, in countries where distinctions of rank are sanctioned, a pernicious custom may exist, and be confined to the higher orders of society, and be confined to the higher orders of society, and be comparatively little destructive; —but that in our country of equal laws, rights, and rank, such custom, if unchecked by the laws, will necessarily become general, and spread its destructive effects far and wide in the community, to the desolation of thousands of families."[33] This fear of the practice spreading to classes untrained and uncivilized was also sparked in France. In Pinckney's views, the senses of privileges (allegedly wiped away with the Revolution) continued to educate those to who and who not could participate. In France, students of good families and professions of the urban populace were allowed and even expected to involve themselves in this system of honor because of

---

[32] Gabriel Tarde, "Le Duel," *Etudes pénales et socials* (Paris: Masson, 1892), 64.

[33] This letter was written in August of 1804, only a month after Hamilton's death. Quoted in Lorenzo Sabine, *Notes on Duels and Duelling* (sic) (Boston: Crosby, Nichols and Co., 1855), 325.

their aspiration to join the ruling classes of society. For working-class men, even artisans, many commentators warned of this violence spreading beyond control of civility and the state.

The practitioners of the nascent discipline of psychology of the early nineteenth century did not view dueling as a form of madness. There was a possibility that the ritual could be abused by those suffering from an obsession compulsion termed *monomanie*, where a focus becomes so intense that all proper functioning of the individual is destroyed, a highly fashionable illness of the Restoration and July Monarchy, akin to hysteria during the Third Republic. François-Joseph-Victor Broussais, a highly influential theorist of the functioning of the brain, wrote in his treatise, *De l'irritation et de la folie* (*On Irritation and Insanity* [1828]) argued that men who avoided duels with "the grand power of the instinct of conservation" may suffer from an illness of the brain. "On the other hand, it is among such men who renounce life with a singular facility, and several among them seem devoid of courage: such are those who give themselves over to death in order to avoid a duel, equally fearing the appearance of their enemy and the shame of refusing combat."[34] For Broussais, then, not engaging in such acts was a mark not only of failed masculinity, but also insanity.

The role of alcohol within this pattern of shame, dishonor and the emergence of violence must be stressed. Many duels, as numerous sources from court transcripts to police records indicate, began when young men who had indulged in a night of too much wine, either at a café or in a theater, came to blows after an insult had been flung from one party to another, prompting one group to insist on meeting the next day to solve this

[34] Broussais, *De l'irritation et de la folie*, 90.

perceived emasculation.[35] France among all Western countries had the highest alcohol consumption—although the early American republic drank far more distilled liquors (which have a far higher alcohol content than wine, the preferred drink of the French). For instance, the per capita amount of wine drank within France in the year 1839 was 23.3 gallons, at a time when no other country drank more than two gallons per capita.[36] This rate of drinking led to more outbreaks of violence among young men who were already instructed by culture and society always to preserve his honor.

French boxing, known as *savate* (taken from the name from a boot worn by sailors), represented a counterpoint to the democratization undergoing the practice of the duel. Rather than spreading from the aristocracy to untitled families of urban lifestyles, as the duel did, this nascent sport rose upward from criminals and sailors to become a popular pastime of such luminaries as Théophile Gautier. Savate was undergoing a process of formalization in the 1820's, thanks to the efforts of Michel Casseux, who opened the first training site for the sport.[37] The sport which incorporates both punching and kicking moves became popular in the capital in the 1820s among the nobility and tastemakers of the period, such as Théophile Gautier. It was first a practice developed by sailors and in the late 1790's François Vidocq, later to become famous as the putative first private detective in France and chief of *Sûreté Nationale* (1813-1827, and then from

---

[35] The F7 6695 police records usually indicated to the police commissioner how inebriated they believed the duels' participants might have been. See also cases in *La Gazette des Tribunaux* (for instance, 8 March 1835, in the case of a young man so hungover when he fought his duel that he vomited before he could fire his pistol).

[36] W.J. Rorabaugh, *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), Appendix Two, 238. France's consumption of wine continued to increase to an all-time high in the years following World War I with a per capita rate of 37.8 gallons.

[37] On *savate* in the early nineteenth century, see Jean-François Loudcher, *Histoire de la savate, du chausson et de boxe française (1797-1978)* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2000), 15-43.

1830-32), helped to bring the activity to a new and varied populace by training his agents to beat alleged criminals in the style of savate.[38] Like manuals for dueling, Casseux set forth the limits of the sport in his treatise *L'art de la savate*, forbidding head-butting and eye-gouging.[39] His student Charles Lecour, influenced by pugilism of the English variety, added techniques that created the sport as it is known to the present. Savate, like dueling, became an intense activity among men of higher socioeconomic status because it preserved sites for the release of violence and aggression that were outside the purview of the state.

The Legalities of the Duel in the 1820's

Debates raged throughout the Restoration and the July Monarchy as to the status of the duel under the law. In 1829, a debate raged in how the duel should be prosecuted and punished. Many proponents of the duel surmised that legal codes of 1791 and 1810 were silent about the duel because they should not be allowed. The minister of justice, Comte Portalis, argued that the form of the law against the duel was incoherent, but that a creation of laws that punished all participants would result in "the excess of injustice by the same means that would be employed to repair it."[40] Charles X and his ministers argued that they believed that the word was not explicitly mentioned in legal codes

---

[38] On Vidocq, see Dominique Kalifa, *La naissance de la polive privée* (2008); and Vidocq, *Mémoires de Vidocq, Chef de la police sureté jusqu'en 1827* (Paris: Tenon, 1828). These memoirs are full of unverified accounts of Vidocq's actions and were penned by a ghostwriter, since Vidocq's grasp of the written word was fragile at best.

[39] Michel Casseux, *L'art de la savate* (Paris: n.p., 1832).

[40] *Archives Parlementaires de 1787 à 1860* (henceforth *AP*), (Paris: P. Dupont, 1867), vol. LVII, 14 February 1829, 120.

because it was clearly under the jurisdiction of laws concerning homicide.[41] Court of cassation (the French Supreme Court), however, often failed to indict men for dueling or uphold previous convictions. The law of 1829 made the illicitness of the practice explicit, punishing offenders with incarceration of no less than one month, and this was increased a year later.[42] These laws, however, gave juries the power to excuse the crime if extenuating circumstances made it allowable under law.[43]

As Charles X's reign was coming under political fire for its reactionary policies, the king saw an opportunity to bridge some support over creating a law that was popular among both some conservatives and liberals. Charles speaking through Bourdeau, the Minister of Justice and Keeper of the Seal (*Garde des sceaux*), went so far as to aver that the duel was not an inherent practice of the French but through the invasion of "barbarous nations," most likely a reference to the Franks. This question of origins was important and Charles' stance differed with a view that saw that the "institution" of the duel originated with the Gauls in the days before Caesar's conquest of the region.[44] As Pierre-Simon Ballanche (1776-1847), the counterrevolutionary philosopher, wrote in his 1818, *Essai sur les institutions sociales*:

> The spirit of conquest, reduced to its cruel nudity, at least will be deprived of all of its glory. The duel, remaining from our ancient Gallic customs and our chivalric habits, served sometimes to redress veritable wrongs that maybe saved us from atrocious reprisals of the stylet [stiletto]. The duel withdraws little by

[41] *AP*, vol. LX, 8 June 1829: 102-105.

[42] *AP,* vol. LXI, 11 March 1830: 554-555.

[43] *AP*, vol. LVII, 14 March 1829, 407.

[44] *AP*, vol. LX, 8 June 1829: 105.

> little before the institution of the jury, destined by its nature itself to redress all wrongs towards individuals as towards society, in order to wash all of its most susceptible marks of honor. [45]

In a move with which many practitioners vehemently disagreed, Charles stated before the Chambre: "The prestige of honor will no longer cover [the duel's] bloody successes, morals and youth will no longer be the regretting accomplices of its crimes."[46] The law passed by the chambers of the legislature set punishment of duelists at two years of imprisonment with no less than a month of time in prison and a nominal fine. This punishment was increased to five years in March of 1830.[47] Of course, the irony of a regime teetering towards collapse with an obsession over dueling begs the question: why were legislators and cultural producers such as novelists and artists invested in the duel?

With the laws of 1829 and further laws after the assassination attempt on the part of Fieschi to kill Louis-Philippe in 1835 came a turning point in the practice of the duel. September laws of 1835 stripped away freedom of the press, reinstated theatrical censorship and ended any right to association. These statutes were expected to halt any subversion on the parts of republican and socialist agitators. A new debate raged in both houses of the French parliament about a law, not *against* dueling but rather about dueling, creating a means to regulate the ritual and not forbid it.[48] New manuals were published in the late 1830's, but yet no spike in deaths accompanied these changes. These legal debates, however, continued to rage and, in fact, it was not until 1863 when the duel was

---

[45] Pierre-Simon Ballanche, *Essai sur les institutions sociales* (Paris: Fayard, 1991), 73. This edition includes the 1818 text with prefaces added in 1830.

[46] *AP,* vol. LX, 8 June 1829: 105.

[47] *AP*, vol. LXI, 8 March 1830: 554-555.

[48] *AP*, vol. CXIX, 8 May 1838: 169.

seen as a violation of the civil code.[49] The Third Republic witnessed a new transformation in the duel. Its use expanded and more cases ensnared the highest officers of the government to newspapermen of the cheapest periodicals of the nation. In fact, journalists fought 70% of all duels, where profession of combatants is known, between 1880 and 1899.[50]

In France, the duel was not universally celebrated. Numerous lawmakers, writers and journalists deplored the bloodshed that was occurring in their cities. For many of these critics, they utilized a rhetoric of fear and national loss of the country's young men to these battles in order to promote strengthening laws that would be used to prosecute duelists. These laws, however, never succeeded. In the 1840's, for instance, not a single man brought up on charges of dueling was ever convicted by a jury.[51] These critiques of duels were not limited to the French and the famous English writer of aphorisms and longtime resident of Paris, Charles Caleb Colton, said: "If all seconds were as averse to duels as their principals, very little blood would be shed in that way."[52] The notion that it was the seconds who urged on their supposed friends to such practices that could potentially lead to death, speaks to the force that male friendships had on the escalation of violence. As Colton elaborated, "In all affairs of honour, excepting those where the sole motive is revenge, it is curious that fear is the main ingredient."[53] Nineteenth-century

---

[49] Guillet, *La Mort en Face*, 180; Reddy, *The Invisible Code,* 237; Nye, *Masculinity*, 145.

[50] Guillet, *La mort en face*, 251; Reddy, *The Invisible Code,* ch. 5.

[51] Guillet, *La Mort en Face*, 103; Yves Michaud, *La violence* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1986), 28.

[52] Charles Caleb Colton, *Lacon, or Many Things in Few Words, Addressed to Those who Think* (London: A. Spottiswoode, 1837), 41.

[53] *Ibid.,* 116.

lawmakers were often caught in an ambivalent relationship to a custom they found simultaneously troubling and glorious to the nation.

The Rules of the Duel: Manuals and Exhortations

Dueling manuals of the nineteenth century sought to correct the usage of weapons and gestures that had marred its practice in preceding centuries, stressing politeness and civility. Earlier works by authors such as Brantôme allowed for fighting that was deemed unseemly in the nineteenth century. For instance, Brantôme, in his *Discours sur les duels* (originally published posthumously in 1665), stated that beards served a vital purpose "for they are very good to grip when they are long and thick," a view that would be deemed uncivilized in the Romantic period.[54] The letters of Lord Chesterfield had proved an enormous publishing success in both England and the continent—six editions in Paris and Amsterdam had appeared by 1800 after its initial publication in 1775-76.[55] He stressed the need for young men to be "polished" and warned that "nothing is more insulting than to take pains to make a man feel a mortifying inferiority in knowledge, rank, fortune, etc. In the first it is both ill-bred and ill-natured; and in the latter two articles it is unjust."[56] Chesterfield's admonitions doubtless fell on deaf ears in France after the turn of the century, where any such impunity to a man's character assuredly resulted in a duel. In fact, Barbey d'Aurevilly's famed treatise of 1844 on dandyism hoped to reverse the disdain that men, such as Chesterfield, had for vanity: "But is vanity

---

[54] Brantôme, *Discours sur les duels*, in oeuvres completes, vi, 241.

[55] Chesterfield, *Lord Chesterfield's Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), xi.

[56] Lord Chesterfield, *Advice to his Son, on Men and Manners* (London: Scott, Webster, and Geary, 1836), 52. This was a selection of Chesterfield's letters intended for young men. Such selections were also popular on the continent in the early nineteenth century.

really the lowest [of sentiments]? … Vanity pays attention to everything."[57] In the nineteenth century, the new discourse surrounding the Romantic hero and individualism stressed the opposite values of eighteenth-century authors about courtesy.

The ubiquity of the duel was, in part, due to the notion that it was a timeless ritual committed across cultures. Across the Atlantic world, duelists defended the necessity of the practice. Treatises published in the American South were translated into French, and differences among nations of Europe were often summarized in treatises about the custom. Supporters consistently spoke of its appearance in legal codes of Justinian and the Burgundians in the sixth century.[58] Defining a duel became the focus of a number of nineteenth-century histories. Many commentators about the tradition cited the historical details of the practice, stretching the definition to include David and Goliath, or Achilles and Hector.[59] For supporters and detractors alike, reforms were considered necessary; far too many duels were being fought over "trivial reasons."[60]

In the 1820's these male codes of honor had a cross-Atlantic appeal. Of course, the most celebrated duel in American history and publicized across France was Alexander Hamilton's demise at the hands of Vice President Aaron Burr in 1804. John Geddes, the Governor of South Carolina from 1818 to 1820 and mayor of Charleston for a one-year term in 1824, wrote a treatise on dueling after he had killed a man who

---

[57] Jules Barbey d'Aurevilly, *Du dandysme et de Georges Brummel* [sic] (Paris: Dentu, 1845), 4.

[58] Sabine, *Duels*, 25; Chatauvillard, *Essai sur le duel*, 15.

[59] Sabine, *Duels*, 5-10. Campigneulles, *Histoire des Duels*, 9-15.

[60] Lorenzo Sabine entitles an entire chapter in his mid-nineteenth-century work on duels, "trivial Causes of Duels—Disgraceful and Ridiculous Duels;" Sabine, 35-41. Charles Cottlesworth Pinckney, Chatauvillard, and Fougeroux de Campigneulles all called for rationality to rule over the correct formulation of dueling practice.

insulted him during the mayoral campaign. This text was translated into French a year after his death in 1828.[61] Edward Livingston, Secretary of State under Andrew Jackson from 1831-33, who played a large role in the drafting of the 1825 Louisiana civil code, based on Napoleonic Code, wrote an important opinion on the ritual, which was translated into French in 1829.[62] Charles Cottlesworth Pickney, a detractor of the custom, still recognized that it held sway in a society defining itself through honor. His strong attacks upon the duel were widely publicized in the antebellum South. His tracts were likewise translated into French. This American work became influential to practitioners in France.

The most striking transformation in the duel from early modern period to the nineteenth century was the newfound individual autonomy attached to its practice. Codes of honor had previously demanded dueling at slights of individual honor as it spoke to familial and kinship networks. Although familial honor still held sway, the social status of a single man provoked more dueling than feuds between kin groups, as was the case in the ancien regime. In this preceding period, the nobility often held a monopoly on codes of honor, duelists in the nineteenth century witnessed what Robert Nye has termed "the democratization of honor."[63] After the Revolution, urban elites who had not been ennobled through venality participated boldly in such rituals, stating their own ability to hold the honor that had been stripped from noble privileges. As the president of the Cours

[61] John Geddes, *Reflexions sur le duel et sur les moyens les plus efficaces de le prévenir* (Paris: n.p. 1828).

[62] Edward Livingston, *A System of Penal Law for the United States of America* (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1828).

[63] Nye, *Masculinity,* 10.

d'Assises of the Seine stated in 1834, "a whistle (*soufflet*), in our morals, demands a bloody reparation."[64]

The deomocratization of honor, however, had its limits. Members of the working class were still forbidden from such displays of violence. As one lawyer defined the act in 1834, "the does not consist in the nature of arms which one uses, nor in the presence of witnesses. What characterizes the duel is the consent of two champions who freely and without the effect of any constraint convenes reciprocally to renounce the protection which the law affords to all citizens and to expose their life in order to place in peril that of their adversary."[65] This lawyer used a novel approach in his use of the rhetoric of the act in regard to a brawl fought between two laborers. Here, the attorney stresses that the act is not the privileged domain of the aristocracy and bourgeois elites but available to all men who consent to the code of honor. This line of reasoning met with resistance from the judge, who convicted the men for a prison sentence and fine. Men of high social standing could not support the notion that this type of honor was available to men of the working class. Urban elites fought among themselves and against nobles to claim their possession of this code of honor, and stretching it to include all men would render their bloody battles null and void.

The duel occurred under an incredibly strict code of practice. Numerous manuals were published during the Napoleonic regime, Bourbon Restoration and the July Monarchy stipulating how the ritual was to occur from the first breach of honor to the final handshake after the act's completion. Some of these books were in upwards of four to five hundred pages detailing how a duel *à l'épée, au pistolet,* or *au sabre* was to

---

[64] Quoted in Guillet, *La Mort en Face,* 169.

[65] Quoted in Guillet, *La Mort en Face*, 168. From *La Gazette des Tribunaux*, 18 May 1834.

proceed. The most famous of these manuals was Cahtauvillard's *Essai sur le duel*, published to acclaim in 1836.[66] It claimed to be the first to outline the rules of the game. The book became such a success that lawmakers and judges even utilized the argument of Chatauvillard in celebrated cases.[67] Chatauvillard stressed that some duels should be outlawed because of the danger to the combatants. The rules he set forth demonstrated to many men that the duel was a "civilized" act, for some nothing more than a competitive sport, demonstrating prowess. Works such as that of Chatauvillard sought to establish rules for the practice, in order to give it an air of rationality. By creating regulations, writers and participants hoped to create an act that garnered respect from legislators. "Let's not hesitate to give this name [of the law] to rules imposed by honor, because honor is not something deemed less sacred than governmental laws. Each is exposed to this hard necessity of risking its life to avenge an offense, an injury."[68] For Chatauvillard, duels fought to the death displayed "behaviors not suitable to gentlemen."[69]

The ambivalence to the duel is captured by Fougeroux de Campigneulles, an attorney in the Royal Court of Douai under the July Monarchy, in his 1838 work *Histoire des duels, anciens et modernes*.[70] Campigneulles opened with an epigraph from Rousseau's *La Nouvelle Héloïse,* stating "the man of courage disdains the duel, and the

---

[66] Chatauvillard, *Essai sur le duel* (Paris: Chez Bohaire, 1836). For discussions of this text, see Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France,* 141-45; and Guillet, *La Mort en Face,* 18-25.

[67] On legislative and political uses of Chatauvillard, see Guillet, *La Mort en face*, 135-150.

[68] Chatauvillard, *Essai sur le duel*, 5.

[69] *Ibid.,* 20.

[70] Fougeroux de Campigneulles, *Histoire des duels, anciens et modernes* (Paris: Libraire Joubert, 1838).

good man abhors it."[71] He then continued to speak of the power of the duel, a power so intense that even those who are most condemnatory of the ritual were still entranced by its raw strength. The triviality of much of these honor killings became the focus of jurisprudence and writing around duels throughout the nineteenth century. Although it was never clearly defined, examples of "trivial causes" of duels were utilized by writers of disparate political leanings to show the need for controlling and regulating the practice. Even Baudelaire in *The Painter of Modern Life* stated a dandy could commit a crime without remorse, "but if this crime was born of a trivial source, the dishonor would be irreparable."[72] Eugène Sue embodied the coolness to the act in his now celebrated proverb (wrongly attributed to *Les Liaisons Dangereuses* of Choderlos de Laclos) that "revenge is a dish best served cold" ("*la vengeance se mange très-bien froide*").[73]

The Romantics and the Duels in the 1830's

Romantic authors were perhaps the most instrumental in this shift of duelists working within well-regulated networks of either noble families or royal patronage. In novels from Dumas to Hugo, suffering men battled in duels as a result of their interior struggles. Their heroic deeds were called on by circumstances beyond their control. They created heroism by valorous deeds unable to be accomplished by a social reality that no one could escape.

---

[71] Rousseau, *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, letter 37.

[72] Baudelaire, *Le peintre de la vie moderne,* in *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 3: 483.

[73] Eugène Sue, *Mathilde* (1841). There is great debate over the origin of the phrase. Sue italicizes the adage, pointing to its pre-existence, but no other reference is found in earlier known works. Unfortunately today, most know the phrase as a saying of the Klingons from *Star Trek II: The Wrath of Khan*, as evidenced by Tarantino's use of that epigraph in the opening stills of *Kill Bill, Vol. I* (2004).

Young men born around 1810 who were entering their twenties in the 1830's became the most important practitioners of the duel and in its reinvention.[74] As legislative debates were gaining ground in French parliamentary chambers, Romantics saw the duel as a crucial way to see their manhood performed within greater society. Men such as Théophile Gautier, Petrus Borel and Alphonse Karr remade the ritual. The dandies, a rival group of many romantics, utilized the practice as well for the same ends but with differing ideological bases for their work.[75] The 1830's saw a concomitant democratization of the ritual and a reinforcement of the boundaries and privileges attached to it. This paradoxical stance is most visibly seen in the usage of dandies who disdained anything that represented greater bourgeois society and although many came from families recently ennobled or never possessing a title they held on to the privileges of titular nobility.

The exploits of young men like Gautier were most likely perplexing to an older generation of Romantics such as Charles Nodier and even someone who was only nominally older than these men, such as Hugo and Dumas. Hugo himself wrote in the letters to his future wife, Adèle, later published to wide sales and critical acclaim, "When a reasonable man has had the unhappiness to battle in a duel, he must hide himself from it or admit his own wrongdoing from a poor action or an extravagance. In general, duels are often less dangerous than one believes them to be and only prove very little physical bravery, the least estimable and most common courage."[76] Even someone who disdained

[74] Spitzer, *The French Generation of 1820*, ch. 1; V.G. Kiernan, *Duel in European History*, 167.

[75] Ellen Moers, *The Dandy* (New York: Viking, 1955); Rhonda Garelick, *Rising Star*, ch. 1.

[76] Hugo, *Lettres à la fiancée*, 74.

most Romantics, such as Stendhal, a member of an older generation (b. 1783) who mocked the behavior of many of the young men of the 1830's, saw the practice of the duel as marking an important practice of social life. Stendhal in his piece, *De l'amour* insisted that "Women hear all their life men speaking of objects claimed to be important: of large gains of money of success at war, of people killed in duels, of atrocious or admirable vengeances, etc." Women, however, "feel to be outside the state of deploying a remarkable pride" because they cannot speak of topics of violence to which men are constantly referring.[77]

The specter of suicide often tinged many discussions of the duel. Were some participants driven by a drive to destroy their own lives? Pétrus Borel (1809-1859), a more extreme Romantic of Gautier's generation proposed in a story from his collection, *Champavert, contes immoraux* (1833), a way for the state to make money off of suicides and duels: "suicide has become very fashionable, nearly as fashionable as it was in the third century of the Christian era. Like the duel, suicide is incurable, instead of taking a complete loss, it would be more useful, it seems to me, to create a milk cow and create a very bountiful revenue."[78] He proposed a machine where those who want to commit suicide or engage in duels would be taxed and executed by the state in "a gentle and agreeable method," thereby making both acts unfashionable. The link between suicide and the duel is one remarked upon by numerous writers of the period. The inner turmoil, exemplified by the Romantic genius, tore a man apart forcing him to submit to his violent inclinations. Only the guidebooks of the duel would impose a rational approach to its practice, in order to diminish the desire to kill.

[77] Stendhal, *De l'Amour,* ch. XXVIII, "La tyrannie des homes."

[78] Petrus Borel, *Champavert, contes immoraux* (Paris: Montbrun, 1947), 169.

The greatest adherents of Romanticism, such as Gautier and Borel, were the students of French urban centers and their practices exposed that dueling was both a bonding ritual and an intensive way of gaining masculine maturation. Student involvement in duels often consisted of state and local officials turning blind eyes to violence in their jurisdictions. Young men who provoked duels lose their inscriptions of spring and summer trimesters in universities across France if prosecuted in court. For instance, authorities determined a *duel au pistolet* took place in Aix between two students in 1820 followed from a café and was not political. One was wounded in the leg. The students were acquitted by the correctional Tribunal of Aix because they showed no resistance to the gendarmes. When gendarmes brought the students to the magistrate, several students came to support their comrade. The issue sparking the duel was a sobriquet one gave to the other in a cafe, not political subversion, which state authorities highly feared and policed.[79]

Among the Romantics, the discourse of homosociability makes its appearance most obvious. Young men often found the experience of dueling a formidable moment of male bonding. Even police officers noted in reports that young men after brawling or dueling would go off to cafes to become inebriated together.[80] When the moment of violence passed, young men, even if wounded with a flesh wound would find their honor unharmed and intact. With the profession of manhood through this act, the young men could become sociable singing songs and drinking wine. Alcohol played a major role in much of the formation of these young men. It served as a social lubricant and produced

---

[79] AN F7 6692, letter of Chief of Police in Aix-en-Provence to Minister of Police, 5 June 1820.

[80] For instance, see AN F7 2249, letter of police to Minister of the Interior, November 1828.

male bonding. For many youths, alcohol would produce more aggression and temptation to fight, especially in a nation with a high consumption of alcohol.[81]

In networks of homosociability, desire is triangulated is created where a woman inhabits a ghostly presence but the true yearning operates between the men.[82] Thus, women form a necessary position in order to obscure the erotics between the battling men. The need for hierarchical status among men forced them to posture and demand their superiority to other men but also to the entire female gender. In a crucial scene of Musset's *Confession d'un enfant du siècle*, Octave tells his fickle mistress:

> "If someone should say to me, 'You are a coward!' I, who am 22 years old and have fought on the field of honor, would throw the taunt back in the teeth of my accuser, Have I not within me the consciousness of what I am? It would be necessary for me to meet my accuser on the field, and play my life against his; why? In order to prove that I am not a coward; otherwise the world would believe it. That single word demands that reply every time it is spoken, and it matters not by whom."

Octave clearly lays out the parameters of male honor and sets its limits. The pattern set forth by Octave was understood by many men of the time as being unassailable and mandatory. No one could question its logic or its utilitarian value for French society. Octave proceeds in his demonstration of the need for masculine honor and its concomitant violence:

> "Women do not fight; but as society is constituted there is no being, of whatever sex, who ought to submit to the indignity involved in an aspersion on all his or her past life, be that life regulated as by a pendulum. Reflect; who escapes that law? There are some, I admit; but what happens? If it is a man, dishonor; if it is a woman, what? Forgiveness? Every one who loves ought to give some evidence of life some proof of existence. There is, then, for woman as well as for man, a time when attack must be resented. If she is brave, she rises, announces that she is

[81] W.J. Rorabaugh, *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 237-239.

[82] Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet,* ch. 1.

> present and sits down again. A stroke of the sword is not for her. She must not only avenge herself, but she must forge her own arms. Someone suspects her; who? An outsider? She may hold him in contempt—her lover whom she loves? If so, it is her life that is in question, and she may not despise him."
> "Her only recourse is silence."[83]

Musset has stated in clear terms the vision of gender, honor and violence of nineteenth-century France. Men must uphold honor through recourses to bloodshed, while women, conceived as creatures incapable of aggression, can only be silent and rely on the men nearest to them to preserve their virtue and chastity.

Alphonse Karr (1808-1890), who would become editor of *Le Figaro* in 1839, had earlier written novels that focused on the travails of young men after the July Revolution. His first novel *Sous les tilleuls* (*Under the Linden Trees*) followed in semi-autobiographical fashion a young protagonist on his complicated journey towards love. Karr stressed the hypocrisy of those who most vehemently opposed the duel were often participants as well. "To that," Karr's protagonist states, "we shall respond first that the duel, if it is an evil, must be ready for all: such is the man, while leaving a house where he had spoken eloquently for an hour and a half against the duel, has, while leaving, been pulled from his philanthropic meditation by a blow from the elbow, that has followed a quarrel."[84] Karr's immortality relies on the coining of a the famous adage, "plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose" in an 1849 edition of his journal, *Les Guêpes* (*The Wasps*). In this now-ubiquitous proverb, Karr created a statement that can apply to the historical sense of Romantics and their ideological sense. Things may change in superficial fashions but the desire and conflicts that power human affairs are often

---

[83] Musset, *Confessions d'unfant du siècle*, ch. 5, 276.

[84] Karr, *Sous les tilleuls* (Paris: Librairie de Charles Gosselin, 1832), 157.

constant. This ideological assumption creates universalized passions untouched by change. Historical actors and present agents may appear different, but beneath this the same core of human emotions and passions existed. Romantics conceived the duel in such a way: the weapons may change, but its usage throughout numerous usages made it a naturalized practice of adolescents becoming men.

Charles Mackay's now classic *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (1841) ended with a discussion of dueling, with many of his examples from French anecdotes to note the absurdity of the practice. The hypocrisy he laid out to his reader revolved around the opprobrium lawmakers gave to the practice and those who were found guilty in court, but when "divested of his robes, the judge would say, 'If you do not challenge him, if you do not run the risk of making yourself a murderer, you will be looked upon as a mean-spirited wretch, unfit to associate with your fellows, and deserving nothing but their scorn and their contempt!' It is society, and not the duellist (*sic*) who is to blame."[85] Mackay went on to place responsibility on women who find "mere animal bravery" attractive and their lionizing of successful fighters. His solution to the problem were courts of honor that would address insults and create forums to garner and give apologies. Those who found this route insufficient would break a second law of not following the advice of the legal body and break a second law. For these men "of a nature so bloodthirsty" who "resort to the old and barbarous mode of an appeal to pistol" would have to be shamed for only a further insult "would bring them to reason."[86]

Dueling was only one of a myriad of ways that young adult men engaged in

---

[85] Charles Mackay, *Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1932), 693.

[86] *Ibid.,* 694.

violent activity in the early nineteenth century. A famous joke that circulated at the turn of the twentieth century, and recorded by Mark Twain in *A Tramp Abroad*, related the tale of a wife searching frantically for her husband when he does not arrive for dinner one night after work. She journeyed to his office, favorite bar, brothel and even his mistresses' boudoir to no avail. When walking through the streets of Paris, she runs into a colleague of her husband. To her pleas as to his whereabouts, he replied: "Have you not heard? He is waging a duel in the Bois de Boulogne!" The wife responded: "Oh, thank heavens, he is safe!"[87] The joke hinges upon the notion that the French duel often resulted in the merest of flesh wounds (unlike in Central Europe, where death rates were far higher from duels), but for young men in nineteenth-century France, the duel was a useful device for not only self-presentation and the display of honorable masculinity, but a way to forge networks among young men and craft a sense of masculine belonging.

---

[87] Mark Twain, *A Tramp Abroad*, chapter VIII.

CHAPTER THREE:

RAUCOUS PERFORMANCES:

STUDENT UNREST IN FRENCH THEATERS,

1818-1830

In 1823, a law student by the name of Sabatier filed a petition of pardon to the court of Aix-en-Provence, following a scuffle at a theater in a large university town in the south of France. He and several of his classmates were accused of making lascivious comments towards women in the audience and disparaging remarks to military officers and city officials. After one of his verbal targets shot back to the youth, Sabatier physically attacked the man, lunging towards him with his fists. Meanwhile, his friends, suspected by the officer of the gendarmes present of being intoxicated, cheered him on, thereby halting the performance. He was sentenced to five days in prison and a fine of fifteen francs, a rather paltry sum for an upwardly mobile family, for allegedly causing "rebellion around public forces." The report from Aix to the Ministry of Justice in Paris stressed this young man had not been engaged in any political subversion before the brawl took place. The court granted Sabatier his pardon after a fire at a different theater, where he and several other students, who were not native inhabitants of the city, helped

quell the blaze because "they merely wanted to show their zeal."[1] His act of charity rectified the damage he had caused previously, and the meager fine and sentence were stricken from his school record.

The case of Sabatier was by no means a rare occurrence in early nineteenth-century France. University students were often crossing paths with legal authorities involving altercations in the halls of theaters across the nation. Why did students across the nation, predominantly from law and medical schools congregate in these venues where their nights would end in scuffles and sometimes bloodshed? These were men from good, upstanding urban families who were engaging in the study of professions that were valued by society. Why were they then, instead, engaged in behavior that was deemed unseemly of them? And more importantly, why did authorities mete out such light sentences to the offenders?

The dilemma of young men who were coming of age during the Restoration pivoted on their inability to gain access to the exalted status of masculinity. They watched as their fathers, who had been embroiled in the events of the Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, remembered with great fondness these formative moments of their youth. Their sons, however, were denied such seminal points in their life narratives. The novels of Stendhal, Balzac and Victor Hugo portrayed male characters engaged in the search of meaning in a world whose rapid changes left many astounded and confused. The military, so fundamentally changed under Napoleon, had created a new officer

[1] Archives Nationales (hereafter AN) BB 21/286: Graces accorded, students of Aix, 1823. Sabatier also appears in the police records. AN F7, 6692, dossier 2, Bouches du Rhone, letter of prefect of police to Minsiter of the Interior, Dec. 20, 1822.

system that was closed off to most without some connection to the armed forces.[2] Young men pursuing careers in law or medicine faced a dilemma because their careers did not bestow the same masculine attributes as that of the soldier. The theater became a battleground for these university students to assert their masculinity under the watchful gaze of the women, state officials and even their elders present in the audience. This French generation of 1820, to use Alan Spitzer's terminology, sought the glories of the warrior and the respect of the priest but found neither.[3]

Practitioners of cultural history have stressed the importance of literary and artistic forms in the framing of social and political assumptions across class boundaries. Scholars have come to see the theater as an important venue for the practice of popular politics. Alain Corbin has spoken of the political dimensions of these "theatrical agitations," as a unique way for historians to probe Restoration society.[4] Sheryl Kroen, in her monograph, *Politics and Theater*, examined a group of political incidents at performances of Molière's *Tartuffe*.[5] This classic farce about religious hypocrisy became a touchstone for Restoration audiences who were outraged at Charles X's policies towards the Jesuits. These instances of "*tartufferie*," however, are a mere fraction of the outbreaks that occurred during the Restoration. She has charted 123 instances of theatrical agitations around Molière's play, from 1823 to 1829. Denise Davidson has stressed the participation in theatrical audiences as one of the few places women could

---

[2] On the shifts of the military, see Rafe Blaufarb, *The French Army, 1750-1820: Careers, Talent, Merit* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), ch. 5.

[3] Alan Spitzer, *The French Generation of 1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

[4] Alain Corbin, "Agitations in Provincial Theaters under the Restoration," in *Time, Desire and Honor: Towards a History of the Senses*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Polity, 1995), 39-61.

[5] Sheryl Kroen, *Politics and Theater: The Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France, 1815-1830* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

occupy in the public sphere. [6] Building on this important work, this chapter will argue for the theatrical revolts as contestations over masculinity hinging on issues of class and politics.

Corbin and Kroen have pointed historians to the popular politics of the Restoration. They privileged the theater as an important venue of not only cultural change, but social and political metamorphoses, as well. Cultural productions have also much to afford in analyses of changes in the structures of gender. More than this, the stage allows for investigations of what accounts for "the performativity of gender," in Judith Butler's famed formulation.[7] These suggestive works have shown that a vast under-analyzed area of French culture exists for the socio-political historian, and that there is even more to the story of theatrical revolts than these eminent scholars have recounted. These instances of theatrical unrest, embodying its own sense of spectacle within houses of staged entertainment, speak to a major shift, taking place in French society in the early nineteenth century. These theatrical revolts dramatized the battle between competing forms of masculinity in a society experiencing the shift from hierarchical structures to the fraternal order, an indicator of the modernity of Revolutionary France.[8] Civil society is defined as non-violent, but the fraternal order

---

[6] Denise Davidson, *France After Revolution: Urban Life, Gender, and the New Social Order* (Cambrdige, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007).

[7] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 185-193.

[8] On this topic, see Thomas King, *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750: The English Phallus* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), esp. 220-225.

upon which it is based is realized through oaths and the threat of bloodshed.[9] This paradox of modern political life strains the civility of the public sphere, while the state must police the boundaries of violence from invaders and rabble.

The world of French urban theater

In the urban centers of Paris, the theater was a site of entertainment and sociability. During the early nineteenth century, when literacy rates were low—53 percent of army conscripts in 1832 could not sign their own name—and newspapers and books had not yet benefited from the lowering of costs that came from the mass production of book bindings and periodicals during the 1840's, the theater served as the main venue where many urban dwellers could escape the alienation inherent with occupations involving little skill and less pay.[10] Although those who were destitute could not afford the price of theater tickets, which were anything from several sous for the highest seats in the house (referred to as "paradise") to the large sum of ten francs for seats in the boxes at the large theaters of the capital city, the popular theaters of urban centers were often patronized by a large cross section of the population of a city.

Theatrical performances in France during the Restoration (1815-1848) bear little resemblance to those of today.[11] Lights were not lowered during the performance. Drunken brawls often broke out among male members of the audience. In moments of

---

[9] The essays of Jerome Boime, who never completed his manuscript upon his death, are suggestive of this point. See the collection edited by his brother, the art historian Albert Boime. *Violence and Utopia* (Greenville: University Press of America, 1996), esp. "Violence and Sociality."

[10] Jeremy Popkin, *Press, Revolution and Social Identities in France, 1830-35* (University Park: Pennsylvania state University Press, 2002), 5-7.

[11] The Restoration referred to here was actually the second Bourbon Restoration. Napoleon's escape from Elba interrupted the first.

political distress, certain lines could result in the shouting of slogans or even anthems demonstrating the biases of a sect of the audience. Unpopular actors were met with fruits and vegetables, and some viewers came simply to be seen and not to watch any spectacle that occurred on stage. What was the meaning of this violent unrest at stages across France? What can we read about changing social relations and political scenes in these events?

Due to a Napoleonic law of 1806, most cities in France outside of Paris were limited to one or, at most, two theaters.[12] In Paris, six official theaters from the Comédie Française to the Ambigu Comique specialized in genres ranging from classical tragedy to drama and from comedy to opera. Venues catering to lower-class audiences focused on amusements that were outside the purview of authority.[13] A vibrant theatrical life inhabited the Boulevard du Temple on the eastern edge of the city.[14] The theaters along this street, since the eighteenth century, had provided new forms of entertainment to a populace hungry for innovation. Because certain houses were given monopolies on particular dramatic genres under Louis XIV in the 1680's, these theaters on the periphery of the metropolis invented new forms or adapted older performance styles. Pantomime, puppetry, and acrobatics became the specialty for certain theaters. By the early nineteenth

---

[12] The cities granted two theaters were Lyon, Rouen, Nantes, Marseille, Bordeaux and Toulouse.

[13] For analyses of these theaters, see Maurice Albert, *Les Théâtres des Boulevards* (Paris: Société Française d'Imprimerie et de Librairie, 1902); Gérard Gengembre, *Le théâtre français au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1999); F.W.J. Hemmings, *The Theatre Industry in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); John McCormick, *Popular Theaters of Nineteenth-Century France* (London: Routledge, 1993); Robert Storey, *Pierrots on the Stage of Desire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1985). For precursors to this type of artistic life in the eighteenth century, see Robert Isherwood, *Farce and Fantasy: Popular Entertainment in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); Michèle Root-Bernstein, *Boulevard Theater and Revolution in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984).

[14] The Boulevard du Temple was also the subject of one of Louis Daguerre's early photographs from 1838. It is the oldest known extant photograph containing the image of a person.

century, after the troubled Revolutionary period when government regulation of theater ended and began anew under Napoleon, only to witness further controls under the Restoration, the institutionalized theaters of France, the Comédie-Française, the Theatre Italien, and the Opéra, had seen their audiences flock to the theaters of the boulevard where comedies, melodramas and mysteries were played to packed houses. The Boulevard du Temple became known as the "Boulevard du Crime" because, as George Sand noted in 1830, "Every evening I see an execution, a hanging, a suicide, or at least a poisoning accompanied by cries, convulsions, and agony at the theaters there [the Boulevard du Temple]."[15]

The ministry of the police scrutinized behavior from audiences due to the belief that the theater housed numerous ranks of society and political speeches given that there would be a wider sector of society present than at other public locales. Within the theater, the parterre—the floor benches in front of the stage—were reserved exclusively for men; women were not allowed into this area until the Third Republic.[16] This section of the theater was notorious for rowdy behavior from men. In the decades leading up to the Revolution, the parterre became a place for the voicing of political beliefs and dissension viewed with wary eyes from state officials in the closing years of the reign of Louis XVI.[17] In the nineteenth century, whistles (*sifflets*) and epithets often emanated from this

[15] Quoted in James Smith Allen, *Popular French Romanticism* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1984), 202. See also, Dominique Kalifa, *Les crimes de Paris: lieux et non-lieux du crime à Paris au XIXe siècle* (Paris: BILIPO, 2000).

[16] F.W.J. Hemmings, *The Theatre Industry in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 96.

[17] See Jeffrey Ravel, *The Contested Parterre: Public Theater and French Political Culture, 1680-1789* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999).

section of theater houses. Officers of the gendarmes were often stationed in this area in order to apprehend anyone partaking in such subversive behavior.

For state authorities, the theater was a precarious site. So many people from different sectors of urban society inhabited one space that any sedition which could take place would not only be hard to quell but would end up offending the numerous patrons from higher society. Because of this, the protection of women occupied the concern of officials. Female audience members, who were considered the most susceptible to the passions of theater, had to be protected not only from lascivious subject matter but also from the antics of men within the audience who might harass young ladies. Moreover, state officials saw the theater as "the only school in which the lower class of society goes to learn its lessons."[18]

The popularity of theater and its severe political implications put fear into the hearts of many a government official. Minister Camille Montavilet expressed the government's position on the theater when he said that "the theater acted as a magician on the audience: fascinating, passionate and dangerous." He added that, "among all the opportunities for public disorder, the theater could produce the most."[19] When the re-establishment of theatrical censorship was placed for debate in 1835, the French minister of Justice, Jean-Charles Persil, extolled the benefits of regulating the theater, by saying, "When opinions are converted into acts by the presentation of a play or the exhibit of a drawing, one addresses people gathered together, one speaks to their eyes. That is more

[18] Quoted in Odile Krakovitch, *Hugo Censuré: la liberté au théâtre au XIXe siècle* (Paris: 1985), 88.

[19] Quoted in Sally Charnow, *Theater, Politics and Markets in Fin-de-Siècle Paris* (New York: , 2005), 56.

than an expression of an opinion, that is a deed, an action, a behavior."[20] French university students were some of the most avid consumers of theatrical culture in France in the early nineteenth century. They had leisure time by ignoring their studies, and were often provided ample amounts of disposable income by their parents. The possibility of rebellion within this confined space did nothing to dampen their enthusiasm, but instead only furthered their already heightened interest.

Student Happenings at the Theater

For students, the theater was the prime space of sociability outside of the classroom. Unlike at their schools, however, women were present in the audiences of performances, making these sites more titillating and exciting to these young men. When Juste Olivier (1807-1876) arrived in Paris in the spring of 1830, he was dazzled by the sights and sounds of Paris, especially the numerous theaters, patronizing a different one each night of his first week within the capital. [21] He and other young men came under the intense scrutiny of the eyes of state officials. Their great numbers at theaters across France and their participation in movements of political dissension, especially liberal groups after 1820, meant that they were considered the prime instigators of political rebellion in these venues.

The duty of surveying the theaters of France fell to the lieutenant of police, housed under the Ministry of the Interior after 1818, who maintained extensive records of

[20] Quoted in Robert Justin Goldstein, "France," in *The Frightful Stage: Political Censorship of Theater in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. R.J. Goldstein (New York: Bergahan Books, 2009), 74.

[21] Juste Olivier, *Paris en 1830*, 3-4.

occurrences in theaters across France.[22] The gendarmes were, and remain to this day, charged with the servicing of crowd control and policing public order. Historians have viewed nineteenth-century police practices in France as a Foucaultian narrative of the implementation of intrusive surveillance onto the private world of the nation's inhabitants.[23] The theater was of vital interest to state authorities because of the wide segment of the population that attended spectacles on a weekly basis. For most of the Restoration, officials eyed these locations suspiciously for political activities. . Beginning in 1818, the police started tallying such events and found close to two thousand such instances across the nation. The vast majority of such occurrences happened in university towns. Cities such as Aix-en-Provence, Rouen, Marseille, Lyon, and Paris could see over a hundred theatrical revolts in the course of a year, while sleepy, more conservative hamlets, such as Angers, would only have one event happen over the course of the decade, and this was usually the result of an intoxicated man interrupting a performance.

State officials were required to submit reports to the Minister of the Interior in Paris, reporting any disturbances. Often, provincial bureaucrats made certain to stress the non-political nature of student unrest in theaters ("*les opinions politiques étaient tout a fait étrangères à cette émeute*").[24] Due to the Restoration's unsure position, quelling dissent was necessary to ensuring peace. Although there were many theatrical riots

---

[22] This explains why the archival sources used in this chapter begin in 1818. After the July Revolution, censorship was ended (albeit briefly until 1836), and the police were halted from monoitoring theatrical performances as ardently as under the Restoration.

[23] For examples of this, see John Merriman, *Police Stories: Building the French State, 1815-1851* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) on the *commissaires de police*; Clive Elmsley, *Gendarmes and the State in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Dominique Kalifa, *La Naissance de la police privée: Detectives et agencies de recherche en France, 1842-1942* (Paris: Plon, 2000), which deals with the commodification of surveillance.

[24] See for instance, AN F7, 6692, dossier 4, Bouches-du-Rhône, letter of Procurer General to Minister of the Interior, 14 December 1822.

without political overtones, when affairs of the nation and its ruler were involved, the local governments placed themselves on high alert. Many in the government, whose own progeny may have participated in some of these very incidents, viewed these young men with little consternation. Others, however, saw them as menaces to society: "These are men who would like to see the days of [17]93 reborn."[25] This reference to the heady days of the Terror, which lived on in the post-revolutionary imaginary as a phantasm from which all should escape, exposed the fears of the more conservative elements of French politics. Allowing violence to proceed among what were considered "radical" youth was the first step in the bloodbath of the days of Robespierre. This view, however, was rare and usually only voiced by supporters of extreme censorship.

Censorship in France had become more oppressive after the assassination of the Duc de Berri in February of 1820, when a horseman, employed by the royal family, stabbed the prince fatally outside the opera house. This murder led to a turn to the right in the French legislative assembly and the dismissal of the more moderate Prime Minister, Élie Decazes.[26] The previous year, after a similar stabbing of the playwright, August von Kotzebue, by a student, Metternich issued the Carlsbad Decrees that placed strict limits on universities and the rights of assembly for students. The conservative party of France, the Ultraroyalists, was unable to pass the same restrictions on academic freedom within their nation because the assassin of the Duc de Berri was not a student but a disgruntled member of the royal livery. Newspapers, books and theatrical works, however, came

---

[25] AN F7, 6692, dossier 5, Seine-Inférieure

[26] On the assassination of the Duc de Berri, see David Skuy, *Assassination, Politics and Miracles: France and the Royalist Reaction of 1820* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003) and Jo Burr Margadant, "The Duchesse de Berry and Royalist Political Culture in Postrevolutionary France," *History Workshop Journal* 43 (Spring 1997): 23-52. On ultra-royalism, see Nora Hudson, *Ultra-Royalism and the French Restoration* (New York: Octagon Books, 1936).

under intense scrutiny from public officials, hoping to eradicate all dissent from the public sphere. Members of the ministry of the interior began increased method surveillance of students, especially in public places, e.g. theaters, restaurants and taverns, due to the perceived radical nature of student's political beliefs.[27]

The second event of the early 1820's that caused state authorities to eye more suspiciously the activities of students were the alleged actions of Carbonari cells in France. The first Carbonari were Italians resisting the Napoleonic occupation. Utilizing a set of underground guerilla tactics, these groups hoped to thwart the oppression of French authorities in Northern Italy. In the 1820's, the structures created by the Italian Carbonari were adopted by former Napoleonic soldiers and many of these former officers would recruit like-minded students. The reach of these groups between 1821 and 1825 was highly exaggerated by the police. Some student groups who had no connection to the Carbonari were often identified as such cells by authorities. Yet, officers of the gendarmes now extended their surveillance of theaters after 1822 because of the fears, often hyperbolic, of these groups.[28] After 1826, the ever increasing paranoia of Charles X's crumbling regime in the face of resistance spurred on more surveillance and concomitantly more resistance.

The law and medical students of France during the 1820's were a strong social force in the cities of the nation. Approximately 2,000 students were enrolled in medical schools across the country in 1821, while the nine schools of law housed a slightly larger

---

[27] Although the files of police surveillance of the theater begin in 1818, the majority of reports date from the period of 1820 until 1829.

[28] The definitive account of the French Carbonari is Alan Spitzer's *Young Hopes, Old Hatreds: The French Carbonari against the Bourbon Restoration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard university Press, 1971).

number.[29] Jean-Claude Caron has argued that the students of the 1820's were politically mobilized against what they viewed as the tyranny of the Bourbon Restoration. By 1834, much of this agitation had dissipated into a set of murky goals that were no longer coherent, but during the 1820's, a broad consensus developed among these students with disposable income about the need for a more liberal form of government that would call for the relaxation of government regulation on commerce and the end of political and artistic censorship. These students considered themselves to be the sole "youth of France" and the future of their nation.[30]

Students often congregated in certain neighborhoods of their university cities. In Paris, the famed Latin Quarter of the left bank of the Seine housed many students from the Sorbonne. They lived in apartments for approximately twelve francs a month and spent an additional fifty francs on food, leaving them with a sizable amount of disposable money for leisure activities.[31] With the cost of such schooling at approximately one thousand francs or more, their families were often able to send their sons money for recreational activities.[32] For many students, their recreational activities took priority over their studies. Reading rooms, restaurants and taverns in smaller towns, such as Aix-en-Provence or Lyon, would be overrun with students from the local universities.[33] The theater occupied much of their time and depleted their stores of cash.

---

[29] Jean-Claude Caron, *Générations romantiques: les étudiants de Paris et le Quartier latin, 1814-1851* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1991), 46.

[30] Caron, *Générations romantiques,* 401.

[31] *Ibid.*, 135.

[32] *Ibid.*, 79-80. In 1829, only two men out of 240 confined in debtors' prison were students.

[33] See Jerrold Seigel, *Bohemian Paris: Culture, Politics and the Boundaries of Bourgeois Life, 1830-1930* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999, second edition), 3-31; and Rebecca

When these young men reached these theaters, however, they taunted other audience members, often provoking clashes during a performance. “What brought such violence to the theater?,” wrote one local government official. “These young people with their spirit of cabal and opposition. One simply came to the show (*spectacle*) throw a chair into the parterre. Members of the parterre threw it back and in an instant twenty chairs were in the air.” Julie Pellizzone, a woman from Marseille, detailed in her diaries the behavior of “the youth of the best families who amuse themselves by being insolent troublemakers.”

> It is impossible to imagine their boastfulness (*jactance*), their rudeness (*malhnonnêteté*), even their incivility (*grossièreté*), without having been witness to their behavior every evening as I am. Their manner of dress (*mise*) is ridiculous, their remarks indecent, their countenance insolent; they speak to each other more loudly than the actors and prevent honest people from hearing the play. If we ask for silence, they respond with stupidity (*sottise*), if we threaten them, they sneer and that’s it… And the police permit all of this because they are the children of nouveaux riches families.[34]

When it came time for municipal courts to punish these men, judges were hesitant to be stern, often blaming these episodes on “youth” and “absent-mindedness” (*étourderie*).[35] As a the Minister of the Interior wrote to the Procurer General of Aix-en-Provence in regards to a case coming to the courts, “The punishment may be too severe

---

Spang, *The Invention of the Restaurant: Paris and Modern Gastronomic Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 207-234.

[34] Julie Pellizone, *Souvenirs*, (p. 119-120), quoted and translated in Denise Davidson, *France after Revolution: Urban Life, Gender and the New Social Order* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), 121-122.

[35] AN, F7, 6693, dossier 16, Rhône-Alpes, letter from procurer general of Lyon to Minister of the Interior, April 14, 1825.

and would result in a scandal of impunity."[36] The central authorities of Paris ensured that their provincial counterparts were not overstepping their boundaries and putting too many young men from important families into prison. The resulting complaints would further ail the unpopular Bourbon government, which was in a desperate attempt to consolidate any support it could. No fines were greater than fifteen francs, which though a sizable amount was not impossible for these students and their families to pay. When a harsher punishment was meted out, it usually involved an instigator who had previously come before the law. For instance, a young *avocat stagiaire* (a lawyer in training, who had completed his education) from Nantes, named Mouton, was sentenced to three months in prison because he had already spent a previous month in prison and had "a mind (*esprit*) for disorder and insubordination."[37] In court, he continued to whistle, further angering the judge. The fact this man had completed his studies, but yet insisted on continuing such behaviors made the judges wary of someone who could not seem to grow up.

Frequent disorders at a theater in Nantes confused local officials who could not seem to control the youths of their city's university. The local prefect of police, working in concert with judges of the municipal court, devised a plan to use several students as an example to other members of the city, sentencing them to fifty francs and three days. As the Minsiter of the Interior wrote to the provincial notable, 'One would hope that the first of these condemnations more severe than those applied up to the present in Nantes, for the crime of the same nature, will have a happy influence on the habitual disposition of

---

[36] AN, F7, 6692, dossier 2, Dec 13, 1822 in Aix. Letter from Minister of the Interior to procurer-General.

[37] AN F7, 6692, dossier 2, Bouches-de-Rhône, Letter of Procurer General of Aix-en-Provence to Minister of the Interior, March 4, 1821.

the turbulent youth who compose the parterre of the theater of this city."[38] The ruse failed, however, and the cure for these revolts was the stationing of more gendarmes within the theater.[39]

The combination of lenient sentences and officials who often turned their backs on misdoings of these young students suggests that these theatrical riots were easily contained and, although a public nuisance, of no great harm to society. These young men were of good families. State authorities were far more concerned with political subversion in the form of liberalism or republicanism.[40] Since many students filled the ranks of liberal and republican associations, the police were diligent in rooting out any attempts on the part of these young men to inject their politics into a night at the theater. Performances of *Tartuffe*, as Sheryl Kroen has admirably chronicled, were often interrupted by catcalls from the audience, referencing Charles X's unpopular policy towards Jesuits. Often liberals were identified after calling for the singing of a Revolutionary song, such as "Ça ira" or a couplet that seemed to speak of the state in a negative way.[41] Students often met in local cafés after a large fight broke out in a theater. These talks frightened city officials, who suspected that political talk and action, of a liberal and anti-royalist bent, would take place. In one case, in Aix-en-Provence, twenty-five infantrymen were sent to stop such a meeting, where students were planning on

---

[38] AN, F7, 6692, dossier 18, Seine-Inférierure, Letter of Minister of the Interior to Prefect of Police of Nantes, June 22, 1822.

[39] AN F7, 6692, dossier 18, Seine-Inférieure, Letter of Prefect of Police of Nantes to the Minister of the Interior, July 21, 1822.

[40] Pamela Pilbeam, *Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France, 1814-1871* (London: Macmillan, 1995), 72-75.

[41] AN F7, 6692, dossier 4, Calvados, Letter of Procurer General of Caen to Minister of the Interior, January 14, 1827.

writing a letter complaint against the local Commissaire de Police, whom they believed had wrongly arrested a comrade.[42]

These raucous men created numerous irritations to the officials throughout cities of France. These men, however, did not possess the franchise—the Laîné law of February, 1817, provided the vote to all men over 30 who paid at least 300 francs in taxes; this was modestly expanded after the July Revolution of 1830, when one needed to pay more than 200 francs in taxes.[43] For many of these students, roads to politics were closed and their violence was an attempt to be heard. The government feared expanding the franchise because they believed many of these students to be radical. In the theaters, they considered themselves to be arbiters of taste. Yet this belief in their aesthetics could not hide their insecurities about defining themselves as men. The fights between students and members of the French officer corps speak directly to this anxiety.

Officers against Students

One aspect of theatrical revolts not explored by previous historians is altercations between bourgeois students and officers of the French army. Although many fights happened between students of similar backgrounds, a surprising number occurred after derisive remarks were exchanged between these two groups not often considered to be in great amounts of contact. In fact, students in the 1820's often supported soldiers in their political grievances, especially ex-Napoleonic soldiers who were on half-pay, known as

---

[42] AN F7, 6692, dossier 2, Bouches-de-Rhône, letter of Prefect of Police to Minister of the Interior, March19, 1823.

[43] André Jardin and André-Jean Tudesq, *Restoration and Reaction, 1815-48*, trans. Elborg Foster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 32, 105.

demi-soldes.[44] The Saint-Cyr law of 1818 gave the Crown a tremendous amount of control in promotion and the meritocracy, often associated with Napoleon's army, was minimized.[45] The Officer Corps, often recruited from the Ecole Polytechnique, founded in 1794, represented some of the wealthiest families of France, who benefited from the return of the Bourbons in 1815.[46] The privileged status of many of these men rankled students from law and medical schools, who believed they were cut off from the possibility of becoming officers in the army. With the Saint-Cyr law, the number of promotions to the rank of officer from time served as a foot soldier was drastically reduced.

In the early nineteenth century, the image of the soldier was a fast and sure way of gaining privilege and status. The image of the warrior with its focus on warfare and violence assured young men of their position as men within society.[47] The inability of many young men to attain the exalted status of the chivalrous fighter provoked a great deal of anxiety. What this uncertainty, in turn, produced was the negotiation of a new form of masculinity for men who were not members of the armed forces. In Stendhal's famous novel, *The Red and the Black* (1831), the main character Julien Sorel grappled with his own need for violent masculinity, while following the course to become a priest. With Sorel, the combination of religious devotion and aggression ended in his execution

---

[44] Douglas Porch, *Army and Revolution, 1815-1848* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974), 5-8.

[45] Blaufarb, *The French Army,* 197-201.

[46] Patricia Lorcin, *Imperial Identities: Stereotyping, Prejudice and Race in Colonial Algeria* (London: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 1995), 99-117.

[47] On the issues of the soldier, see Leo Braudy, *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* (New York: Random House, 2005), esp. 291-302.

after shooting a former lover, Mme. De Rênal, at convocation of mass.[48] Young law and medical students felt this same disconnect between their chosen profession in "bourgeois" professions and the need to identify as hostile men of opposition. One means of accomplishing this feat was through fighting the men who embodied the aggressive image they seek to cultivate, army officers.

Many disputes between officers and students, not only in theaters but in cafés and on the street as well, were sparked by desultory remarks made on the part of members of the armed forces to these young men, who were often dressed in a style of clothes deemed "effeminate." The current fad for Romanticism in the 1820's lent an air of peculiarity to the personal style of these students, resulting in desultory remarks from other more conservatively dressed observers. Dandyism, influenced by the British sartorial expert, Beau Brummel, prided itself on tight pants, highly starched collars, elaborate goatees and eccentric hairstyles. Barbey d'Aurevilly (1808-1889), who wrote a popular pamphlet on French dandyism in 1845, mentioned that French dandies would never achieve the same ironic stance as their British counterparts because the trappings of French honor systems often resulted in violent undertakings in which the cool Britons would never partake.[49] When an officer mocked a young man's attire, the dandy was often forced to call a duel to the armed soldier. Authorities rarely prosecuted these duels, even after legislation in 1837, made punishments much stricter for armed combats such as these.[50]

---

[48] Stendhal, *Le Rouge et le Noir* (Paris: Flammarrion, 1965 [1831]), 434.

[49] Barbey d'Aurevilly, *Du dandysme et de Georges Brummel* (Paris: Editions Garnier, 1921), 41.

[50] Robert Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 175.

One such duel occurred after a theatrical performance in Marseille, where an officer ridiculed a student's red cap. The student called for a duel from the lieutenant and the next morning the student received a flesh wound from the soldier, unable to aim directly at the officer. Afterwards, the prefect of police noted in his report that the two men went to a café to drink together.[51] The two men were able to form a bond of mutual respect after taking part in this form of ritualized violence. With no serious wounds, they had both achieved a modicum of status—the officer for winning the duel and the student for fighting such a stronger opponent.

Fighting officers, like their student counterparts, rarely faced extreme disciplinary action. Many of the accorded pardons recorded in this period were for soldiers who had brawled or dueled with civilians or fellow members of the armed forces. The Minister of the Defense wrote specifically to the Minister of the Interior, stressing the need for these pardons because without these men the army's strength would be "greatly and terribly diminished."[52] The prefect of police from Angoulême warned the Minister of the Interior in ominous tones that if appropriate measures were not taken, then chaos would ensue. "We must punish these people forcibly," he wrote, "or we shall see these troubles in more than one city of France and they will finish by becoming seriously worrisome."[53] A Procurer-General from Lyon echoed these same concerns: "The tribunal looks suspect because it was very lenient on four officers [after an altercation in a café after a night at the opera]," but previously this court had condemned a gendarme to two years in prison

[51] AN F7, 6692, dossier 2, Bouches-du-Rhône, Prefect of Police of Marseille to Minsiter of the Interior, June 21, 1823.

[52] AN BB 18/145, Accorded graces, Soldiers of the Bas-Pyrenees, April 1822.

[53] AN, F7, 6692, dossier 6, Angoulême. Letter from prefect of police to Minister of Interior. May 3, 1826.

for having hit a man several times with the flat edge of his saber. The plaintiff had injured the gendarme in the "grossest manner," and he was merely defending his honor. This court, like many regional courts and courts of appeal, were unclear as to how duelists should be punished. Often, members of the gendarmerie faced no punishment, but occasionally the courts held a case, especially one with some coverage in the press, as an example and placed a severe fine or jail sentence on the offenders. Even in these instances, the offender was often placed on parole before their sentence was complete. The official closed his report with the cutting remark: "In this case, one could oppose force with force."[54]

By engaging in fisticuffs with officers, students grappled with their own identity as men and further solidified the link between male-ness and violence. These fights granted men points of honor that could not be achieved in the quotidian practices of universities. When this form of aggression was coupled with the new aesthetics of Romanticism, young men found a way to express themselves through art—since a political voice was denied to them—and found a means by which the artist and his supporters could be seen as powerful men within French society. The duel's perceived cold rationality mixed in with the heat of these more bestial forms of aggression. Both conferred male honor, but held different meanings in different contexts. The greatest theatrical scandal of the early nineteenth century was the opening night of Victor Hugo's controversial play, *Hernani*, only months before the July Revolution of 1830. During this night, and the performances succeeding it, university students of Paris and aspiring writers engaged in a great generational drama. The young hostile men came to blows

---

[54] AN F7, 6693, dossier 16, Rhône-Alpes, letter from procurer general of Lyon to Minister of the Interior, September 1, 1824.

with their elders, and to all observers, it seemed clear that youth had triumphed. The reasoned world of aesthetics and literary repartee mingled freely and easily with the mad blood stirring of drunken, riotous youths.

The Battle of Hernani

Hernani opened on a cold, frigid night in February that happened to be the birthday of its author, Victor Hugo. By the time the curtain rose on the first act, many of the members of the audience had been in their seats of the Comédie-Française since early that morning. The theater reeked of urine because the managers of the venue believed that the lack of open restrooms would discourage the young supporters of Victor Hugo's play from remaining on the premises; they were wrong. The actors recited their lines during the performance over the catcalls of detractors. Hugo's friends and devotees physically attacked the older men they referred to as *les genoux* (the knees—referring to their baldness) and *les perruques* (the wigs). Fights broke out; a teenaged Théophile Gautier said he used a silver handled cane to beat an ideological enemy over the head.[55] The play ended, and even if no one in the audience heard a single word, the theater had sold an impressive number of tickets. *Hernani* was a success. The war, however, was not over. Joanny, the actor who first portrayed Don Ruy Gomez, kept a regular diary during the ongoing spectacle. On March 22, after the fourteenth performance, he simply recorded, "*Toujours la même chose*" ("always the same thing").[56] The battles waged on each ensuing night as the two factions hoped to see its enemy retreat in defeat.

---

[55] Gautier, *L'histoire du Romantisme* (Paris: Librairie de Callmann, 1881), 246.

[56] Joanny, Manuscrit Joanny, *Manuscrit autographe de ses representations, 1809-46*. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal Fonds Rondel Rf 794.

With the so-called "Battle of *Hernani,*" the war of generations was placed on vivid display. The fight was spoken of in a rhetoric of vibrant youth pitted against the failings of old age. The novelty of *Hernani* lied in how the author utilized the energy of students to solidify his success. The savvy Hugo used the model of student revolts to structure the opening night of his play theaters in order to attain the highest level of publicity possible. The antics of this premiere exemplified the longings of a group of non-franchised men to fashion a new form of urban masculinity, one which would form a parameter for a "modern" way of life. The Romantics and these students accepted that passions, celebrated by their favorite artists and authors, led inevitably to violence. Defiled honor, for these men, resulted in avenging brute force. Adherents to Romanticism did not shift patterns of honor; rather, they wanted to democratize this virtue for those who were not titled aristocrats. Broadening accessibility to honor, however, led to a pervasive sense that all men were *naturally* attuned to aggressive behavior. In effect, by attempting to engender a cultural and political revolution, Hugo became a part of a major transformation in the social order.

The Comédie-Française in the early 1820's witnessed declining revenues, as more inventive theaters, such as the Théâtre Ambigu, the Funambules, and the Gaité produced innovative and popular melodramas, pantomimes and comedies. The appointment of Baron Isidore Taylor in 1825 helped to reverse the downward trend of the theater's profits. Taylor saw the new fashion of Romanticism a particularly apt way to bring publicity and controversy to the most staid institution of Parisian cultural life. Although Hugo's *Hernani* has been referred to as the first Romantic play to take the Comédie-Française stage, Taylor had produced works by Alexandre Dumas and Alfred de Vigny

previously. Vigny's verse translation of *Othello* appeared in 1827, followed by Dumas' *Henri III et sa cour*. Both plays, however, met similar fates after receiving unenthusiastic reviews from leading periodicals, such as *Le Conservateur* and *Le Journal des Débats*, and saw audience attendance decline with each subsequent performance.[57]

Victor Hugo, however, was a master of self-publicity and utilized his network of friends and contacts to ensure the success of his play. After the disastrous opening (and closing) night of his play, *Amy Robsart*, in 1828 at the Odéon, and the refusal of the censorship board to allow the performance of *Marion Delorme,* due to its portrayal of Louis XIII, Hugo wrote *Hernani* furiously in a five-week span.[58] He made sure the play pleased both the censors and the directors of the theater. With its acceptance by the theater, and minor changes made to the text, the play went into rehearsals.

During the weeks leading to the premiere, Hugo advised his followers to spread rumors of the importance of his work and the need to bring as many people to the opening night as possible. When the excitement around this play began to frighten state officials and more conservative members of the public, the Minister of the Interior, Guillaume Isidore, approached Charles X, advising him that perhaps the play should be canceled or postponed. Charles X, in a rare moment of prescience, was reported as saying, "I recognize merely my right to a seat in the parterre."[59] As the play was allowed

---

[57] Marvin Carlson, *The French Stage in the Nineteenth Century* (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Pres, 1972), 30-42.

[58] On the early period of Hugo's dramatic writing, see; Albert Halsall, *Victor Hugo and the Romantic Drama* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 60-76; Odile Krakovitch, *Hugo Censuré: la liberté au théâtre au XIXe siècle* (Paris: 1985), 32-45; André Maurois, *Olympio: The Life of Victor Hugo*, trans. Gerald Hopkins (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), 135-152; Graham Robb, *Victor Hugo: A Biography* (London: Picador, 1997), 131-157;

[59] Quoted in John Garber Palache, *Gautier and the Romantics* (New York: Viking Press, 1926), 15.

to proceed, Hugo gathered his men, with the help of his wife Adèle, and created a red ticket with an obscure Spanish war cry: "*Hierro despiertate*" ("Iron, awake"), which would be distributed to young men who would form a large part of the audience that night.[60] What Hugo created with these young men, such as the aspiring Romantic authors, Théophile Gautier, then 18, and Gérard de Nerval, then 22, a volunteer "claque." The claque (derived from the French word meaning to slam), previously, had been a group of hired men who would sit in the audience during a performance and laugh, applaud and cry at the author's direction. Hugo believed this would detract from his work and allow critics to state that the play was only a success because of these mercenary audience members.[61]

The premiere of February 25, 1830, was replete with violence and a performance filled with so much noise that much of the play must have been incomprehensible. From the recitation of the first line, which used a shocking enjambment of the Alexandrine verse, unheard in French classical drama, to the diction, apparently ignoble for the royal nature of the characters, the play sparked widespread tumult among the elite audience. The Comédie-Française sold over 5,000 tickets the first night, and the succeeding forty-two performances brought in more audience members than any previous staging of a play by Racine or Corneille the previous two years.[62] When the play closed the following summer, because the actress Mlle. Mars desired to take a vacation, the play was widely considered by the liberal press of *Le Journal des Débats* and *Le Globe* to have rendered a

---

[60] Anne Ubersfeld, *Le Roman d'Hernani* (Paris: Comédie-Française-Mercure de France, 1985), 43.

[61] Adèle Hugo, *Victor Hugo raconté par Adèle Hugo* (Paris: Plon, 1985), 73.

[62] Ubersfeld, *Le Roman d'Hernani*, 23.

revolution in French theater. Classicism had been exiled, and Romanticism had now gained crucial respect from the highest institution of dramatic literature in the nation.

For students, the premiere of *Hernani* was an important moment. For Juste Olivier, the play represented not only an artistic triumph, but the victory of his generation over the ossified traditions of his parents. "I went to the [Comédie] Française full of ardor to see *Hernani*. Ah! How I will remember it! If I had rewritten all the notes I made that night upon returning, my journal would have had a superb beginning. Six pages at least."[63] Théophile Gautier, writing in 1874, was the great mythmaker of that night.[64] He rhapsodized about that evening as the most important night of his life.[65] Gautier's most memorable formulation of this evening and its significance to his life was found in this work; the elegiac tone of the book spoke to Gautier's sense that this period of vitality had passed never to be seen again. "The whole of youth seemed to be rushing unanimously towards the future," he wrote, "intoxicated with enthusiasm and poetry, and expecting to gather for itself the palms it was fighting to secure for another."[66]

In a self-aggrandizing moment in his later novel, *Les Misérables,* Hugo placed a reference to *Hernani* in the mouth of his character, Gillesnormand. The crotchety and cantankerous grandfather of Marius has been yelling at his nephew Théodule for his recent behavior when he erupts into a diatribe about the actions of the Romantic generation:

---

[63] Juste Olivier, *Paris en 1830*, 5.

[64] Gautier, *Histoire du romantisme* (Paris: Simon Raçon, 1874), see esp. 99-115.

[65] On Gautier, see also Martine Lavaud, *Gautier: militant du romantisme* (Paris: Flammarion, 1995).

[66] Gautier, *Histoire du romantisme,* 101.

> The nineteenth century is poison. The first whippersnapper (*freluquet*) you meet wears his goat's beard, thinks he is very clever, and tosses out his old relatives. That's republican, that's romantic. What does that mean, romantic? Be so kind as to tell me just what that means! Every possible folly. A year ago, you went to *Hernani*. I ask you, *Hernani*! Antitheses! Abominations that are not even written in French! And now they have cannon in the court of the Louvre. That's the highway robbery we have come to these days.[67]

By having a character who is clearly identified with an older generation of French society, Hugo has perpetuated the myth he helped to fashion about the premiere of *Hernani*. Gillesnormand represented for Hugo, and his readers who waxed eloquent about that night, an image of the prototypical supporter of Classicism at the Comédie Française.

The demise of student theatrical revolts

The police records analyzing student unrest in theaters end in early 1830 before the July Revolution. Some files focusing on Romantic performances in Paris were stolen in the later part of the century to be sold to collectors of the papers of Hugo, Dumas, and Vigny, thus accounting for why some of the most famous theatrical revolts do not appear in the police records. We can only speculate as to why the sudden shift in police activity against the theater. The very real political threats Charles X began to face in his last months as king by those resenting his ever-increasing reign of autocracy required the resources of the state to be focused on more pressing concerns, and the sense that these students were not at their most dangerous in the theater but rather in secret assemblies that were hidden from the reach of the state.

Unlike the surveillance of theatrical performances that was at its height during the 1820's, police observations of masked balls thrived during the following decade. The authorities, who believed to have gained domination over staged pieces, found that balls

[67] Hugo, *Les Miserables,* tome III, v, vi, 695.

bred behavior that even "the least scrupulous morality can only condemn (*reprouver*)."[68] With an annual state subvention of eight thousand francs, journalists often linked the state to these indecent affairs.[69] "One would think," wrote an unnamed writer for *Le Corsaire*, "that this theater would maintain a line of dignity, decorum and pomp that would be worthy of calling it the premier stage of Europe."[70] Yet again, the concern of the state in regards to the behavior of young men revolved around the young women who watched Spaniards perform "obscene dances and saturnalias of the deepest immorality."[71]

Apart from the performances at these venues, theaters housed another vital part of student leisure activities: balls and masquerades. The Opera of Paris held balls for fundraising and charity work; however, the authorities found masked dances a nuisance to police. As one prefect noted, "With everyone wearing masks, it is impossible to locate the perpetrators of indecencies."[72] One official was so scandalized by the behavior of the attendees that he wrote to the minister, "I would recount what happened last night at this unfortunate event, but I cannot bring myself to put these scandals in writing."[73] These fancy-dress (*travesti*) affairs lasted far into the morning hours. Occasionally, students,

---

[68] AN AJ/13/ 182, Opera, letter of prefect of police to M le Conseiller de l'Etat, 12 February 1837.

[69] AN AJ/13/182, Opera, letter of M. Véron, director of Opera, to M. le Conseiller de l'Etat, 13 February 1837.

[70] *Le Corsaire*, 11 February 1837, copy held in AN AJ/13/182, Opera.

[71] AN AJ/13/182, Opera, letter of prefect of police to M le Conseiller de l'Etat, 12 February 1837.

[72] AN AJ/13/182, Opera, letter of prefect of police to Minister of the Interior, 16 May 1836.

[73] AN AJ/13/182, Opera, letter of prefect of police to Minister of the Interior, 11 February 1837.

emboldened by alcohol and the sense of anonymity that came from their disguise, accosted officers of the law, further frustrating the police.[74]

Misspoken words and intoxicated young men in the presence of women often combined to create breaches of honor, forcing the slighted male to call a duel. Jean-Léon Gérôme (1824-1904) memorably depicted these altercations in his 1857 painting, *Duel after a Masked Ball*. A man dressed as Pierrot, the always-wronged stock character of French mime, is held in the arms of his seconds as he bleeds onto the snow with his sword dangling from his limp hand. In an ironic portrayal, Pierrot's opponent in this duel, walking away from his victim in the early dawn, is Harlequin, the character who has spoiled continually the plans of Pierrot to woo his love, Columbine. Life has imitated art as the men dressed as these personages have continued the fierce rivalry, albeit with a more violent end than ever met Pierrot on stage.

Hugo abandoned the Romantic drama after the failure of his play, *Les Burgraves,* in 1843, but his literary acolytes would maintain their fervent pride for that night in 1830. The premiere took on special political resonance when Hugo was in exile after 1852. Before his return to France, the play was revived in Paris in 1867 to critical acclaim. In the 1880's, after the fiftieth anniversary of the work's premiere and after Hugo's death in 1885, participants, like Gautier and Alexandre Dumas, continued to write rhapsodies of that night. Many wrote nostalgically for this event, not only because of its importance to French literature, but because it conferred on them the status as agents of history and as men, as well. Though many of the memoirs written about the premiere exaggerated its magnitude and their participation, these writers saw this event as crucial to their life-

---

[74] AN AJ/13/182, Opera, letter to M. Véron, director of the Opera, from Minister of the Interior, 5 January 1833.

narratives. They had accomplished the transition form adolescence to adulthood by combining their artistic pursuits with a night of passion and aggression. They, in short, had become men.

CHAPTER FOUR:
STAGED COMBATS:
THEATER AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF BOURGEOIS MASCULINITY

In a strange instance of life imitating art, Alphonse Signol, the author of *Apologie du duel* (1828) and a play of the same year focusing on the violent ritual, found himself involved in such an act in 1830 that ended his life. Alexandre Dumas recounted the event in great detail in his memoirs, reconstructing the young writer's death as a precursor to the doomed regime of Charles X that was to fall less than two months after Signol's demise.[1] At a fête given by the duc d'Orleans, and future king Louis-Philippe in the spring of 1830, Signol became involved in a dispute with an officer of the army. The furor caused by the fight prompted even the host of the party to become involved. Dumas, at this point a prolific author who had become a member of the liberal opposition to the Bourbon monarchy, saw his acquaintance was at the heart of the disturbance. Dumas stepped in, hoping to calm the agitated Signol. Signol in his state of rage said to his rival: "I engage here my word of honor that I will send to [the first officer of your regiment] a slap."[2] Signol enlisted Dumas as his witness in this affair that with these

---

[1] Alexandre Dumas, *Mes Memoires* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1989 [orig. pub. 1855]), vol. II, 12-18.

words augured a violent doom for Signol. The next morning Dumas awoke to Signol, exasperated and readied for battle. "It was not only an officer of the third regiment who wanted to kill him; it was, like Han d'Islande [the title character of Victor Hugo's novel of 1826], the entire regiment who wanted to annihilate him."[3]

Dumas did not even know what caused the fight. Later, after Signol's death, he discovered that the *point d'honneur*—the insult instigating such a violent custom—had occurred at a theater when Signol had troubled a military general, by the name of Marulaz, with Signol's repeated tapping on the soldier's seat. The military officer, offended by the placement of Signol's hands, soon demanded Signol to account for his behavior. Signol, in a moment where Dumas refers to him as a "fool," slapped the man who commanded the third regiment of the Royal Guard. Marulaz' anger could no longer be contained and he declared to the upstart: "I will not murder you, but I am going to kill you!"[4] An important distinction, because the popular rules governing the duel supposedly freed the victor from criminal culpability—although laws against the act were extant. In the swordfight that followed, Marulaz disarmed Signol then passed the epée through the body of the young playwright. As the blood ran from Signol's dying body, Marulaz turned and walked away from the scene of death; he asked the witnesses: "Messieurs, have I done [this] fairly [*loyalement*]?" The witnesses agreed to Marulaz's honest following of the ritual.[5]

---

[2] *Ibid.,* 13.

[3] *Ibid.,* 14.

[4] *Ibid.,* 17,

[5] *Ibid.,* 18.

Signol's death differed from other instances of violence in theatrical venues because of Signol's role as an apologist and writer of dueling, giving scholars a window into how young men justified their violent actions. Signol was convinced of the efficacy and power of this rite, a rite that allowed men to claim manhood for themselves in an age when social categories were in flux, but yet he simultaneously saw the damage it could do to these young fighters and their families. The strange spectacle of a man of the urban elites intensely interested in the dynamics and meaning of dueling provides access into the post-revolutionary construction of masculinity as necessarily imbricated with aggression. This event offers insight into the role cultural representation played in the affirmation and contestation of honor among differing groups of young men. Youths of the urban elites were not allowed to express their maleness as a privileged member of the officer corps, and they were unable to impose their authority in a familial setting due to their age and lack of a spouse.

The forging of bourgeois masculinity, a system of gender wherein the sexes inhabited separate spheres of influence and men were defined as rational, but also passionately violent, animals in direct opposition to passive, weak women, occurred, in part, on the stages of nineteenth-century France. Playing to audiences derived from a cross section of social classes, dramas instructed spectators in the pleasures, perils and deceptions of gender. The men of romantic theater, who suffered from what Margaret Waller has termed "the male malady," wept and carried on in search for the passionate partner with whom they could find completion.[6] Authors of popular works directed at the

[6] Margaret Waller, *The Male Malady: Fictions of Impotence in the French Romantic Novel* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1986). Waller has argued forcibly that Romantic authors effected complete domination over women through the appropriation of female emotions. She has charted this

wealthy urban dwellers, notably Eugène Scribe, Guilbert de Pixérécourt and Casimir Delavigne, often mocked the young men who felt so comfortable with their emotions, and instead privileged a stoic imagery of masculinity and rationality. It is the appropriation of "minority" masculinities by the dominant order that effected a seismic shift in the definition of masculinity in the early nineteenth century.[7] The negative definition of the category of woman as the *lack* of all that man possessed compelled men to search for what defined the male animal. Placed firmly within the essential requirements of manhood was an aggressive nature, one which women did not possess.

In the 1820's, a series of plays, novels, and paintings engaged in a prodigious increase in the representation of violence.[8] Whether it was the vengeance exhibited by Don Ruy Gomez in *Hernani*, the impending death of the minions of Sardanapulus in Delacroix' painting, or Henri III's clutching of Marie de Medici's arm with an iron gauntlet in Alexandre Dumas' *Henri III et sa cour*, the reader and spectator of French Romantic art witnessed new forms of how to render cruelty legible. A dramatic shift occurred on the stages of Parisian opera houses in this decade. Tragic endings began to outnumber conclusions that saw a *deus ex machina* solving the problems of the main characters and paving the way for the upbeat finale, a transformation first seen in 1826

---

peculiar mode of masculinity through the works of Stendhal and Balzac, but has little to say about how it contributed to the definition of masculinity itself.

[7] On the relation of minority masculinities to dominant masculinity, see R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* and Judith Halberstam, *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives* (New York: NYU Press, 2006), 135-145.

[8] On the increase in artistic expressions of violence, see Ian Haywood, *Bloody Romanticism: Spectacular Violence and the Politics of Representation, 1776-1832* (London: Palgrave, 2006); and Gina Marie Trigiani, "*Livrets de Mise en Scène* from Nineteenth-Century Productions of Romantic Drama: Staging Violence in Alexandre Dumas' *Henri III et sa cour* and Victor Hugo's *Marie Tudor*" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001), 15.

with Rossini's *Le Siège de Corinth*.[9] Though the rates of homicide were most likely declining in the 1820s, the portrayals of murder, assault and rape dramatically increased.[10] Vanessa Schwartz has pointed to the various ways that reality was constructed through discourses of spectacles in the later nineteenth century, but these processes had begun in the later eighteenth century and increased with the experience of the break of the past that was caused by the French Revolution.[11] The staging of duels followed these patterns of how audiences came to empathize and react to theatricalized aggression. The subject matter of this art helped young men who struggled to comprehend their place in society. They saw in these works the fight of heroes to escape the unbearable weight of history.

Plays provided a means by which young men could interpret their own actions and place quotidian events into a meaningful narrative. These works reveal the reasons why and how honor violence was to be conducted, and reinforced for audience members, female and male alike, the desirability of defending one's status through duels. The celebration of these acts, however, held sway over French theater for a rather limited period in the early nineteenth century, only to be revived under the Third Republic. The "culture of defeat," to use the term of Wolfgang Schivelbusch, of France, after the defeats of Waterloo in 1815 and Sédan in 1870, prompted a thorough re-evaluation of masculine

---

[9] Anselm Gerhard, *The Urbanization of Opera: Music Theater in Paris in the Nineteenth Century,* trans. Mary Whitall (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 76-81.

[10] For rates of actual violent deaths, see Jean-Claude Chesnais, *Les morts violentes en France depuis 1826* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1976), 29-31.

[11] Vanessa Schwartz, *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siècle Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). On the break of the past, see Peter Fritzsche, *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004). For a differing analysis, that places emphasis on the earlier part of the century, see Jennifer Terni, "A Genre for Early Mass Culture: French Vaudeville and the City, 1830-1848," *Theatre Journal* 58, no. 2 (May 2006): 221-248.

roles and ideals.[12] While the warrior ideal continued to be prominent, members of the urban elite unable to attain the heights of the officer corps, found themselves toying with notions of gender, simultaneously embracing aggressive ideals, and resisting and negotiating with this image of the fighter. Theatrical performances provided models of maleness for young men to mimic. A shocking example of such emulation is demonstrated in a court case brought before the Cour de cassation in 1832 and publicized in the *Gazette des tribunaux*, a newspaper dedicated to covering cases coming before the courts of France.[13] A group of young men wanted to reenact a famous scene of Alexandre Dumas' *La Tour de Nesle*, a tragedy recounting the fates of the daughters-in-law of Philippe IV ("*le Bel*").[14] This horrifying act of premeditated rape points to how plays of the Romantic period helped shape audience members' understanding of the world around them, and consequently how they shaped their own lives according to the models and assumptions they crafted from their engagement with such works.

Fighting Brothers, Fainting Fiancées

---

[12] Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery,* trans. Jefferson Chase (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003). Interestingly enough, Schivelbusch did not analyze France after 1815 in this work, but confined himself to France after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870.

[13] The *Gazette des Tribunaux* has become a prominent source for cultural historians of France due to the lengthy speeches that were reprinted from court cases where people defended acts or vehemently denied such deeds. For prominent works mining this journal, see Judith Devlin, *The Superstitious Mind: French Peasants and the Supernatural in the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987); William Reddy, *Navigation of Feeling: Towards a History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Caroline Ford, *Divided Houses: Religion and Gender in Modern France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).

[14] Georges Vigarello, *A History of Rape: Sexual Violence in France from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, trans. Jean Birrell (London: Polity Press, 2001), 115. For more on this event, see chapter 6.

Gabriel Tarde, the renowned French sociologist of the nineteenth century, in an oft-cited article on duels wrote: "If one counted the duels contained in the novels, comedies, and dramas performed in France for ten years, one would certainly find the number twenty or forty times greater to the number of duels that actually took place in the general French public. The historians of the future, if by chance they judge us by our literature, will believe us to have far more duelists (*bretteurs*) than we do in reality."[15] In certain ways, historians from Robert Nye to François Guillet have fallen into the very trap of which Tarde warned.[16] The romanticized representations of tragic men dying on dew-covered grass in the Bois de Boulogne have been too difficult to resist. Nye has insisted that the number of duels is larger than any statistics that Tarde or the Ministry of Justice provided in the nineteenth century. I do not wish to argue that the duel's centrality to French honor culture of the nineteenth century be diminished, but rather instead to focus on the haunting presence of the duel, its nature as an ever-present phantom, instilling ambivalent feelings of pride, fear, hubris and dread in young men across class lines in the post-revolutionary nation. The theater of the period exposed these contradictory emotions and views on the duel. Playwrights constructed male characters who posed as great fighters, while their mothers, sisters or lovers fretted nervously. Brash, youthful enthusiasm of violence was tempered by older, wiser authority figures who better understood the functioning of these rituals.

---

[15] Gabriel Tarde, "Le duel," *Etudes pénales et sociales* (Paris: Masson, 1892), 64.

[16] Robert Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997). Nye claims that the number of dueling was far higher than what the ministry of Justice released in the 1840's, citing as evidence the numerous duels represented in literary works, 76. François Guillet, *La mort en face: Histoire du duel de la Révolution à nos jours* (Paris: Aubier, 2008), 5-12.

The plays of the 1820's and 1830's were rife with dueling men. Why did this ritualized aggression become so central to cultural representation in this period, and then why did it disappear so quickly in the 1840's? On the one hand, the duel served as a convenient plot twist for writers, much like mistaken identity in bourgeois *drames* of the eighteenth century.[17] One or more characters could be easily eliminated in a scene of dueling that could occur onstage. Dueling served moreover as a flashpoint of discussion for playwrights and audiences to discuss what violence meant and how aggression related to manhood. Not all plays celebrated the duel, others pointed to how this ritual could, in fact, destroy families, but no play could advocate or even imagine that the duel would disappear from French society. This stance was echoed by Charles Caleb Colton, an English writer of aphorisms and a keen observer of Parisian society: "Duelling (sic) is an evil that will be extremely difficult to eradicate," he wrote, "because it would require a society composed of such materials as are not to be found without admixture; a society where all who are not Christians, must at least be gentlemen, or if neither—philosophers."[18] The irony is that dueling as a device of playwrights fell out of fashion with the demise of Romanticism's popularity after 1843. A society with diminished dueling, beyond the realm of possibility during the Restoration, became a point of fact in the closing years of the July Monarchy. Dueling and its cultural representation reemerged with even greater force under the Third Republic.

---

[17] Few historians of the theater have noticed this upsurge in staged violence. François Guillet has analyzed several plays related to dueling in *La Mort en Face*, 58-66. But standard works on theatrical history by F.W.J. Hemmings, Gérard Gengembre or Marvin Carlson have made no mention of this trope.

[18] Charles Caleb Colton, *Lacon, or Many Things in Few Words, Addressed to Those who Think* (London: A. Spottiswoode, 1837), 116.

The duel was a useful device for authors, where death, honor, shame and ritualized violence could take pride of place. The act was often criticized in theatrical works, but it was assumed to be a necessary—and at times—crucial aspect to masculinity. The various discourses of this ritual competed to define its purpose. Within a homosocial space—examples of dueling women do not begin to appear until the Third Republic[19]—a particular definition of maleness found its most prominent exposition. Two plays, Léon Halevy's *Le Duel* of 1826, and Hippolyte Cournol's *Le Majorat* of 1827 expose the different ways that playwrights treated honor and shame.[20] In Halevy's work, the duel is the center of a comedy of errors; while in Cournol's drama, it represents the breakdown of kinship relations under the Restoration. For many authors of the Romantic age, a clear ambivalence towards systems of honor was apparent. They understood that the rage and aggression that erupted from events of shaming resulted from misunderstandings or insults of no grave importance, but the notion of dispensing with honor altogether seemed impossible. For Alphonse Signol, whose tragic death opened this chapter, the duel was often catastrophic but inevitable within post-revolutionary French society. "If everything must be done in order to avoid [a duel]," he wrote in his 1828 play, "there are circumstances where one is forced to submit to all of its unfortunate consequences."[21]

Léon Halévy, (1802-1883), was a professor of French literature at the Ecole Polytechnique, granting him insight into the tastes of his students who made up a

[19] On the case of a female duelist in the Third Republic, see Andrea Mansker, "'Mademoiselle Arria Ly Wants Blood!' The Debate over Female Honor in Belle Epoque France," *FHS* 29 (no. 4): 621-647.

[20] Léon Halevy, *Le Duel* (Paris: Carpentier-Mericourt, 1826) and Hippolyte Cournol, *Le Majorat* (Paris: n.p., 1827).

[21] Alphonse Signol, *Le Duel* (Paris: Barba, 1828), Act II, scene v, 25.

substantial portion of theatrical audiences in urban centers of the nation. His play, *Le Duel* premiered at the Comédie-Française on August, 29, 1826.[22] It had only nine performances, which would pale in comparison to the number of times that the libretto for *Carmen,* written by Halévy's son, Ludovic, would be performed over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The play, a comedy of manners, focused on a widow whose beguiling demeanor (at the elderly age of thirty) seduces a young law student, Gustave, bringing him into conflict with the widow's brother-in-law, a former general in the French army.

Gustave rationalizes the violence he will commit by telling the Baroness: "No, Madame, I cannot listen to you; I suffer while pulling away from you, to leave you in the presence of a man who treats so cruelly those whom he should love and defend."[23] Gustave, as the general remarks, is a man who loves the baroness "to the point of folly" and who would have been better placed in the light cavalry rather than in the legal profession.[24] The general relishes his impending duel with the young man, taunting him. His retirement has closed him off to the possibility of the violence that brought him status in the army. He "will find satisfaction in this little duel," reclaiming some of his lost glory. He resorts to a genetic explanation for his thirst for hostile acts: "Don't scold me, madame! It is a default of my family; it is in the blood!"[25] He mocks Gustave, telling him about the duel that is soon to follow: "In front of you, I will dream of only one thing. This

---

[22] Joannidès, *La Comédie-Française* (Paris: Plon, 1889), n.p.

[23] Halévy, *Le Duel*, 17.

[24] *Ibid.,* 6.

[25] *Ibid.,* 18.

will be of wounding you so lightly, so lightly that your wedding will not be delayed by a single day!"[26]

The irony, and its concomitant misogyny, of the play emerge in the finale when Gustave, who has spent the play defending the honor of the Baroness, promptly spurns her to marry the much younger Delphine, the General's daughter. The duel that takes place off stage at the end of the play is not between the General and Gustave, but transpires between Gustave and a man hungering for the affections of Delphine. This act, which results in a "mere contusion" on Gustave's arm and a "less light wound" for the rival suitor, confers manhood on Gustave, enabling him to marry the young woman with a light heart.[27] The humor of the play arises from Gustave's love for an elderly widow and his inability to see the impropriety of such a match, when it is clear to all the characters including the Baroness, that he should court someone younger and more amenable to marriage, such as the General's daughter. The marginalization of the baroness at the end of the play reveals the status of widows in nineteenth-century France, surprising due to her relative young age. The celebration of violence between male characters in the piece furthers notions of aggression as an immutable and innate piece of masculine nature. These men communicate only in the language of hostility; the language of the salons cultivated in the eighteenth century is no longer considered the viable means of rectifying a loss of honor.[28]

---

[26] *Ibid.,* 16.

[27] *Ibid.,* 28.

[28] On the tensions and arguments of the salons, see Dena Goodman's influential, and problematic, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994) and Antoine Lilti's deeply researched *Le monde des salons: Sociabilité et mondalité à Paris au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 2005).

Unlike Halévy's play, Hippolyte Cournol's play, *Le Majorat*, from 1827 exposed the tragedy at the heart of the violence enacted between young men.[29] It expressed the myriad of ways that young men dealt with issues of violence and class within their family system during the turbulence of the social order of the Restoration. The play was submitted to the Board of the Censors, and although the censors finally allowed the play to be performed, numerous changes were required in order to allow it to proceed.[30] The play follows the Frémont family and the rivalry between two brothers, placing the demands of status and shame within the familial unit. The competition between these siblings progresses until they are both ensnared in a series of actions leading to their deaths. Cournol, a celebrated translator of Horace and Sappho later in the century, crafted a play with an incisive critique of honor culture and its role in destroying the family unit.

This play highlighted many of the anxieties that families who had recently risen to the urban elite faced in trying to conform to outdated visions of honor and aristocracy. The play tells the tale of two brothers, one of whom, Ferdinand, had become an officer in the army, while Henri toiled as a financier. As the mother tells her youngest son: "Your father was born in the days when one's name meant everything. A bourgeois man transmitted all his wealth to his eldest son, and how in the times of troubles and anarchy [meaning the Terror of 1793-4] your grandfather lost both his fortune and his life, and your father, as well, was forced by Misfortune to return to the world of commerce.

---

[29] Two copies of *Le Majorat* have been consulted for this analysis. The original printed version of 1829 and the manuscript submitted to the censors for approval in 1827. See AN F/21/966, Procès Verbaux.

[30] AN F/21/966. Procès-verbauz des censeurs, Manuscrits.

Nobility was always the goal of [your father's] wishes, much more than wealth."[31] The father represented to the audience the strong desire of many urban families, either newly rising industrialists or returned nobles exiled during the Revolution, who hungered for the stature of the aristocracy under the Ancien Régime. Ferdinand's father hopes to gain a majorat for his son with, a title needed in order to become a Peer of France and provided the holder with an annual subsidy.[32] In this case, Ferdinand would be provided with 20,000 francs of *rente*, a sizable sum in the 1820's.[33] It is Henri's cousin, Amélie, who makes the most damning criticism of the culture of false nobility under the Restoration: "A title is glorious when it is merited, but it is only a rattle [*hochet*] of frivolity, otherwise." She goes on to implore her brother to allow Ferdinand to have the "sterile advantage" of the title of Baron, but that Henri would honor the family name through his "virtues."[34]

Frederick is a prodigal son, clearly favored by the elder Frémont, but notorious for his spending. His father rails at him after a long night of gambling, but Frederick combats his father's disapproval by using the same rhetoric of honor in which the elder Fremont engages. "And how do you want me to appear in the brilliant salons of the high nobility? I would go shabbily (*mesquiner*) in the eyes of my friends, and shame (*faire*

---

[31] AN F/21/996, Procès-verbaux des censeurs, Manuscrits. A line in this speech about the role played by venal nobility was excised by the censors.

[32] The possession of the majorat to become a peer occurred after an ordonnance of Louis XVIII, in 1817. The majorats were established by Napoleon in 1808 to help foster a new nobility. Lewis Goldsmith, *Statistics of France* (London: Hatchard and Son, 1832), 9. This work compiled by an Englishman sympathetic to the Bourbon regime, and disdainful of the liberals, is useful to historians who want an itemized account of the structure of the Bourbon government.

[33] Cournol, *Le Majorat,* 45.

[34] *Ibid*., 2.

honte) those who allow me in their home."[35] Monsieur Frémont sought the hand of a girl from a titled—but impoverished—family; however, the girl to whom Frederick is promised is, in fact, the love of Henri. This furthers Henri's belief that his father cares nothing for him. "Father," Henri moans, "never gave me a single embrace, caress or soft look."[36] Cournol has structured the play with his sympathy geared towards Henri. The rejection that Henri feels from his father would have resonated with many of the young men (and, perhaps, their female suitors, as well) in the audience of the Comédie-Française. His celebration of intellectual labor as a valid means of engaging in society and becoming a man posited an alternative to the dominant discourse of masculinity, reliant upon military prowess.[37] Henri, however, defends his honor and his ability to perform such violence. "Become my rival. If you succeed in this fatal project, remember my wounded soul consented to pray and saw you turn away."[38]

In the end the senseless tragedy of dueling is placed on vivid display when both brothers are killed. The brothers had reconciled with each other, but after they settled their differences, the officer to whom Ferdinand had lost a great deal of money gambling called for his debts to be repaid. An insult was flung, and Henri agreed to help his brother in their newfound devotion to each other. The battle, however, ended with bullets in each brother's chest. In the final moments of the play, Madame Frémont delivers an impassioned plea to her family, blaming her husband for the death of her children:

---

[35] *Ibid.,* 20.

[36] *Ibid.,* 72.

[37] The celebration of labor that Cournol constructs is similar to debates in the Belle Epoque about how work could define the French nation under the Third Republic. See, Patricia Tilburg, *Colette's Republic: Work, Gender, and Popular Culture in France, 1870-1914* (New York: Berghahn, 2009).

[38] Cournol, *Le Majorat,* 40.

> You barbarian! Save them! Kill them! It is you who made this discord and fury grow in their hearts. Yes, you loved only yourself. Your blind tenderness only had pride for one goal. Your children! Now dead![39]

The curtain falls as the grief-stricken mother falls to her knees in wracking sobs. Her husband begs for her forgiveness, and, in the final lines of the play, he requests that the executioner's blade be raised above his head.[40] The curtain falls on a tragedy of epic proportions. The unintended consequences of the duel, Cournol has persuasively argued, are the most insidious aspect of this male ritual. The theatrical censors allowed this play to proceed because of its criticism of a crime that the authorities could not control. The work was performed approximately twenty times from 1829 until its last performance in 1832.[41]

Alphonse Signol's brief two-act drama, *The Duel*, first published and performed in 1828, like the plays of Cournol and Halévy, exposed the ambivalent desire to partake in the act and to avoid it. The work revolved around a dispute around a lawyer and man of the military over the honor of the advocate's sister to whom the soldier has secretly betrothed himself. Like much of the plays of the period, the duel was an inevitable act after the initial act of insult, the *point d'honneur*, occurred. The main character, fittingly named Alphonse, is a young man who has been promoted within the army to command his own regiment.[42] His assured posture is contrasted to the brooding lawyer, Eugène, with his "severity of morals (*moeurs*)."[43] Throughout the play, Alphonse is lauded for his

---

[39] *Ibid.,* 86.

[40] *Ibid.,* 88.

[41] Joannidès, *La Comédie-Française*, n.p.

[42] Signol, *Le duel,* 8.

[43] *Ibid.,* 11.

bravery and youth. When Alphonse's attempt to marry the sister of Eugène fails, due to the brother's intransigence, the brothers advance ever closer towards impending violence. Alphonse dreads the moment, referring to honor as a "vain chimera," but the duel cannot be avoided.[44] Unlike the other plays previously discussed, the battle is waged on stage, with precise directions by Signol as to how it should be performed. When the smoke from the pistols has cleared, Alphonse is dying on the stage and apologizes to his sobbing fiancée and his former friend who feels the remorse of his act. Signol's own death from such an incident only a year later seems to show that even if Signol believed that honor was a "vain chimera," it was the organizing principle of the social order of post-revolutionary France.

In all of these plays, women fulfilled the role of the fretting and passionately weak women, who were often overwhelmed by the thought of their loved ones competing in a violent manner. This pattern is typical of what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has termed "homosocial desire." Women are at the heart of this social bonding, but merely as an abstract presence, when in fact it is the relationship between men that is held together by "the affective or social force" of desire between them.[45] Whether it was the mother of Henri and Ferdinand in Cournol's *Le Majorat*, the Baroness in Halévy's *Le Duel*, or Ernestine is Signol's drama of the same name, all of these women agonized, fainted or feared their own demise with the impending doom of the violence that could annihilate their loved ones. As one character refers in reference to Alphonse's betrothed in Signol's

---

[44] *Ibid.,* 15.

[45] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 2.

play, “The unfortunate Ernestine would not survive [his death].”[46] The Baroness at the end of Halévy’s comedy is relegated to a status of a de-sexed widow, unable to find the pleasures in being courted by men.

Many of these women are found in states of excitement, where the men are forced to calm them or catch them as they fall to the ground. In all of the plays previously cited, female characters collapse on stage when hearing devastating news about their male counterparts. Men could find this weakness alluring and even define this as a desirable and “natural” trait of the female sex. This act of emotional breakdown was not confined to the stage: female audience members often fainted at performances when shocking events transpired in plays. Representations of women in the early nineteenth century rarely portrayed sympathetic women as violent. Women who had fallen insane (such as Donizetti’s *Lucia di Lammermoor*, based on Walter Scott’s novel) or powerful women rendered masculine (such as Hugo’s *Lucrezia di Borgia* or portrayals of Joan of Arc) were the sole perpetrators of aggressive behavior on the stage during this period.[47] With the works of romantic playwrights, such as Victor Hugo and Alexandre Dumas, the fainting spell of a woman was not sufficient. The end of a play was accompanied by the often-spontaneous death of the female protagonist. In Alfred de Vigny’s *Chatterton* (1835), Alexandre Dumas’ *Antony* (1831), and Hugo’s *Hernani* (1830), all of the main female characters are dead at the end: Kitty Bell in *Chatterton* dies of shock; Doña Sol in *Hernani* commits suicide by poison; Antony kills the heroine in the shocking conclusion

[46] Signol. *Le Duel,* 25.

[47] Violent women were celebrated in the seventeenth century as noted by Joan DeJean when speaking of the Amazonian noblewomen during the Wars of Religion. See, *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 80-85. On violence perpetrated against women on operatic stages, see Catherine Clément, *Opera: The Undoing of Women*, trans. Betsy Wing (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999) and Susan McClary, *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991).

to Dumas' play. Their deaths help confer on the male characters their sense of maleness, replete with its hostile aggression.

Hernani: Historical Honor and Romanticism

Victor Hugo by the time of the raucous premiere of *Hernani* in 1830 had already become a self-appointed leader of the French Romantic movement. His novels from *Han d'Islande* (1826) and lauded collections of poetry, such as *Les Orientales* (1829), had placed him within the highest portions of Parisian literary society. *Hernani* was a shocking play for its liberal politics, language, and diction. The opening line consisted of an enjambement breaking a pattern. Hugo's play was a hybrid of sorts between the melodramatic influences of Guilbert de Pixiérécourt and Eugène Scribe, as well as the conventions of Classical tragedy. Hugo disposed of the "unities" of Aristotelian theater, which in a mistaken reading of Aristotle by Boileau in the seventeenth century imposed that the plot of a work take place on the same day within in the same location and revolve around a single event whose resolution would take place at the end of the play.[48] Hugo wrote the play in verse to demonstrate that elevated diction would not be sacrificed in Romantic dramas. The journalist Jean-Jacques Weiss related the shock of this play in his recollections of the premiere of the play fifty years later. His teacher stormed into class, furious about what he had seen. "You will never believe it, he sputtered to the confused boys of his class. "Don't believe it, if you do not wish. Do you know what the first verse

---

[48] Hugo's theatrical work has been analyzed far less than his poetry or novels. One of the key texts is Anne Ubersfeld's *Le Roi et le buffon* (Paris, 1985), a semiotic reading of Hugo's theater, starting with *Le Roi s'amuse*, thus avoiding a discussion of *Hernani.* Halsall's Victor Hugo and French Romantic Drama and both find *Hernani*'s dramaturgical structure lacking in the power and precision in comparison to Hugo's poetry.

of the piece was? Dérobé! It was a verse of tragedy. What enjambement!"[49] The strength of Hugo's Alexadrine verses (rhymed couplets of twelve syllables) emerged from his ingenious juxtaposition of metaphors and his playful use of the structures of the verse. The normal pause that comes at the sixth syllable of each line is ingeniously disposed of in the very opening line of the play. Théophile Gautier noted in his memoir of the opening night that the war began with that opening enjambement.[50] The rigid structuring of the alexandrine verse even prompted Stendhal to aver that "English and Italian verse permits all to be said," while nothing could be uttered in French poetry.[51]

> Serait-ce déjà lui? (*un nouveau coup*)
> C'est bien à l'escalier
> Dérobé.
> (Is it already him? [*a new knock*]
> It is coming from the hidden staircase.)[52]

The Romantics sought to identify a loss of the grandeur of the past in a present that they, along with many of their contemporaries, found lacking.[53] The days of the Ancien Régime, portrayed in a range of cultural venues, offered a suitable reprieve from the quotidian banality of Restoration France. History became an entity to be consumed

---

[49] Jean-Jacques Weiss, *Le théâtre et les moeurs* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1889), 68.

[50] Gautier, *Histoire du Romantisme* (Paris: Charpentier, 1874), 99.

[51] Quoted in Brander Matthews, *French Dramatists*, 30.

[52] Hugo, *Hernani*, Act I, scene I, lines 1-5. See Evelyn Blewer's excellent reconstruction of the original text of the play. *La Campagne d'Hernani: edition du manuscript du souffleur* (Saint-Pierre-du-Mont: Eurédit, 2002).

[53] On French Romantic theater, see Florence Naugrette's excellent introduction, *Le théâtre romantique: Histoire, écriture, mise en scène* (Paris: Seuil, 2001). One early study still has useful chapters: Frederick Draper, *The Rise and Fall of French Romantic Drama* (London: Constable & Co., 1923). See also Barry Daniels, ed. *Revolution in the Theater: French Romantic Theories of Drama* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1984).

within the world of commerce.[54] Popular entertainment transformed "history into an object to be viewed," in the words of literary scholar Maurice Samuels, and "provided a model not just for historiography, but for a range of historical discourses in the nineteenth century."[55] The past became a focal point to air the political grievances of the present and to explore the nostalgia, melancholy and loss of what was so irretrievably lost in the Revolution. Alfred Musset's formulated his famous conception of the *mal de siècle*—sickness of the century—in his memoirs from 1836, stating about his generation: "Behind them a past forever destroyed, but with the still smoldering ruins of centuries of absolutism; before them the dawn of an immense horizon, the daybreak of the future; and between these two worlds something like the ocean… something vague and floating, a rough sea full of wrecks."[56]

When Hugo submitted the work to the censors, they took issue with the play, advising Hugo of what changes needed to be made. On October 23, Hugo received the conditions upon which they would allow it to be performed. First, all references to Jesus Christ would have to be suppressed. A line directed to the Spanish king, "*Vous êtes un lâche, un insensé*" (You are a coward, a madman") would have to be removed.[57] "*Crois-*

---

[54] Spitzer, *The Generation of 1820*, 74; Pamela Pilbeam, *Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 135. By 1826, works of history had increased fivefold since the turn of the century.

[55] Maurice Samuels, *The Spectacular Past: Popular History and the Novel in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 19.

[56] Alfred Musset, *Les Confessions d'un enfant du siecle*, 8.

[57] Odile Krakovitch, *Hugo Censuré. La liberté du théâtre au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1985), 25-32. Krakovitch's important monograph on theatrical censorship focuses mainly on Hugo's theatrical works after 1832, but her deep research into theatrical archives and precise argument about the political uses of literary suppression has provided new inroads for scholars for looking into the history of such state-funded controls. See also Gregory Brown, *A Field of Honor: Writers, Court Culture and Public Theater in French Literary Life from Racine to the Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), and F.W.J. Hemmings, *Theatre and State in France, 1760-1905* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

tu donc que les rois, à moi, me sont sacrés?" (Do you believe then that kings to me are sacred? Be altered. The words "*un mauvais roi*" would have to be erased. Changing the line that read: "*Basse-cour, où le roi, mendié sans pudeur/A tous ces affamés émiette la grandeur*" (A farmyard where the king, subject to shameless entreaties, scatters to all these starvlings his grandeur"). And the line, "*à cause de Droit attaqué et de l'Echafaud*" (because of the attacked right and the scaffold"), would have to be amended.[58] Hugo fought two of the items (the second and fourth), then made the other requested changes and *Hernani* was approved. One of the censors released the part of the text in order for legitimist newspapers and parodists to begin the work of disrupting the premiere and unintentionally furthered the furor around the piece.[59]

Hugo's play was not simply part of an aesthetic revolution, but a part of a grander political scheme on the part of a sect of Romantics. The political nature of the piece became evident in the preface Hugo wrote for the play when it was published in the second week of March in 1830. Echoing many of the sentiments in his famous preface to Cromwell from 1827, Hugo equated Romanticism with Liberalism. History is divided into three stages, a move inherited from his hero Chateaubriand and Madame de Staël's interpretation of Herder: primitive childhood, adolescent development and maturity, each equated with a literary genre. Lyric poetry represented childhood; the epic for the transition to adulthood; and drama for maturity.[60] Maturity began with the founding of Christianity in the West (borrowed from Chateaubriand's sense of history in *Genius of*

---

[58] Evans, *Hernani*, 51.

[59] Graham Robb, *Hugo: A Biography* (London: Picador, 1997), 134. Adèle Hugo*, Victor Hugo raconté par témoin de sa vie* (Paris: Librairie Internationale, 1853), 299-300.

[60] Hugo, "Preface to *Hernani*," *Hernani*, 23.

Christianity. The drama is the Hegelian synthesis of two preceding art forms. The names of those who are dead are always thrown in the face of the living."[61] This coded reference to Racine and Corneille referred to his generation's constant need to emulate those whose works in many ways had reached a cul-de-sac of thought. Tragedies by these exalted authors no longer sold tickets to the Comédie-Française. It was, in Hugo's opinion, time to dismiss the first two unities but the third unity of action was still crucial: "It is the only one of all that can be admitted because it results from a fact: the eye nor the human spirit knows how to take hold of more than one ensemble at a time. The unit is as necessary as the other two are useless."[62] He went on to admonish any other men who had literary ambitions: "Let us speak daringly. The time has come and it would be strange that in this epoch, liberty, like light, penetrates everywhere, except in that area which is the most natively free in the word, the area of thought."[63]

Hugo's politics, by this point in the late 1820's, had shifted from a belief in the legitimacy of the Bourbon restoration to the need of a constitutional monarchy that would limit its influence in sectors of business and artistic production. At this point, Charles Nodier, the librarian at the Arsenal and a close supporter of Hugo, noted that the Cenacle was becoming more violent with younger men calling for the downfall of any of Hugo's enemies.[64] They had become more attuned to the notion that Classicism would have to be defeated, no matter what it took. "The preface to Cromwell," wrote Hugo's young

---

[61] Hugo "Preface to *Cromwell*," *Oeuvres Complètes: Critique* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1985), 21.

[62] *Ibid.,* 20.

[63] *Ibid.,* 23.

[64] Richard Oliver, *Charles Nodier: The Pilot of Romanticism* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1964), 45.

minion, Théophile Gautier, "blazed before me like the Tables of the Law on Mount Sinai, and the arguments it contained seemed unanswerable."[65] The Classicist press who dismissed this work caused Gautier and his fellow soldiers for Hugo's cause to be filled with the fiercest rage. "Fight the hydra of old fogeyism" became their rallying cry in the weeks leading up to the first performance.[66]

Hugo structured his play around a Castilian bandit, named Hernani (named after a small town in Spain that Hugo had visited as a child), who must battle the king of Spain and a landed member of the aristocracy to have the hand of Doña Sol.[67] The play's events were set in motion with the murder of Hernani's father by Don Ruy Gomez, Doña Sol's uncle and soon-to-be husband. Hernani's moping character and need for revenge revealed the cultural anxieties around honor and shame that haunted many of Hugo's most ardent supporters. Hernani's status as an outlaw has forced him to reside in a space apart from the privilege and pleasure of the Spanish aristocracy, to which he belongs by birth. Don Ruy Gomez bemoaned the existence of the younger generation by stating that in the days of El Cid and Bernanrdo del Carpio, men "loved within the law."[68] By placing Hernani's work and love outside the purview of the state and the law, Hugo has situated his

---

[65] Gautier, *Histoire du Romantisme*, 20.

[66]*Ibid.,* 21.

[67] For discussions of the text of *Hernani*, see Anne Ubersfeld's *Le Roman d'Hernani* (Paris: Presses, 1986); Patricia Mainardi, *Husbands, Wives and Lovers: Marriage and its Discontents in Nineteenth-Century France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 143-48; Susan McCready, *The Limits of Performance in the French Romantic Theatre* (New York: Durham University Press, 2007). In France, three recent works have been published on *Hernani* and Hugo's later play, *Ruy Blas*: Arnaud Laster and Bertrand Marchal, ed., *Hugo sous les feux de la rampe: Relire* Hernani *et* Ruy Blas (Paris: PUPS, 2009); Sylvain Ledda, Hernani *et* Ruy Blas: *De flame ou de sang* (Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2008); and Judith Wulf, ed., *Lectures du théâtre de Victor Hugo:* Hernani, Ruy Blas (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2008).

[68] Hugo, *Hernani*, Act I, Scene ii, 121.

character in a liminal space where his deep passions can be articulated without the fear of compromise by material possessions.[69]

The three principal male characters of *Hernani* inhabited a pattern of honor where shame leads inexorably to rage and vengeful violence. This leads inexorably to the death of three main characters at the curtain's close. Gomez demands that Hernani commit suicide when he hears the sound of his horn, and after his nuptials with Doña Sol, he hears the clarion and he takes poison. His impending death forces his new bride to end her own life. As W.D. Howarth has said that the deaths at the end of the play are representative of "the supreme Romantic myth of twin souls finding perfect communion in a shared, unblemished love"[70]

Only Don Carlos remains alive at the end. In a moment reminiscent of the eponymous character of Shakespeare's *Henry V*, Don Carlos at the close of the fourth act has an epiphany regarding his endless search for revenge. He speaks to the tomb of Charlemagne: "Have I cast off the pitiful weakness I had as king, and now that I am Emperor have I become another man? (…) I cried out to you: Where shall I begin? And you replied: With clemency, my son." [71] Don Carlos, the future ruler of the Holy Roman Empire, Charles V, has found a means of escape from this oppressive system of honor. His grant of clemency to Hernani, Don Ruy Gomez, and the other conspirators who

---

[69] Queer theorists have seen the figure of the outlaw as an important actor in the breakdown of social oppression. See for instance, Leo Bersani, "The Gay Outlaw" in *Homos* (Camrbidge, Mass.: Harvard Unviersity Press, 1995), 113-184; Kate Bornstein, *Gender Outlaw* (New York: Vintage, 1994); bell hooks, *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations* (New York: Routledge, 2006); John Rechy, *The Sexual Outlaw: A Documentary* (New York: Grove Press, 1977).

[70] W.D. Howarth, *Sublime and Grotesque: A Study of French Romantic Drama* (London: Harrap, 1975), 169.

[71] Hugo, *Hernani,* Act IV, Scene v, 1793.

sought to assassinate the king, has freed all these men from seeking revenge from the newly-elected Emperor and has placed Don Carlos is a realm separated from the trivial concerns of quotidian pursuits. As Emperor of God's earthly realm, Carlos has been freed from the chains of mere humanity and the social laws of class. He may have become "another man," but as Emperor he has remained human. Is Hugo here stressing the need of growth from children to adults in order to end the tragedy of honor? If this is the case, why has Don Ruy Gomez, Don Carlos' senior by many years, not freed himself from the futile quest of retribution? The answer may lie in Don Carlos' ability to free everyone from his honorable bounds through the undeniable power of the Empire. Hugo has provided—perhaps, unwittingly—an alternative to the honor culture and masculine aggression that he seemed to celebrate.

Bourgeois Dramas: Scribe, Delavigne and the Melancholy of Non-violence

In the early nineteenth-century, several supposed revolutions took place upon the French stage. After the Romantics claimed victory in 1830 with the rhetoric of free-market liberalism, a variety of plays replete with violence authored by Dumas, Vigny and Hugo became successes. But in the 1840's, these works fell out of favor with the theater-going public and a revival of classical dramas, heralded with Rachel's performances of Racine and Corneille.[72] Delavigne would also see his bloated historical epics become dated and outmoded. Scribe's works, however, continued in their popularity. Their tidy endings and melodramatic portrayals of the family and what "bourgeois masculinity"

---

[72] For this standard narrative of French theatrical history, see Marvin Carlson, *French Theater in the Nineteenth Century*; Gérard Gengembre, *Le Théâtre au dix-neuvième siècle* (Paris: Hachettes, 2001).

resembled became de rigeur.[73] Not until the Third Republic, beginning in the 1870's, would Romantic plays be revived due to the interest of new artistic movements.

Eugène Scribe was the most performed playwright of the nineteenth century, even more than writers who have now entered into the canon of French theater, such as Hugo, Dumas, Jarry and Rostand.[74] His "well-made plays" were widely successful and he was a prolific writer of librettos, vaudevilles and comedies. Romantics criticized Scribe as money-hungry, embedded within commercial markets to be granted the title of art. His works never sought the intellectual rigor that many Romantics favored. As Scribe said during his inauguration into the Académie Française in 1836: "The theater is not for instruction or correction, but for relaxation and amusement."[75] A famous print of the period depicted Scribe writing furiously, with bags of money surrounding him.[76] In 1859, Philibert Audebrand, writing in the *Gazette de Paris*, accused Scribe of driving the Romantic writer, Gérard de Nerval, to suicide four years earlier. Audebrand believed Scribe stifled Nerval's brilliance by flooding the market with worthless plays, closing the possibility of publication and performances to young authors.[77] Although Scribe succeeded in the libel case he pursued against Audebrand, Scribe suffered such

---

[73] For important analyses of melodrama, see Peter Brooks' classic, *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, James, Melodrama and the Mode of Excess* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

[74] Scholarship on Scribe is scant. The most thorough study is Jean-Claude Yon's *Eugène Scribe: la fortune et la liberté* (Saint Genouph: Libraire Nizet, 2000). In regards to his librettos, written in collaboration with Verdi and Donizetti, Karin Peddle has written the definitive book: *Eugène Scribe and French Opera of the Nineteenth Century* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1979).

[75]Yon, *Eugène Scribe*, 34.

[76] For an analysis of this print, see James Smith Allen, *Popular French Romanticism*, 24.

[77] Colin Duckworth, "Eugène Scribe and Gérard de Nerval: 'Celui Qui Tient la Corde nous Etrangle," *Modern Language Review* 60, no. 1 (Jan. 1965): 32.

suspicions for the remainder of his life. Scribe's body of work was diverse, with librettos for operas by Donizetti and Verdi, melodramas, and historical dramas, but the plays never found popularity among the young men of the Restoration and the July Monarchy, who would come to be the professors, critics, and journalists of the later part of the century, responsible for the formation of the canon of nineteenth-century French literature.

The works of Scribe, Delavigne and Pixérécourt failed to present violence in the same way as the Romantics did. Signol, Cournol, and Halévy may not have found great success with their audiences, but their aesthetic of violence found resonance with the generation of men born around 1810. The historical dramas of Hugo and Dumas placed a naturalized sense of masculine aggression in times and places far away, seeming to confirm that the link of maleness and brutality was universal. This is not to say that the plays of Scribe depicted no violence; for instance, a duel takes place in *Bertrand et Suzette, ou un Mariage de Raison* (1826).[78] Unlike Cournol and Signol, who criticized the act of dueling and imbued it with a tragic air, Scribe openly mocked it. Along with the masculine posturing he found ridiculous, he deplored impulsive marriages of young men who ignored the valuable advice of their parents—and mainly their fathers. Scribe could never be greeted with the open arms by the very men who cultivated taste within nineteenth-century France, but his works found success with women, thus relegating his work to a genre of work, in the eyes of future critics, unworthy of study.

Melodramas were performed in theaters on the Boulevard du Temple, nicknamed the "Boulevard de Crime," due to the number of murders, rapes and criminal activities

---

[78] Scribe, *Bertrand et Suzette, ou un Mariage de raison* (Paris: Chez Robert, 1845), 400-402.

performed on stages.[79] These theaters were not confined to the same restrictions in repertoire as state-subsidized theaters and performed a variety of plays, including vaudevilles, parodies of other plays, pantomime and even dance. At some venues, critics were quick to point out that women made up the majority of the audience, one citing the female sex as ninety percent of the spectators at a melodramatic piece.[80] Flaubert famously skewered these women, obsessed with Romantic novels and melodramatic intrigues, in *Madame Bovary.* "Emma tried," Flaubert writes of his character, "to imagine just what was meant, in life, by the words 'bliss,' 'passion,' and 'rapture'—words that had seemed so beautiful to her in books."[81] She would never experience the true meaning of these ideas in her banal life with Charles Bovary.

Casimir Delavigne's *Le Conseiller Rapporteur* was the final play he wrote. It premiered in 1841 to largely negative reviews and was performed only twenty-three times.[82] Delavigne framed the play with a common device where he provided a prologue to a much older play upon which he had stumbled, similar to the apparatus utilized by Daniel Defoe in *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and Nathaniel Hawthorne in *The Scarlet Letter* (1850). In the prologue, Delavigne claimed Alain René Lesage, the famed eighteenth-century playwright, could have been the author of this work. The convoluted plot that followed was a comedy of errors surrounding an oppressive judge, a lawyer who hoped to marry his daughter and various other characters in search of happiness while being

---

[79] Dominique Kalifa, *Les Crimes de Paris: Lieux et non-lieux du crime à Paris aux XIXe siècle* (Paris: BILIPO, 2000), 12.

[80] Patricia Mainardi, *Husbands, Wives and Lovers,* 142.

[81] Gustave Flaubert, *Madame Bovary,* trans. Francis Steegmuller (New York: Modern Library, 1982), 39.

[82] A. Joannidès, *La Comédie-Française de 1680 à 1900* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970 [orig. pub. 1901]), n.p.

thwarted by forces beyond their control. Delavigne had previously specialized in large historical dramas, such as *Louis XI* (1832) and *Les Enfants d'Edouard* (1833), both of which had seen successful productions at the Comédie Française. Delavigne had scored his first triumph with *Les Vêpres siciliennes* staged at the Odéon in 1819. When the work was transferred to the national theater, Delavigne saw his fame and assets rise. He followed this initial victory with a comedy that was reminiscent of Molière*, L'Ecole des vieillards* (1823), one of his most praised works. Even by the end of the 1830's, Delavigne witnessed the passing of his celebrity. Delavigne was tied increasingly to the July Monarchy, whose popularity crumbled after its first decade of power. His status as the librarian of the Palais Royal pointed many critics to his connections to the unpopular regime.

The critic of *Le Journal des Débats* wrote a lengthy and vituperative article about Delavigne's work, dismissing it as anachronistic and full of "old-fashioned ideas" (*vieilleries*).[83] This review ranted against Delavigne's female characters, who "spoke like the literary novels from 1820 until 1830 used to speak." This writer saw a clear tension in the play: it could not communicate to the audiences of the day because it was clearly trying to celebrate a past that was irretrievable, but it was incapable of achieving nostalgia because the play did not capture the wit and wisdom of classical French comedy. One of the major complaints of this unnamed critic is the lack of violence. Not even "the smallest kick in the pants" (*le plus petit pied au derrière*) lightened the mood and provided the physical comedy necessary to make this piece work. [84]

---

[83] "*Le conseiller rapporteur*," *Le Journal des Débats,* 19 april 1841.

[84] *Ibid.*

The plays of Hugo and Dumas have formed a central part of the canon of French theatrical works in the nineteenth century. The supposed revolution of Romanticism ushered in with the first performances of *Hernani* in 1830 has colored much literary history of the period. The irony, however, is that the most performed plays of the period were not these texts, but rather the plays of Eugène Scribe and Guilbert de Pixérécourt, which saw the greatest success of the early nineteenth-century French theater. Not only recent scholars but contemporaries as well have scorned the dramaturgy of these writers. The formulaic structures and one-dimensional characters, however, found great resonance among audiences across Europe in the early nineteenth century (consider the works of Kotzebue in Germany, or Gothic melodramas of Matthew Lewis in Britain).

Only Scribe's *Une verre d'eau* (*A Glass of Water*) still enjoys a rare performance at the Comedie-Française to this day. The other numerous works of Scribe, Delavigne and Pixérécourt have been forgotten. The canon has privileged the works of the Romantics not only because of the literary merits of Stendhal, Dumas, and Hugo within their novelistic and dramatic oeuvres, but because these works seem more representative of the early nineteenth century. The reliance on depictions of honorable violence hold more value to readers and audiences today than the stilted plots of Scribe or Delavigne who were seeking to identify a new urban elite in period of economic, political and social flux. The stark simplicity of many of these characters was an attempt to fix French society in terms of good and evil, which would be easily legible.

Romanticism burned brightly in the 1830's after the success of plays by Dumas, Hugo and Vigny at the Comédie Française. Parodies of these works were staged at other theaters across the main theaters of France. In 1843, the flame of Romanticism on French

stages was extinguished when Hugo's *Les Burgraves* was a spectacular failure, closing after only a handful of performances that were unable to cover the costs of the production.[85] Productions of historical dramas tapered off in the major houses of France in the late 1840's.[86] The high cost and resulting high ticket prices frightened most producers from taking the risk to put on such a show. Many theaters in Paris and in the provinces preferred melodramas and vaudevilles, which required fewer costumes and less elaborate sets. On the stage of the Comédie-Française, a return to the classics of Racine and Corneille reassured both the producers and the members of the state that assured the theater's state subsidy. With the disdain shown for Romantic pieces after 1843, fewer and fewer instances of dueling appeared on stage.

This changed dramatically during the Third Republic, as exemplified by one of the greatest successes of the French stage in the nineteenth century, Edmond de Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac*, which premiered in 1891. Dueling as a theatrical trope returned. Perhaps, the new popularity of dueling on the streets and stages of France was a re-imposition of honor culture after the nation's defeat in the Franco-Prussian war and the political turmoil facing the nascent republic. For the fin-de-siècle saw as many battles of swords and pistols as occurred in the 1820's, with a revival of many of the Romantic plays of Hugo and Dumas. In fact, Hugo's *Hernani* was first revived in 1867 as a political protest against the government of Napoléon III and the play continued to be a favorite at the Comédie-Française for the remainder of the century.

---

[85] On the failure of *les Burgraves,* see Anne Ubersfeld, *Le Roi et le Buffon*, 450-465; Graham Robb, *Hugo*, 325.

[86] Florence Naugrette, *Le Théâtre Romantique*, 125. See also, the number provided by Joannidès, *Le Comedie-Française*.

With the newfound popularity of Romantic plays, the derision towards melodrama increased. Critics dismissed these works as directed at women, while the Romantic plays became lauded as landmarks of the French canon. The Third Republic's artistic politics celebrated men like Hugo, who had been exiled during the Second Empire, and denigrated the popular works of the mid-century. Dueling on stages took prominence once again, and, like Freud's famous return of the repressed, young men in the late nineteenth century struggled with many of the same issues with masculinity as those in the 1820's and 1830's. The staged battles of these plays taught French men, not only the necessity of defending one's honor, but educated them on the inherent risks of the act. Most importantly, however, they determined their status as men to fall crucially on the performance of hostile violence.

CHAPTER FIVE:

BLISTERING SANDS:

BRUTALITY AND MANHOOD IN COLONIAL ALGERIA, 1830-1848

Pierre Deval, French consul to North Africa, arrived for a meeting with the Dey of Algiers on April 29, 1827 to discuss the rectification of debts that the French government owed to Jewish merchants in the Ottoman port for wheat purchased in 1799 to feed Napoleon's soldiers during the Egyptian campaign. In the sumptuous hall, the French representative spoke to the Turkish official with an attitude of superciliousness, refusing to bow deeply, further antagonizing the Dey. Deval claimed that the French were unable to pay these debts, citing that Napoleon's obligations were not those of the present king Charles X. After hearing this, the Dey slapped the French representative on the forehead with his flywhisk.[1] Deval's insult was quickly conveyed to his monarch. Charles X and his ultra-royalist ministers saw in this moment of emasculation an opportunity for his faltering regime to gain a sure foothold in a region that he saw as rich in natural resources and a means to cultivate some national prestige, still smarting after the devastating losses at the Congress of Vienna in 1815.[2] In the Chamber of Deputies and the newspapers of

[1] Sources differ on whether it was a horse-haired flywhisk or a fan.

[2] Accounts of the encounter can be found in Charles-André Julien, *Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine: la conquête et les débuts de la colonisation (1830-71)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964), 87; Charles Robert Ageron, *Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine, 1830-1988* (Paris: Presses

Paris, the tale of Deval's abuse was heralded as a moment national humiliation, requiring the immediate action of the French state, possibly even military intervention.

A three-year blockade was enforced against the Algerian vassals of the Ottomans. Many European powers, and the bourgeoning American republic, were in favor of the economic sanctions because of the inability of the governments of the Maghreb to contain the Barbary pirates, who were impressing Europeans and Americans into their navies and appropriating goods in transit. The blockade did not accomplish its goals of officials relinquishing control of key ports to the French. As the years progressed, the demands of the French became steeper in term of costs and territorial requests. The lead up to the invasion was met with bitter debate in the Chamber of Deputies. Many representatives, especially Liberals, and those opposed to the Ultras, saw through the attempt to distract France from economic troubles and the political opposition to Charles' religious policies.[3] In June of 1830, 34,000 French troops landed west of Algiers and defeated the troops of the Dey handily. When the invasion was complete with little loss of life on the part of the French, even men who favored more liberal policies saw the possession of the territory as vital to the future of France. The immediate aftermath of the invasion, however, fell on uninterested citizens. As the prince de Joinville noted decades later in his memoirs, "[The invasion] might well have roused the enthusiasm of the nation, tightened the bond between France and her king and reconciled the people to their ancient flag [the *drapeau blanc* of the Bourbons]. It did nothing of the kind." By the

---

Universitaires de France, 1991), 25; Jamil Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghreb* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 248-152; John Ruedy, *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation,* 2nd ed., (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 45-50; Jennifer Sessions, "Making Colonial France," (Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania, 1999), 27.

[3] See *Archive Parlementaires* (Paris: P. Dupont, 1867), vol. LXI, April and May 1830.

1840's, Alexis de Tocqueville, who at one time virulently opposed the policies of Charles X, was arguing for the necessity of Algeria to the nation and the concomitant need to violently oppress the indigenous populations.[4]

The invasion of Algiers and nearby ports took place in the spring of 1830, in the last, faltering days of Charles X's regime. Algeria, however, had not always been a center for Orientalist imaginings. In the eighteenth century, Istanbul, Cairo and Jerusalem held higher places in the French imagination, but the deeds of the Barbary pirates brought focus to a country only separated from France by a brief journey by ship.[5] Algeria then came to serve as the backdrop for the male fantasies of the French, a place where desert sands conferred violent manhood on those who engaged in activities deemed typical of a "savage" land. The colony provided France with a means of ridding itself of political dissidents and worrisome foreigners. The military excursions of the 1830's and 1840's proved the first-run of tactics used by the French army in the repression of dissidents in Paris after the revolution of 1848. The strategy of violently suppressing both native Algerians and Parisian workers typified the cultural equation of the lower-classes and supposed racial inferiors. Much of this equivalence arose from the notion that neither the uncivilized brutes of North Africa nor the republican-minded workers of the patrie knew the proper role of aggression. Violence in the hands of these men would spell the end of the French nation; the duty of the armed forces came to rest on protecting their country from those who could not control their belligerent tendencies. The state became the arbiter of the proper use of violence both in the metropole and the colonies.

---

[4] Alexis de Tocqueville, "Algérie," in *Oeuvres Complètes*, vol. III, 67.

[5] On this shift, see Franck Laurent, "Introduction," in Laurent, ed. *Le Voyage en Algérie* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 2008), viii-ix.

Historians have paid a great deal of attention to the Algerian War of Independence and the roots of the nationalist uprising. The beginning of the French occupation of North Africa in the early nineteenth century, for the most part, has remained untreated. A group of scholars have begun to investigate how the conquest worked on political, social and cultural levels, especially its relationship to violence.[6] Important works treating the nineteenth century have traced the contours of the Jewish question in Algeria and matrices of gender as it worked under colonialism, but once again little of this delves into the early part of the conquest. The early years of the French occupation in the Maghreb, however, sheds light on the changing understanding of masculinity in the metropole and its relation to violence. In Algeria, the added factor of race helped propose new shades to the supposed link between manhood and aggression. By understanding North Africa, as a land without civilization, travelers, writers, soldiers, their officers, and scientists, proposed that by analyzing Berbers and Kabyles they were witnessing masculinity in its purest form. The forms of hostility they witnessed in the area were hence demonstrations of a timeless and universal expression of male belligerence.

---

[6] Three important and recent works on Algeria and violence have appeared recently: Abi-Mershed, *Apostles of Modernity: Saint-Simonians and the Civilizing Mission in French Algeria* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009); Benjamin Brower, *A Desert Named Peace* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009); and Abdelmajid Hannoum, *Violent Modernity: France in Algeria* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010). See also, Jennifer Sessions' exhaustive dissertation, "Making Colonial France: Culture, National Identity and the Colonization of Algeria, 1830-51" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2005). The most prominent French historians (e.g. Furet, Farge, Corbin, Kalifa), however, have not delved as deeply into their nation's colonial past. Many French works border on the nostalgic, such as Georges Fleury's *Comment l'Algérie devint française, 1830-48* (Paris: Perrin, 2008).

Consolidating the Conquest

When the initial invasion was achieved, many of the initial grumblings of the detractors of Charles X gave way to the excitement of a renewed French empire.[7] After the July Revolution, major changes were effected on the North African coast. Diplomatic and consulary corps were created and the French Foreign Legion, formed by royal decree in 1831, was deployed throughout the region.[8] For many young men, a sense of adventure and the chance to tour the region encouraged them to travel to the region or take a job as a diplomat, consul or in the officer corps of the Legion. They sought to fulfill the image of the male warrior and attain a greater sense of masculinity in a so-called exotic setting, but many of them instead found a difficult terrain and much hardship. General Thomas-Robert Bugeaud was sent to Algeria in the 1830's to consolidate the conquest of the area and to help put down the resistance of Abd al-Qadir and his troops. His tactics in the Maghreb were brutal. He wrote to François Guizot in 1836 that France should send its "anarchists" and other disruptive elements to North Africa.[9] Bugeaud had been inflexible as a member of the Chamber of Deputies in extending the vote, and his time in North Africa affirmed this stance. He drew many comparisons between the lower classes of Algeria and those of France, and for him, both groups would have to be treated in the same harsh manner.[10] In 1848, Bugeaud and his colleague, Léon-Eugène Cavaignac, were given this chance when they applied their

---

[7] Edgar Newman has argued that the crowd in the July Revolution of 1830 demanded an even stronger foreign policy. "What the Crowd of the July Revolution Wanted," in *1830 in France*, 124.

[8] Douglas Porch, *The History of the French Foreign Legion* (New York: Harper, 1990), 7.

[9] Anthony Thrall Sullivan, *Thomas Robert Bugeaud: France and Algeria, 1784-1849* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1983), 58.

[10] Comte d'Idéville, *Marshal Bugeaud* (Paris: E. Didier, 1882), 154.

strategies developed in Algeria on the revolutionaries in Paris during the June Days.[11] The "manly ideal" of the warrior did not create a utopia of men regardless of class, but rather it defined precisely where civility and barbarism were divided.

The occupation of Algeria served several distinct purposes to the French state. The initial invasion was a desperate attempt on the part of Charles X's administration to shore up popular support for his faltering regime. The invasion of Algeria allowed the French to regain some of n lost stature from the removal of Napoleon's holdings after Waterloo. As the Minister of War, Aimé-Marie-Gaspard Clermont-Tonnere wrote to Charles X in 1827, "Besides, It can be useful sometimes to remind France that military glory survived the revolution and that a legitimate monarchy … also knows how to float its battle-flags (*étendars*) in far-off countries."[12] This search for a renewed national glory resulted in the subjugation of a population outside of continental Europe but close enough to launch an easy invasion. The facility with which the French government mobilized troops shocked the Dey of Algiers and the Ottoman sultan.

When the July Revolution swept Charles X out of power, Louis-Philippe saw Algeria as a crucial part of his regime and a useful prize for his foreign policy. The early years of the conquest were not easy. Uprisings of populations outside the urban territories of Oran, Constantine and Algiers often posed a threat to military units in the region. Abd al-Qadir mounted an armed resistance to the French until his forced exile in 1847. Northern Africa became a favored destination for exiled political dissidents in the 1830's,

---

[11] Sullivan, 125; David Harvey, *Paris: The Capital of Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 78.

[12] Aimé-Marie-Gaspard Clermont-Tonnerre, "Le Rapport du marquis de Clermnont-Tonnerre, ministre de la guerre, sur une expedition à Alger (1827)," ed. Paul Azan, *Revue Africaine* 70 (1929): 216.

but it would not become a settler colony until much later in the century, when revolting Arab groups were forcefully put down, especially after a mutiny in 1871. By 1834, the year Algeria was first referred to as a colony (it would become an integral part of France after 1848), according to government statistics, only 2,731 French men resided in the new colony; however, the country served many other useful purposes.[13] In 1831, under a royal edict, Louis-Philippe created the French Foreign Legion.[14] The government deemed the group of foreign mercenaries who were kept on French shores to be impractical. Their loyalties could not be assured and the new regime was convinced of its stability. By creating this new army of foreigners, who would be stationed in Algeria as their first call of duty, Louis-Philippe and his ministers were solving simultaneous problems of foreign-born soldiers now being sent from the metropole and placating the violence of indigenous groups in Algeria without sacrificing French blood. In addition to this, new officer and consular corps were created which eased the influx of students into *Grandes Écoles*, such as the École Polytechnique and École normale supérieure.

Economically, French state authorities saw the possession of a colony such as Algeria as laden with hidden benefits to the French state. The country served as a land of untapped markets. Although the Maghreb was not rich in natural resources and valuable metals, as some surmised, it did hold markets and opportunities for French commerce. French theater owners petitioned the government for royal privileges to open venues in the cities of the area.[15] Many families traveled to explore agricultural ventures in the

---

[13] CAOM, F 80, 725, Statistiques Generales, "Rapport General au Ministre de l'Interieur," March 1834.

[14] On the French Foreign Legion, see Douglas Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*; Tony Geraghty, *March or Die: A New History of the French Foreign Legion* (New York: Fontana Press, 1987); Pierre Montagnon, *Histoire de le Légion de 1831 à nos jours* (Paris: Pygmalion, 1999).

Maghreb, eventually transforming the environment of the area over the course of the nineteenth century.[16] Zinc and iron mines began to provide new exports to the region, the majority of which went directly to France, significantly boosting the economy of the territory. French-style neighborhoods were built in Constantine, Oran and Algiers over the course of the 1830's and 1840's when the conquest was consolidated across the country.[17] During the course of the 1840's, the European population in Algeria exploded by over fifty percent, and with this growth in population came a concomitant rise of European possession of Algerian lands by 75 percent in just one year.[18] The cost to the state, however, was high; by 1851, over seven billion francs had been spent on the invasion, colonization and administration of Algerian affairs.[19] Although the colony offered more obstacles to economic exploitation in the form of rebellions on the parts of the indigenous population than benefits, the French state was able to capitalize on its possession of the territory for over one hundred years.

Perhaps, most importantly, Algeria served as a useful place for the French imagination. The Orient in the eighteenth century was a favored place of artists and writers to imagine political possibilities, despotism and sexual liberty. Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Diderot centered works in a region that they imagined to create something

---

[15] See CAOM, F 80 1600 Théâtres.

[16] Caroline Ford, "Reforestation, Landscape Conservation, and the Anxieties of Empire in French Colonial Algeria," *American Historical Review* (April, 2008): 341-362.

[17] Paul Rabinow, *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). For the twentieth century, see Gwendolyn Wright, *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

[18] Abi-Mershed, *Apostles of Modernity,* 100. Abi-Mershed's source for these numbers comes from CAOM, F 80, 1087 and F 80, 1108-1109. See also, Kamel Kateb, *Européens, "indigènes," et juifs en Algérie, 1830-1962*, (Paris: Editions de l'Institut National d'Études Démographiques, 2001), 27-33.

[19] Ageron, *Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine,* 35.

far different from what was available to those in Europe. In the nineteenth century, the fascination with the Orient and its local color continued. Authors experimented, as Mostafa Lacheral noted, with a form of "warrior Romanticism," combining the search for exotic locations with the violence embedded in the popular novels and plays that celebrated dueling and bloodshed.[20] In this mode, aggression and male embodiment were forever linked. Gustave d'Eichtal (1804-1886), a noted traveler and future Hellenist, used a language of mourning to discuss the loss of masculine glory in France after Waterloo:

> We have been told that we would each do well to return to our family and resume our activities of the old society (*l'ancien monde*), to become again traders, doctors, engineers…. This petty life, this narrow life, this life without poetry was for us an unbearable burden. We dreamed of something better, something great…. We no longer enjoy the thrills of the warrior; we have no more crusades to undertake, no new worlds to discover; the time of Napoleonic expeditions is past; we have no more solemnities, nor temples, nor tournaments, nor songs, nor festivals.[21]

The differing terrains of North Africa sparked intense evocative images. The crowded streets of Algiers provided images of veiled women behind wooden screens and tiled parlors with men smoking hookah. The desert with its quiet desolation inspired Balzac (who never went to the barren landscape that he fictionalized) to write in his story of 1830, "Une passion dans le désert," "In the desert, you see, there is everything and nothing. … It is God without men."[22] Although the knowledge of the area before 1830 was scarce in France, the stereotypes of Islam and the Muslim world created over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were easily applied to Northern

---

[20] Mostafa Lacheraf, *L'Algérie: nation et société* (Paris: Maspero, 1965), 90.

[21] Gustave d'Eichthal, 1832, qtd in Barrie M. Ratcliffe, "Saint-Simonism and Messianism: The Case of Gustave d'Eichthal," *FHS* 9 (1976): 484-502, p. 494n48.

[22] Balzac, "Une passion dans le désert," *Histoires droles*, 65.

Africa.[23] Islam was seen as a religion of fanaticism where "force itself was God," in the words of Cardinal Charles Lavigerie, who was sent to the Maghreb for the purpose of proselytizing in the 1860's.[24] These images held a great deal of force over the imagination of the French when dealing with the Algerians on a level of policy and on a level of sheer, exuberant fantasy.

Maleness and Violence in Algeria: Memorializing the Invasion

For many young men, their masculine imaginations were given new flights of fancy when thinking of the harsh climate and landscape of Northern Africa. Algeria became a place for men to envision and experience the sense of being an aggressive fighter. The warrior has served as a common archetype of masculinity for much of recorded history.[25] Its power comes from its seeming universalism, but the realities of the warrior have changed greatly over time and varied form culture to culture. The early nineteenth-century French sense of the soldier was heavily marked by the pinnacle of world domination achieved under Napoleon and its loss after Waterloo. With the terms of the Congress of Vienna, journalists and politicians felt the strictures imposed on them by foreign powers. The colonization of Algeria allowed for Frenchmen to achieve a new masculine glory by traveling to a landscape imagined throughout the eighteenth century as full of mystery and exoticism. Although this was not the cause of the military assault, it became an important marker for many when looking at the relationship between France

---

[23] Of course, the most important proponent of this view is Edward Said in his classic, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

[24] Letter from Cardinal Lavigerie to Duphin, director of French Schools in the Orient, quoted in Bonnafont, *Douze ans en Algérie*, 311.

[25] See for instance, Leo Braudy, *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* (New York: Knopf, 2003).

and its colony, a paternalistic feeling that provided France with honor. This aspect of the politics of gender has gone unobserved by many historians.

The violence of the conquest marked the eventual texts that recounted to the hexagon the many ethnographic details of the Algerian landscape. By the end of the nineteenth century, a steady stream of memoirs appeared, recounting the experiences of numerous functionaries or soldiers in the Maghreb. Consistently in these works, the authors note their conversion from boys into men because of the Algerian environment. What these authors stressed as the catalyst of their emerging masculinity differed; some emphasized the natural surroundings of deserts, or the sometimes-incomprehensible difference of the culture of the native inhabitants, and others noted the sexual liberty of the women. The Algerian experience gave credence to the belief that masculinity was born out of the crucible of violence. The men who achieved their manhood in the arid environment of the desert believed this all to be true and saw their experience as proof of this.

French writers and artists often depicted several different levels of ferocity in representations of the Maghreb in the nineteenth century: the violence of nature, the violence between Europeans in the area, the violence between Europeans and Algerians, or the violence of the "Algerian race" itself. In a style of writing, which found its apogee in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, the landscape of the supposed "dark continent" or "alluring Orient" brought out the basic instincts of sexuality and aggression within even cultivated members of the European elite. This fascination with the assumed belligerence of the area belied these writers' own obsession with and projection of aggression upon their surroundings. "This book was written in the midst of the upheaval in the stormiest

of circumstances," wrote government official Charles Richard, "and it is with the most serious preoccupations that many of these pages have been written, at the sound of the musketry of our front posts, and some of these pages are tinted with blood."[26] For Richard, the text represented and reflected the very bloodshed, which he observed. Richard's treatise was one of many to stress the violence of the territory and the effect of that on the subjectivity of its witnesses and participants.

The letters of Jacques Leroy de Saint-Arnaud had become a commercial success in 1855 upon their publication and had been printed in a third edition by 1864. Saint-Arnaud, a decorated soldier and then a minister of war who oversaw operations under Napoléon III's coup d'état of 1851, stressed in his letters the excitement created by witnessing such violence.[27] The army life within Europe could not allow for such violence to be committed against Europeans but in Algeria he saw the possibility of great bloodshed. It was not until 1848 that he saw the practices he developed in Africa deployed on Parisian radicals. His letters run rampant with tales of blood flowing from his comrades and the Algerians in clashes that take on fictional qualities. In describing his reunion with a commanding officer after their separation during a battle, his tone reflects the masculine bonds between soldiers and the constitutive effect that bloodshed had on their identity as men.

> Happy to find each other alive, we shook each other's hand. He complimented me several times, while seeing me with my saber and my Turkish *yatagan* [a type of sword], and my body and hands covered in blood, my saber red; in short, I had the slight air of a butcher. To this blood of which none came

---

[26] Charles Richard, *Du gouvernement arabe et de l'institution qui doit l'exercer* (Algiers: Bastide, 1848), 20 quoted in Hannoum, *Violent Modernity*, 38.

[27] Jacques Leroy de Saint-Arnaud, *Lettres du Maréchal de Saint-Arnaud*, 2 vols. (Paris: Levy, 1855).

> from me, I admitted that I would not have been sorry to see a little of mine mixed with it. I would have desired a wound, which would have still permitted me to see you again and embrace you.[28]

For some men, this violence and a land heretofore unknown marked with a landscape unknowable was an enticing seducer. Men who graduated from officer schools, such as the Ecole Polytechnique (many of whom ardently held the views of Saint-Simon), found opportunities to advance their careers and develop their own nascent feelings of manhood. Ernest Carette (1808-1890), who graduated from the Ecole Polytechnique in 1828 and fought on the barricades in July of 1830, journeyed to Algeria in 1840 as a military engineer. He became an important ethnographer and chronicler of the French military and civil feats in Northern Africa. His dry and authoritative three-volume *Exploration scientifique de l'Algérie* charted his travels across the terrain over the course of the early 1840's.[29] It was published to general acclaim in 1853. His publications included histories of Algeria in the medieval period and a charting of migratory patterns of "tribes" in the Maghreb, which intensified the racial hierarchy with which French colonial administrators sought to organize the territory.[30]

Eugène Daumas took a different path than Carette but similarly utilized his training received at the prestigious and newly created cavalry school at Saumur. He left for Algeria in 1835 and was appointed a French consul to the emir at Mascara after the 1837 treaty with Abd al-Qadr. Unlike the academic prose that gave Carette a sense of

---

[28] Ibid., vol. I, 137-138.

[29] Ernest Carette, *Exploration scientifuque de l'Algérie pendant les années 1840, 1841, 1842* (New York: Kessinger Publishing, LLC, 2010) [Reprint of 1853 edition].

[30] Carette, *Recherches sur l'origine et les migrations des principales tribus de l'Afrique Septentionale et particulèrement de l'Algérie* (New York: Nabu Press, 2010) [Reprint of 1923 French edition]; Patricia Lorcin, *Imperial Identities*, 41-50.

authority, Daumas' works were brushed with the exoticism of Romanticism. His sojourn through the desert spoke of beautiful women uninhibited by the veil and "cute young boys (*mignons*) who live like women."[31] A tension exists in his work to erase the history of the region but simultaneously recognize how much the Sahara has changed in the recent decades, a view exhibited in the opening lines of his work: "From time immemorial and, above all, during and since the expeditions of Abd el Kader against Aïn Madhi… the divevrse factions of the tribe of Arba' lived with very bad understanding of each."[32] These texts combined with the romantic (and Romantic) writings of Nerval, Gautier, Flaubert and Maupassant throughout the century spurred on more young men to find the masculine glory in the desert sands of North Africa.

The image of the masculine soldier embodied in the texts of soldiers touched those who seemed to operate outside of the warrior archetype. Jean-Pierre Bonanfont served as chief surgeon to the army in Algeria during from 1835-1842. He was originally conscripted into the army in the 1820's. His uncle sought ways to keep his nephew from serving, such as paying someone else to take your place as a conscript (a common practice during the Bourbon restoration), but the young man, in the words of a biographer, "decided to know the vast world and be declared 'good for service.' "[33] The

---

[31] Eugène Daumas, *Le Grand Désert: Itineraire d'une caravane du Sahara au pays des Negrès* (Paris: Chaix et Cie, 1848), 78. See also, Daumas, *Moeurs et coutumes de l'Algérie* (Paris: Hachette, 1853) and Daumas, *Les Chevaux du Sahara et les moeurs du desert* (Paris: Lévy, 1858).

[32] Daumas, *Le Grand Désert*, 12. For more on the erasure of history, see Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). For a corrective account of Algerian history before and after the conquest, see Julia Clancy-Smith, *Rebel and Saint: Muslim Notables, Populist Protest, Colonial Encounters (Algeria and Tunisia, 1800-1904)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

[33] Jean-Pierre Bonnafont, *Douze Ans en Algérie, 1830-1842* (Editions Jacques Gandini, 2005), 6. On the avoidance of the conscript, see Douglas Porch, *Army and Revolution: France, 1815-48* (London: Routledge, 1974), 5-10.

initiative Bonnafont took displayed his own sense of the need to explore landscapes unfamiliar to him in order to grow and achieve the masculinity celebrated in the surrounding culture. He recounted the early years of French occupation with detail to the religious and social differences between Christians and Muslims, a people whose "sensual satisfactions were the most easily infiltrated into their beliefs."[34] Although this decision slowed his studies to become a doctor, it provided him with a new sense of self, often professed in the pages of his diary.

Unfortunately, few men were lucky to find their fates as easily created in Algeria as those of Daumas, Carette and Bonnafont. The initial invasion seemed to be a way to create a serious of new officer positions in Algeria, but the number of jobs created by the invasion was few. Many people who traveled to Oran, Algiers and other port cities of Algeria found that the possibility of becoming wealthy in that economy was slight. The officer and consular corps were often supplied with favorites of government ministers. Many young men from universities across France found the acquisition of employment in Algeria to be as difficult as France. Even students from the College de France, who specialized in "Oriental" languages such as Arabic found that the army who ran operations in North Africa were unwilling to employ men outside of the armed services. Army officials, in fact, noted to Ministers in Paris that "the Arabic taught to these students is not useful to us in the field, where dialects of Arabic are far different."[35] Other young men found the experience of serving in Algeria a tiring affair. For many young men who went to Algeria, the glittering sand and clear water written about by so many

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 103.

[35] See CAOM, F80, 385, Personnel. Letter to Minister of the Interior from Director of Bureau of Algerian Affairs, 28 January1833.

was a mere mirage when they arrived. The letters of Colonel de Montagnac relayed his experiences to his uncle of misery, boredom, and sickness and that the plans related by the media in the metropole of "vast conceptions, superb projects of the civil and military authorities… and the most brilliant of results" were in fact non-existent. Instead, he found "a crowd of bankrupt men (*banqueroutiers*)" and spoke of missions where he and his troops felt "lost from the world."[36]

The administration of Algeria was torn by conflicts between military and civil authorities, as well as battles waged between Maréchal Bugeaud and the Saint-Simonians who controlled most of the Bureau des Affaires Arabes. The Saint-Simoniens valued an approach, which would bring the Algerians to a higher stage of evolution, while the army saw pacification as their ultimate goal. As one Saint-Simonien wrote to the Minister of War in Paris:

> It is by enlightening the populations; by civilizing them, that we wish to colonize today; and if political necessities sometimes demand the invasion of a new country, it must be done with the object of ameliorating the fate of its inhabitants, or at least to live sensibly with them in order to render them useful to the general welfare; for in this age of positive interests, we feel that we must no longer destroy, but create and preserve.[37]

The debate between assimilation and association raged throughout the nineteenth century. Could Algerians ever become truly French, or was it better to simply let them be bettered by French government without transforming them into French citizens? The debate's contours fell around lines that related to violence. Both positions, however, noted the surperiority of the French, the lesser status of the indigenous Algerians, and the need of

[36] Colonel de Montagnac. *Lettres d'un Soldat: neuf Années de Campagnes* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1885), 12, 22.

[37] CAOM F80/10, ministère de la guerre, rapport sur la colonization de l'ex-Régence d'alger par Mr de la P., Nov. 1833, qtd in Osama Ami-Mershed, *Apostles of Modernity: Saint-Simonians and the Civilizing Mission in Algeria* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 13.

the French to take a role of paternalism in regards to their vanquished subjects. Civil functionaries saw the Algerians as perhaps backwards and primitive but always able to rise to a higher form of being. If Algerians were violent, the benefits of civility had simply not been taught to them, and that was the duty of their new colonizers. The army led by Maréchals, such as Bugeaud, Cavaignac and Saint-Arnuad, saw the territory and its peoples as inherently and unapologetically violent.

Although most documents published following the initial conquest of Algeria professed a fascination and assumption of the brutal, uncivilized Arab, there were dissenters from this colonial discourse. Pellisier de Reynaud, appointed head of the Arab Bureau in 1834, wrote in his voluminous *Années algériennes* (1836-39), "By accepting without examination, these old expressions of the perfidious Arab, the ferocious Arab, the Arab that can only be ruled by force, we expose ourselves to ignoring the voice of the humanity that should always be heard from a people that have in their hands the noble cause of civilization."[38] But the work of Reynaud and the like-minded Ismaÿl Urbain, both inspired by the writings of the Saint-Simonian Prosper Enfantin, still resisted the idea that Arabs with their traditions and customs would not benefit from French civilization. This conclusion relied on the fact that there was a universalism inherent in the civilizing mission: anyone could be enlightened.

[38] Pellesier de Reynaud, *Années algériennes*, Vol. III (Algiers: Brachet, 1839), 449.

The Exotic and the Sublime: Literary Treatments of the Maghreb

A number of works were released within the first decade of the occupation of Algeria. Many of these works were written in order to educate the French reading public on its new national acquisition. Théophile Gautier's *Voyage Pittoresque en Algérie* was first published in 1845 and spoke to the exotic fantasies that many Frenchmen had towards the Maghreb.[39] It became a key text of a respected Romantic on the vision of Algeria, reifying the images that painters had been depicting of "Oriental" men and women. Arsène Houssaye, the noted critic, once wrote of Gautier: "Gautier used to lead or wanted to lead the Oriental life, finding sweetness in believing in fatalism, because this indefatigable traveler was born lazy (*parresseux*)."[40] Gautier's account was one of many and numerous travelogues, stories and poems told of the delights awaiting any European who traveled there. He wrote to Victor Hugo's wife, Adele, in 1838: "I will go to Algeria, as Monsieur Racine said, to see if the big toe of the Arabs is more separated from the other toes than Europeans."[41] Gautier sought to confirm the commonly held stereotypes of racial difference, which he found even easier to find in the cities of which he wrote in almost mystical terms.

These texts were attracted to the sensual pleasures of the region and simultaneously repulsed by the supposed perversions and decadence of the area. Almost three-quarters of a century before André Gide's *L'Immoraliste* or Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness,* Balzac wrote a story, entitled "Une Passion dans le désert" (1832), of a

---

[39] Théophile Gautier, *Voyage Pittoresque en Algérie* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1973). 1865 texte. Edited with an introduction by Madeleine Cottin.

[40] Arsène Houssaye, *La couronne de bleuets* (Paris: E. Dentu, 1880), 145.

[41] Gautier, *Voyage Pittoresque en Algérie*, 12.

French soldier who journeys to the Saharan Desert, escaping from Muslim captors, to then fall in love with a panther.[42] The trope of Europeans transformed and Africanized by the environment around them continued to hold sway in the European imagination of colonized lands well into the twentieth century. Gérard de Nerval wrote of his own journey of 1842 through Egypt and the Levant, recounting "the confused impressions of a world which is the perfect antithesis of ours."[43] For many who did not know the cultural, political or linguistic differences between Algeria and Egypt, books about North Africa often confused disparate parts of the region. A discussion of any aspect of the supposed Islamic world was applicable in Ottoman Turkey, the deserts of Arabia, or North Africa, with little to no regard for geographic specificity. For many readers of Nerval's work and Flaubert's travelogue through Egypt of the 1850's, the themes and stereotypes of Orientalism remained strong. Nerval's work depicted a world of violence that he sensationalizes in his fictional stories of the Caliph Hakim of the Levant. His tale of the Caliph's rise to power and eventual marriage to his sister recounted a vision of the Middle East ruptured by belligerence. His tale, however, is marked by a telling depiction of violence that bears a striking resemblance to the bloodshed of the French Revolution.

> All the persons indicted by public hatred were led up there, and judgment was quickly pronounced; their heads fell to the acclamation of the crowd. Several thousands perished in those three gory days.
>
> The fighting in the centre of the city was no less murderous. At last Agevan [the vizier and conspirator against Hakim] was struck between the shoulders by the spear of a certain Reidan who brought his head to the caliph and laid it at his feet.[44]

---

[42] Honoré de Balzac, *Oeuvres Complètes,* vol. 20, 110-120.

[43] Gérard de Nerval, *Voyage en Orient*, 1.

[44] Nerval, *Journey to the Orient,* trans. Norman Glass (London: Panther, 1973, 142.

Romantics like Nerval saw the Middle East as a repository of images full of mystical light. Nerval's portrayal of a world torn asunder by aggression and a mystical manliness became a standard stereotype of the fanatic Muslim of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Arabic texts such as the tales of Scherezade which first gained prominence in the early nineteenth century, confirmed this vision. Victor Hugo published numerous literary writings on Algeria, beginning with an 1829 volume of poetry entitled *Les Orientales*, yet in his voluminous political writings he wrote nothing on Algeria. This strange paradox speaks to the way Algeria played in the literary imagination yet could prove to be even more powerful in its political absence. In his later years, during his exile, "French Algeria represented itself," in the words of scholar Franck Laurent as the place of the martyrdom of the Republic."[45]

One such young man who was touched by the vibrant exoticism of Northern Africa was Gustave Flaubert, who dreamed of the dry, desert lands from the cold and rainy climate of Rouen. In an early story from 1836, "Rage et Impuissance," while still a schoolboy, Flaubert wrote of sands, minarets and "the tanned skin of Asiatic women."[46] Three years later, in "Memoires d'un fou," he wrote: 'I dreamt of faraway journeys through the lands of the South; I saw the Orient, her vast sands and her palaces teeming with camels wearing brass bells."[47] Flaubert, like so many other young French men, saw this landscape as rich with possibilities for growth, opportunity and sexual and physical conquest. Flaubert made his own journey through Egypt in 1849, recounting his tales full

---

[45] Franck Laurent, *Victor Hugo face à la conquête de l'Algérie* (Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose, 2001) , 11.

[46] Flaubert, *Early Writings,* trans. Robert Griffin (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991), 56.

[47] *Ibid.,* 114.

of resplendent delight. Flaubert told graphic tales of sexual exploits with prostitutes of both sexes, even suspecting that he contracted syphilis from these encounters.

Many of the literary works professed a marked similarity to administrative and technical reports published on various aspects of the Algerian occupation: namely, a tone of paternalism. Much of the patronizing discussions of Algerians being brought to a higher stage of civilization can be attributed to a hierarchical sense of global masculinities. Clearly, many men in Western Europe, as a schema of race began to gain force and scientific credibility in the nineteenth century, whiteness became inextricably linked with civilization and superiority over any other supposed races of the world. Much of this thought came from the heavily influence upon Romantic socialism from the Comte de Saint-Simon, who proposed a general evolution of societies from agricultural to feudal to the new industrialism beginning to grow across Europe. Saint-Simon was convinced of the power of technology to better the races that came into contact with its ameliorating effects.[48] Upon his death in 1825, Saint-Simon was unknown outside of a tight circle of readers but his acolytes who developed a religious fervor over his writings gained influence over a number of Grands Écoles, most notably the École Polytechnique. Disciples such as Prosper Enfantin and Augustin Thierry carried on his ideas throughout the nineteenth century. [49]

As early as 1814, Henri Saint-Simon and Augustin Thierry had written an essay outlining the need for a general European parliament where he also dictated the need for

[48] On Saint-Simon, see Emile Durkheim, *Saint-Simon and Socialism*, trans. Charlotte Settler (London: Routledge 2009); Frank Manuel, *Prophets of Paris* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965);

[49] For saint-Simoniens in Algeria, see Marcel Emerit, *Les Saint-Simoniens en Algérie* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1941) and Abi-Mershed, *Apostles of Modernity*.

further colonization on the British model. "To people the globe with the European race, which is the superior to all other races of man," they wrote, "thus rendering the world safe for travel and habitable as is Europe is the enterprise for which this European parliament should continually mobilize the activities of Europe and keep it in suspense (*la tenir en haleine*)."[50] The Saint-Simonian organ, *Le Globe,* furthered these views in 1831, justifying the use of force in the newly founded colony: "colonization, that is to say the intervention of civilization among the barbaric people, will be at once an act of moral justice, of industry and of science, association, enlightenment [*lumières*], and ease."[51] Hugo echoed these sentiments in his travelogue, *Le Rhin* (1842). The conclusion of this work written in the style of a political manifesto declaimed, "Henceforth, enlightening nations still darkened will be the function of enlightened nations. The mission of Europe is the education of humankind."[52] For the Saint-Simoniens, paternalism provided an easy means for education the childlike Arabs, Berbers and kabyles of the Algerian region. Even a man opposed to Saint-Simon, such as Maréchal Bugeaud, placed in charge of Algerian policy in 1841. Bugeaud, July 1845: addressed to the people of Algeria: Once you have meditated soundly upon this friendly advice and have begun to practice what I have recommended to you, I shall tell you other things, always for your own good, because we love you as brothers, and we are saddened every time you force us to do harm.[53]

---

[50] Henri Saint-Simon and Augustin Thierry, *De la reorganisation de la société européenne*, (Paris: A. Égron, 1814), 14.

[51] *Le Globe,* 10 November 1831.

[52] Victor Hugo, *Le Rhin*, 151.

[53] Quoted in Abi Mershed, 155.

Going Native: Léon Roches and Ismaÿl Urbain in Algeria

Léon Roches was a flamboyant character, known as both "a handsome swashbuckler" and "an excellent Frenchman."[54] He was attracted to adventure and to others who could satiate his desire for the exotic. He was an imperial *colon* for most of his life, only spending his childhood and old age in France. The majority of his adult life was spent in North Africa, and his final four years in diplomatic service were spent in Japan. His life sheds light on the French imperial project and its many veiled and secretive attempts to attain hegemony. Roches traveled unique networks of diplomacy. He was one of the first French diplomats to spend time in both the Middle East and the Far East. His experience serving the Bey of Tunis for three years in the 1830s, before he received a governmental post, colored all his later actions. Roches represented an extreme version of French foreign policy; his personal views and experience trumped the actual policy set for by his superiors. He often met the consternation of his superiors, who complained he never followed orders. In Japan, he would brag to his diplomatic colleagues that he followed his own "*politique personelle,*" regardless of what the ministers in Paris had to say. Roches, however, was careful not to put such boasts in writing.[55]

Roches is striking as a French—and less famous—counterpart to Richard Francis Burton. Burton, the British traveler, known for his translation of *The Book of One Thousand and One Nights* (1885-1888), traveled across most of Africa and Asia during

---

[54] Jean-Pierre Lehmann, "Léon Roches—Diplomat Extraordinery in the Bakumatsu Era: An Assessment of his Personality and Policy," *Modern Asian Studies,* vol. 14, no. 2 (1980): 275.

[55] Lehmann, "Léon Roches," 266.

the second half of the nineteenth century.[56] Both Burton and Roches would make pilgrimages to Mecca disguised as Arabs—Roches in 1841 and Burton in 1853. Burton did not take a governmental post until he was forty years old, but Roches took his first diplomatic position when he was twenty-one. Burton's fame rests on the impressive amount of publications he made during his life. His fast-paced accounts of travels into Central Africa, Mecca, and his translation of Arabic literary texts that emphasized their sexuality have remained widely read to this day. Roches, on the other hand, published only one account of his journeys, *Trente-deux Ans à travers l'Islam* (*Thirty-two years through Islam* [1884]). His turgid prose did not compare to Burton's ability to imbue his texts with the excitement of his journeys. Burton fashioned himself as the consummate Romantic adventurer, while Roches never attracted the comparable amount of attention to himself.

Burton and Roches differed in another important aspect: their relation to Arabic culture. Both men had "gone native" for periods of their life, donning traditional Arab garb and becoming fluent in the language.[57] Many European travelers wholeheartedly threw themselves into their adopted culture. Famous exemplars of this tradition, along with Roches and Burton, include T.E. Lawrence (1888-1935) and Gertrude Bell (1868-1926), who are credited with creating the modern state of Iraq. For some who gave up their European past, they were making a political statement, renouncing the West, while

---

[56] For biographical treatments of Burton, see Fawn Brodie, *The Devil Drives: A Life of Sir Richard Francis Burton* (New York: Norton, 1967) and James L. Newman, *Paths without Glory: Richard Francis Burton in Africa* (Dulles, VA: Potomac, 2010).

[57] For more on "going native," see Mralinha Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995); Ian Campbell, *Gone Native in Polynesia: Captivity Narratives and Experiences from the South Pacific* (London: Praeger, 1998); Johannes Fabian, *Out of Our Minds: Reason and Madness in the Exploration of Central Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

others maintained a tense relationship between the culture they discovered and the one of their parents. Burton maintained his practice of Arabic customs throughout much of his life; however, Roches, treated his transformation into an Arab as a mere youthful phase.[58] Roches treasured much of what he saw in the North African culture in which he lived, but he also believed that this society would benefit from modernization. As for many Europeans in Africa and Asia, Roches attempted to find a way to maintain the traditions of a society while also bringing it into the modern world. In later life, Roches found that modernization and tradition were sometimes mutually exclusive.

Roches was born in Grenoble in 1809 to parents who had participated in the French Revolution—his great aunt was Madame Roland (1754-1793), who presided over the salon of the Girondins. After finishing his baccalauréat, and excusing himself from law school, Roches joined his father in Algeria in 1832. The following decade, spent in North Africa, became a formative time for Roches, and the relationships he formed with the Muslim elite provided him with a template on which to base his future diplomatic relationships. His father had been an original member of the expedition sent to tame the Algerian wilderness and determine the viability of agriculture in the arid atmosphere. Roches was entranced by the contrast between the lush seaside towns and the sand dunes of the inland areas. He enjoyed awaking early to ride his stallion across the desert as the sun rose.[59] Beyond the landscape, which he found intoxicating, the local customs of the people formed a large part of the thirty-year odyssey in these lands that he considered his home.

---

[58] Léon Roches, *Trente-Deux Ans à travers l'Islam* (Paris: Aubier, 1999), 45

[59] Jean-Pierre Lehmann, "Léon Roches," 277.

Insights into Roches' character are provided by his two-volume memoir, *Trente-deux ans à travers l'Islam*, first published in 1884. His story is structured as a melodrama, replete with a tale of forbidden love with a Muslim girl named Khadidja, the daughter of a local Muslim official. Roches fell in love with the daughter of the sheikh when he met her at the house of a widow he visited occasionally. "When she dared raise her eyes to me," Roches wrote of his first encounter, "I could ascertain that they were of the deepest azure blue, surmounted by perfectly arched eyebrows and curved eyelashes. (…) I was under her charm from that moment."[60] Roches' desire to speak to the girl forced him to learn Arabic and North African customs. Both were afraid of the repercussions they would face if they were caught. Their clandestine affair went on for years, even after Khadidja was married—against her will—to a local Muslim notable. Rohces himself married a woman presented to him by the current Bey of Tunis, Al Hussayn II (reigned 1824-1835). When Khadidja's husband discovered the lovers in a secret rendezvous, he flew into a rage, forbidding his wife to see Roches again. Khadidja replied, "I cannot make such a promise when he is the man I love"[61] Khadidja was whisked away by her husband to the oasis town of Ain Mahdi. Unbeknownst to Roches, al-Qadir had ordered him to lay siege to the city. Afterwards, Roches learned that Khadidja had died during the blockade. Even after her death, Roches set out "to acquire new favors in the love of Khadidja, who, like all lettered Muslim women profess the greatest admiration for courageous men."[62] The echoes of Romeo and Juliet are heard

---

[60]Roches, *Trente-Deux Ans*, 12

[61] *Ibid.*, 73.

[62] *Ibid.*, 23.

amid the exotic world of North Africa, and within the narrative he embellished the facts to create an image of himself as a great masculine lover and adventurer.

The most important relationship Roches forged during this time was with Abd al-Qadir, who remains an important symbol of nascent Algerian nationalism. He was, in Roches' words, "a man of genius and heart."[63] Roches saw the emir, a functionary of the Tunisian state, as an individual who desired to "regenerate his nation, civilize it and enter upon the same glorious path as that which Muhammad Ali [1769-1849] had resolutely marched in Egypt with the aid of France."[64] At this moment, Roches began to navigate the difficult terrain of his identities with Oriental customs and his French background. He was drawn to the romantic aura of the landscape and people, but fervently believed that the French ideal of civilization should be respected. The conflict between his attraction to the exotic and his faith in civilization manifested itself in his personal journey with Islam. Al-Qadir could not allow any infidels into his intimate circle of advisers, and he presented Roches with an ultimatum: either convert to Islam, or leave al-Qadir's side. Roches convinced the emir that he had converted; yet Roches wrote in his memoir that no such thing occurred.[65] Roches played a double game of convincing the Muslim elite around him of their common faith, while secretly maintaining his Catholic faith. Newspaper accounts, after Roches had achieved the position of Consul-General in Tunis, accused Roches of being Muslim. Roches' experience of "indigenization" became more complex as he took a Muslim wife—whom he would later abandon—and an Arabic name, Omar oul'd Roches (Omar son of Roches).

---

[63] *Ibid.*, 32.

[64] *Ibid.*, 36.

[65] *Ibid.*, 55-67.

Meanwhile, Louis-Philippe continued to pursue a vigorous foreign policy and began to violate the terms he had signed into law with the Treaty of Tafna (1837). When French troops began to encroach on the Bey's territory, war erupted between Tunis and the French in 1839 and would continue until 1847. When fighting began, Roches could no longer continue his close relationship with al-Qadir. This moment represented the end of the Frenchman's infatuation with the emir. Roches realized that al-Qadir was not interested in the advice he provided to the Bey about political consolidation and modernization. At thirty years of age, Roches found himself without a career and a home. A stint as an interpreter for the army parlayed itself into Roches' upward trajectory in diplomatic service.

Until he finally achieved a coveted position as Consul-General to Tunis in 1855, Roches dallied in the army and lowly posts in the diplomatic corps. He resented the fact that his superiors forbid his entry into religious service, but he found the rewards of diplomatic employment far better, both in terms of fame and finances. In 1857, Roches prepared the *Ahd al Aman'* (Pact of Security), which forced groups of nomadic Berbers to become sedentary. For the French, a turn to agriculture would mean these Berbers would be civilized.[66] The agreement provided the French with control over these territories and gave Tunisians, both Muslim and Christian, equal status before the law. Notions of liberty, equality and fraternity were articulated in this document, but the limits of universalism met its limit in "the rule of colonial difference." Because of the treaty's stipulation that all Tunisians were equal in the eyes of the law, the Bey of Tunis believed that Europeans could be prosecuted as well. Roches and the French delegation reacted virulently to this judgment, demanding that all cases involving Europeans as either

---

[66] Lorcin, *Imperial Identities*, 15.

defendants or plaintiffs) would be heard by European judges.[67] In 1860, the Tunisian state passed a constitutional charter, but the financial crisis of Algerian proved that French style of rule was unacceptable in North Africa. [68] By the end of Roches' tenure in North Africa, the area was facing severe crises, and Roches, most likely, was searching for a way out of the quagmire. The opportunity to go to Japan presented itself, and Roches accepted the position of Consul-General gladly.

Unlike Roches, Ismaÿl Urbain did convert to Islam. His later writings on Algeria in the 1860's were popular critiques of the French mission in Algeria. In 1835, he traveled to Egypt where he converted to Islam, beginning a journey through North Africa that would continue for much of his life. Urbain saw his time in Algeria as a perfect means to find boyhood dreams transform into acts of virility. He served as an interpreter to the military, and, in the 1860's, he published two pamphlets (under the protection of a pseudonym) decrying the French practices in Algeria. Urbain became an official advisor to Napoléon III on issues regarding Algeria.

In 1839, he and fellow Saint-Simonian, Gustave d'Eichtal, published a series of letters about the "white and black races." In this series of letters, Urbain and d'Eichtal, proposed seeing those of black and white skin as forming a "duality," "in which the white is the male and the black is the female" corresponding to "the law that governs all organic beings." The letters outlined an approach to Native Americans, Muslims, and Africans, which would result in their "intelligence, beauty and morality to be perfected and

[67] Al-Diyaf, 14.

[68] Gustave d'Eichtal and Ismaÿl Urbain, *Lettres sur la race noire et la race blanche* (Paris: Chez Paulin, 1839), 15.

cultivated."[69] Urbain sought a solution to the barbaric nature of the "black race" through exposing them to the benefits of civilization, a viewpoint he held in his much more famous, later pamphlets: *L'Algérie pour les Algériens* (1861) and *L'Algérie française* (1862).[70] This belief was in accordance with the Saint-Simonian system of human evolution. Paternalism and racial superiority and national exceptionalism embedded themselves into Urbain's stance on colonial politics. By considering black races the female counterpart to the male white race, Urbain was able to dismiss considerations of the violent dark races; and, rather, Urbain posited that Africans and Native Americans required care and protection—as would any European woman—from the more highly civilized whites.

Urbain's views contrasted with much official policy, which saw the colony as a benefit to France, rather than to the native inhabitants. Much French policy in Algeria was constructed to offer commercial ventures to Frenchmen or a site to deport rabble-rousers from the hexagon. [71] As Urbain said in a letter to his editor of his later pamphlets: "The goal of France in Algeria is to civilize it. In order to do that, it is necessary to govern and colonize there. European colonization will aid indigenous civilization, on the condition that we will not make an absorbing occupation to which all is sacrificed. And on the condition that civilization will not be the exclusive lot of the

---

[69] *Ibid.*, 17.

[70] Ismaÿl Urbain, *L'Algérie pour les Algériens*(Paris: Seguier, 2000); Urbain, *L'Algérie française* (Paris: Seguier, 2002).

[71] See, for instance, Guizot's letter stressing the need to allow both Frenchmen and foreigners to settle in Algeria who "could open establishments" even over mere artisans who only "brought their arms." CAOM, F 80, 586, Police surveillance in Algeria, letter from Guizot to minister of Algerian Affairs, 23 February 1843.

army and that colonization is the exclusive lot of the civil administration. This division must disappear and allow all to work together for a common purpose."[72]

Urbain and Roches represented a particular strain of masculine performance in the history of European gender. They swore off the trappings of their home to discover new spiritual and political possibilities, but the draw of new cultural understandings was not strong enough to deter these men from seeking to change the very cultural frameworks of the colonized peoples whom they had come to emulate. They simultaneously celebrated, practiced, and disparaged the religion and mores of people with whom they lived. With their intimate knowledge of Algerians, they cultivated a sense of authority that met with welcome ears in France. Their opinions were respected, and they reveled in the newfound status they achieved.

Conclusion: The Empire Strikes the Metropole

For many young men who came of age in the late 1820's and 1830's, the conquest of Algeria seemed to offer possibilities of employment and the chance to consolidate one's own masculine ambitions in an exotic land. The political and social realities of French rule in Algeria, however, dashed these dreams. There was the possibility of owning land in Algeria and being a farmer but the lack of arable land and the violence marking the early years of the conquest made that a more distant option. Only men with the financial wherewithal to travel to the land were able to experience firsthand the exotic qualities of the landscape, which so many men felt beneficial to their psychic beings. To the French state, however, Algeria served as a glittering possession with numerous benefits, both economic and political. The Third Republic, however, is where these myths are reified. For many French historians of the left in the early to mid-

---

[72] Urbain to Frédéric Lacroix, letter of 24 August 1861, qtd in Urbain, *L'Algérie française*, 15.

twentieth century, the Third Republic became the telos by which the events of the nineteenth century were narrated. The stops and starts of nascent republican societies in the 1830's and 1840's found their final achievement in 1871. For those who experienced the messy years of the early occupation of Algeria, by the 1870's when Algeria's status was hotly debated in the legislative branch, these now older men wrote their memories of the events, speaking of their youth in elegiac tones and noting the importance of their work in the colonial theater. These memoirs served a precise political purpose of stressing the need to maintain the Algerian colony, but served personal reasons of stressing one's possession of militarized masculinity in an age when the status of the medico-legal subject of the homosexual and the low birth rate of the French seems to suggest that the country was degenerating.[73]

In 1848, Bugeaud and Cavaignac, who both served in commanding positions in Algeria, found themselves in charge of controlling the rebellious crowds of Paris. In Algeria, these men, along with subordinates, such as Saint-Arnaud and Daumas, they developed military tactics of *razzias*, which originated in counter-raids on Algerian villages (*razzia* being an Arabic word that entered French after 1841). The Maréchals deployed this strategy in Paris during the June Days, massacring over 1,500 insurgents (with casualties in the army at about the same rate). Thousands more were arrested, 4,500 of whom were deported to Algeria.[74] Thus, Algeria formed a perfect circle of French policy: a laboratory to develop new techniques of control of rebellion and a convenient

[73] The vast literature on the discourse of degeneration in France in the late nineteenth century provides numerous insights into the changing nature of masculinity. See for instance, Elinor Accampo, "The Rhetoric of Reproduction and the Reconfiguration of Womanhood in the French Birth Control Movement, 1890-1920," *The Journal of Family History* 21, no. 3 (1996): 20-41; Robert Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor*; Patricia Tilburg, *Colette's Republic* (Berghahn Books, 2010).

[74] Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848-5*, second ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 212.

locale for the placement of those rebels. The national attachment to Algeria persisted throughout the nineteenth century and arguably remained even after the end of the Algerian War in 1962. Some of this sentimentality was linked to the military experience in Northern Africa that seemed to endow upon so many young men the attributes of full manhood.

CHAPTER SIX:

UTOPIAN VISTAS:

WORKING-CLASS VIOLENCE AND THE FAILED DREAM OF SOCIALISM, 1830-1848

In his memoirs, Martin Nadaud, a stonemason who became a Member of Parliament during the Third Republic, wrote of reaching Paris as fourteen-year-old boy on July 31, 1830: "What a tableau! For a child who had just left his village, it was a grandiose show, beyond all words, to see an entire people in the streets, proud of its victory over a king and his perverse ministers who sought to rob them of those few shreds of liberty granted by the Charter of 1815."[1] This myth of the Revolution of 1830 haunted the politics of the July Monarchy, a belief that the entire nation came together, beyond barriers of class and region, to overthrow a regime that had trodden upon them for too long. The succeeding monarchy of Louis-Philippe with its consequent massacres and bloody repressions of workers and political dissidents betrayed the image of the streets of Paris in the summer of 1830. This brief, illusory moment, where workers and members of the urban elite came together, became the focus of the efforts of the political left in France for the following two decades and it simultaneously became the specter that

---

[1] Martin Nadaud, *Mémoires de Léonard, ancien garçon maçon* (Bourganeuf: Duboueix, 1895), 41-42. For more on Nadaud, see Daniel Dayen, *Martin Nadaud, maçon et député, 1815-1898* (Saint-Paul: Lucien Souny, 1998); Gillian Tindall, *The Journey of Martin Nadaud* (London: Pimlico, 2000).

haunted the conservative sectors of French society, who imagined the goals of unified laborers to be inherently bloodthirsty and violent. The proletarians of the nation, in their mind, were set on destruction and they were its intended targets.

The life of the French worker in the nineteenth century was one of exploitation and violence, where they "live in misery and slavery."[2] Norbert Truquin wrote of being a seven-year-old apprentice to an artisan in 1840 and of beatings where "he hit me so many times on my head and back that the broom came off its handle."[3] Agricol Perdiguier wrote of the difficult and perilous "Tour de France" of 1,600 miles followed by all young journeymen hoping to become a skilled artisan.[4] Gabriel Gauny, a gamin in the *faubourgs* of Paris, collected discarded paper and rags to help his family's income.[5] The few surviving workers' autobiographies that exist from nineteenth-century France display a group of men as concerned with their manly honor as aristocrats or Romantic writers.[6] These tales of exploitation spurred members of the liberal opposition of the 1820's and secret republican societies of the July Monarchy to fight for the exploited masses.

---

[2] *L'Artisan*, September 1830. Reprinted in *La Parole ouvrière*, ed. Jacques Rancière and Alain Faure (Paris: La Fabrique, 2007), 159.

[3] Norbert Truquin, *Mémoires et Aventures d'un prolétaire* (Paris: Maspéro, 1977 [1888]), 35.

[4] Agricol Perdiguier, *Mémoires d'un compagnon* (Geneva: Duchamp, 1855), ch. 1.

[5] Gabriel Gauny, *Le philosophe plébéien*, ed. Jacques Rancière (Paris: Maspéro, 1983), 27.

[6] Workers' autobiographies are far less numerous for France than Britain. A comprehensive bibliography of such sources for Britain includes 801 examples between 1790-1900 (John Burnett, David Vincent and David Mayall [ed.], *The Autobiography of the Working Class: An Annotated, Critical Biography*, 2 vols. [Brighton: Harvester, 1984-87]). There are most likely less than 100 such pieces for French laborers during the course of the nineteenth century. Martyn Lyons cites only 22 in "The Autodidacts and their Literary Culture," *Australian Journal of French Studies* 28, no. 3 (1991): 264-73. Jacques Rancière, the most prolific historian of these works, has written about how these few sources skew the historical perspective of the working classes, *Nights of Labor: The Worker's Dream in Nineteenth-Century France*, trans. John Drury (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), preface. Mark Traugott has prepared a useful introduction and translation of the most famous such pieces (Traugott [ed.], *The French Worker: Autobiographies from the Early Industrial Era* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

The ideology of masculine honor and its concomitant experience of violence framed many of the political realities of the July Monarchy. How did male workers conceive of their masculinity in relation to those intellectuals who sought to better their situation? The shape of masculinity among urban elites differed greatly from the working class in its expression but shared much in its ideology. Honor pervaded all groups within the hierarchy, and a shared sense of individual status linked to financial independence deepened a sense of shame to those unable to support their families. This sense of shame resulted in violence. The democratization of honor predicated that slights of honor would have to be met with some resistance and claim to masculine pride, often resulting in belligerent acts. This generalized understanding of social standing was popularized through theatricalized representations, novels, and newspaper articles, which reified the notion among disparate groups. It resulted in provoking great fear among bourgeois groups who feared insurrections and riots.

While experiences in Algeria reified the concept of civility, back in France, clandestine republican societies emerged across the country after the July Revolution that hoped to break free from the growing domination of privileged elites in the running of the state. Such associations became illegal after a draconian law of 1834, and the police hoped to destroy nascent groups with political leanings. Many of the founding members of such societies were university students from colleges of medicine and law.[7] In the 1830's, a series of silk workers' revolts struck Lyon, events that Marx would later cite as

---

[7] On French republicanism in the nineteenth century, see Ronald Aminzade, *Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); François Furet, *La Gauche et la Révolution française au milieu du XIXe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1986); John Merriman, *The Agony of the Republic: The Repression of the Left in Revolutionary France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978); Pamela Pilbeam, *Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France, 1814-1871* (London: Macmillan, 1995); Georges Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain en France, 1814-1870* (Paris: Resources, 1980 [1928]).

the "first outbursts of the French proletariat."[8] The newspaper coverage of these strikes blamed dispossessed workers for the unrest, resulting in the emergence of a division between proletariats and the bourgeoisie that lasted throughout the century.[9] Although many students had helped in mutual-aid societies and republican societies, a growing number of the bourgeoisie found that the laboring classes could be equated with the dangerous ones, and hence they needed to be firmly controlled.[10]

The failure of the early societies to aid workers can be blamed in great part on their conceptions of gender and violence. Intellectuals and activists faced a challenge in communicating to workers. Should workers recreate the bourgeois family and hope to change society through emulation? For radical thinkers, the structure of patriarchy was another troubling symptom of capitalism. Thus, should workers seek to overthrow society violently and create a better one from its charred remains? Aggressive laborers inspired fear in many, and intellectuals were uncomfortable with such a prospect, certain it would lead to a second Terror. Some artisans even accepted this notion and celebrated the Convention of 1793.[11] Much of this derived from a belief that violent rituals in which students participated, such as duels, were rational, while a mob fell into bestial brutality.

---

[8] Karl Marx, "Critical Remarks on the Article: The King of Prussia and Social Reform," in *Karl Marx: Early Texts*, trans. David McClellan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 219. Robert Bezucha, *The Lyon Uprising of 1834: Social and Political Conflict in the Early July Monarchy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974).

[9] Jeremy Popkin, *Press, Revolution and Social Identities in France, 1830-1835* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 175.

[10] See for instance, Cathy Kudlick, *Cholera in Post-Revolutionary Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), ch. 2.

[11] Jill Harsin has argued in *Barricades: The War of the Streets in Revolutionary Paris, 1830-1848* (New York: Palgrave, 2002) that the strain of the republican movement she analyzed, montagnardism, "was unquestionably a working-class movement" (p. 14), but she has conflated mutual-aid societies with republican movements and misconstrued a large section of the literature, which argues contradictorily about the importance of "bourgeois" republicanism.

The celebration of one form of aggression and the denigration of another would prove to be an insurmountable barrier in the alliances between students and laborers. Many workers ultimately sought to reproduce the bourgeois vision of the family, deprived of violence, much to the chagrin of radical thinkers like Marx, Engels, and Fourier.[12] Both intellectuals and artisans deemed the alternative masculinities of the dandy and the Romantic, emulated often from aristocratic behaviors, as inappropriate models for the lower classes. The way bourgeois men thought of their own selfhood had consequences about how a worker should think of himself. The bourgeois and the laborer held many of the same ideals about masculinity, learned through cultural representations, meaning that both groups understood brutality as instrumental to the attainment of manhood.

The historiography of socialism in nineteenth-century France is extensive and enlightening. From traditional Marxist analyses of class conflict to more recent analyses of the place of women in the ideologies of politics, historians have shed light on how class functioned and was conceived in the early nineteenth century.[13] Investigations with emphases on politics and ideology differ markedly from sociological studies of professional placement of workers and standard of living. This chapter centers on the social fears of violence and the ideology of gender as understood by pamphlets penned by

---

[12] On early French socialism, see Maurice Agulhon, *La république au village* (Paris: Seuil, 1979); Jonathan Beecher, *Victor Considerant and the Rise and Fall of French Romantic Socialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Edward Berenson, *Populist Religion and Left-Wing Politics in France, 1830-1852* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); David Owen Evans, *Social Romanticism in France, 1830-1848* (London: Clarendon Press, 1951); Frank E. Manuel, *The Prophets of Paris* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962); Pamela Pilbeam, *French Socialists Before Marx: Workers, Women and the Social Question in France* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).

[13] See for instance, classic works by William Sewell, *The Language of Labor*; Jacques Rancière, *The Nights of Labor*, trans. John Drury (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991). On Gender, see Pamela Pilbeam, *French Socialists before Marx*, ch. 6. The British context has, of course, provided some of the most famous analyses of the working class. From E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* to Anna Clark, *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

mutual-aid and republican societies and the famous tracts of philosophers, such as Louis Blanc, Victor Considerant and Jules Michelet. This essay argues that part of the failure of working-class movements in nineteenth-century France can be placed on bourgeois fears of popular violence, dreads shared even by some of the most vocal and left-wing supporters of the plight of artisans and the indigent poor in the cities of France.

Students and Workers: The Unease of Political Alliance

Bourgeois men understood that patterns of honor, shame and violence helped construct their masculinity, and since their vision of masculinity was universal, it held implications for the masculinity of workers. After 1830, there was an explosion of clandestine republican societies and groups to benefit the working class that appeared across France. Focusing on Lyon, where in 1831 and 1834 silk workers revolted against their employers, this chapter will analyze a collection of pamphlets, which saw workers facing the disgrace of emasculation from a loss of a living wage or meaningful labor. Some of the bourgeois spokesmen of these workers advocated regaining honor through violence, but many (including Jules Michelet) proposed their masculinity could be attained through non-violent means. The fear of mass violence required many young bourgeois men who had experienced violence to deny this experience to laborers. A concluding discussion of Flora Tristan's "L'union ouvrière" will provide an alternative feminist vision for the emancipation of the working class and women.

A resurgence in the work of bourgeois radicals cultivating the support of working-class allies occurred in the 1830's. Doctrines of Romantic Socialism dictated the need to raise the poorest out of the dire straits in which society had cast them. The most radical

notions of this time from Produhon's *What is Property?* (1840) To Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto* (1848) saw a glorious vision of the existing order being transformed. Of course, the way things were required a drastic change, one predicated on violence. But violence became a dangerous tool in discussions of achieving utopian visions. The image of violent uprisings seemed like a harbinger of the return of the "days of '93" to those involved in administration of the state's affairs. By giving the working man a leading voice in government, the result would be bloody murder in the minds of most conservatives and even to many liberals. The prior two decades worth of scientific and philosophic debate about nature and aggression meant that society's role was to control violence. To allow those who were not civilized enough (read either by class or race) to control their natural inclinations meant civilization itself would be destroyed.

Dozens of tracts were published in the 1830's and 1840's detailing the rights and grievances of workers across the nation. [14] The authors of these pieces ranged from bourgeois gentleman engaged in the fight to help the much-maligned laborer, and in rare instances, workers themselves who proved to be literate were able to find publishers of their views. Newspapers, such as *L'Artisan*, sought to educate the elites on "the spirit that animates the mass of workers" and "what they demand," turning these readers into "educated men and true philanthropists."[15] Although this particular journal lasted only four issues in September of 1830, it and the many successors that followed in its suit in the 1830's set forth a philosophy to bring together certain men of the elite and workers.

[14] The most thorough compilation of these pamphlets is the 43-volume collection edited by Maurice Agulhon, *Les Révolutions du XIXe siècle* (Paris: EDHIS, 1974). The collection has been digitized by GALLICA, but is not yet searchable and the original printed volumes contain no page numbers. There is also no editorial introduction to explain the rationale behind the pamphlets chosen, a slight remarked upon by Pamela Pilbeam (*Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France*, 338).

[15] *L'Artisan,* 9 September 1830.

In many of these papers, such as *L'Atelier* and *La Ruche Populaire*, the more radical ideas of "utopists" and "communists" were derided and notions of violence, which would have resulted in political surveillance, prosecution and incarceration during the July Monarchy, were condemned or ridiculed.[16]

The shifting political realities of French society in the early nineteenth century caused much change in ideology and allegiances over the course of the restoration and July Monarchy. Liberals, advocating laissez-faire and free-market enterprise, gained much power after 1830, and the opening of markets with the destruction of government subsidies resulted in workers' becoming distrustful of state policies. Often workers sought government protection and a return to the governmental support under the Ancien Régime. Students began to create republican societies, often existing on the margins of the law. These clandestine groups had a murky political sense, rarely advocating massive social reforms. A clash between liberal ideologies of individual self-determination clashed with the call from workers for associations and worker support. The romantic socialists were unable to escape the fetters that blinded many reformers to paternalist notions of the care of workers, infantilizing proletarians and placing themselves as benevolent instructors of them.

These reasons led to the inability of many students to construct major alliances with workers. Students often saw workers as unable to see the benefit of association and the state prosecuted these groups heavily throughout the period. The tension between free-market liberals and workers who called for tariffs as the solution to their lowered wages presented a problem in how to grow industry and respect the plight of laborers. Workers' threats were encoded in songs and popular worker journals (often edited by

---

[16] *L'Atelier,* 13 February 1844; *La Ruche Popularire,* 23 September 1839.

bourgeois republicans or socialists). One song outlined what bourgeois society would face if living wages were not provided to workers:

> To the parvenu who despises us
> And enriches himself by our labor
> Let him learn that our motto
> Is 'an honest wage or no work'
> From the first harmony will be born
> From the second would come anarchy.[17]

The inflated rhetoric of popular songs such as this seemed to confirm the worst fears of proletariat agitation. To state authorities and conservative writers, these words were proof of how workers were blinded by Jacobin ideology, hoping to refashion a new revolution, resulting in untold bloodshed.

Lyon: Divided Republicans and Discontented Workers

In 1831, silk weavers in Lyon, commonly known as *canuts*, registered their complaints about the turn to mechanization in factories, which resulted in significant job losses. The new Jacquard loom made a set of tasks obsolete, placing many young men out of work. The expense of the device made it unattainable to many poor *canuts,* but demand for patterned brocades, which the loom made affordable, increased, sparking tensions between merchants and weavers. The protest turned into riots and soon enough the National Guard was called in to forcefully put down the demonstrations. The workers chanted a slogan heard throughout much of the nineteenth century, "*Vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combatant*" ("Live free working or die fighting!").[18] Students and political

---

[17] Quoted in Bezucha, *Lyon Uprising of 1834*, 104.

[18] On the Lyon *canut* uprising, see Fernand Rude, *Le Mouvement ouvrier à Lyon de 1827 à 1832* (Paris: Anthropos 1969); Maurice Moisonnier, *La Révolte des Canuts*, 3rd ed. (Paris: Editions Sociales,

leftists fought side by side with the aggrieved workers. Members of the National Guard themselves (some of whom were weavers) were swayed by their grievances and the workers won a hard-fought victory. Louis-Philippe then sent 20,000 soldiers with 150 cannons to suppress the final phase of the revolt.[19]

Saint-Marc Girardin, in the *Journal des Debats*, wrote a famous essay detailing the problems inherent in such working-class grievances as displayed in the Canut riots. In it, Girardin called for the dissolution of the Lyon National guard in order to prevent further agitation, but beyond this pragmatic solution, he saw the danger in new ills that were beginning to infect urban French society.

> The revolt of Lyon has brought a great secret into the open: the inherent conflict which exists in society between the haves and the have-nots.
>
> Is it surprising that they are tempted to attack the bourgeoisie? They are stronger and more numerous; you have yourselves given them arms; and after all they are suffering horribly from want.
>
> And it is going against the maintenance of society to give political rights and national armaments to those who have nothing to lose and everything to gain.[20]

Girardin's article sought to expose a new way of the ordering of society, one ordered not by titles and estates as under the *ancien régime* but one between those who possess capital, and those who possess nothing. Girardin's essay was an important first step in analyzing French society through a lens of class.

In April of 1834, silk weavers revolted again. This time the battle lines were drawn between differing groups and enacted more violence than previously. It was the

---

1978); Ludovic Frobert, *Les Canuts ou la démocratie turbulente: Lyon, 1831-1834* (Paris: Editions Tallandier, 2009), focusing on the *L'Echo de la Fabrique*.

[19] Jardin and Tudesq, *Restoration and Reaction, 1815-1848,* 282-288.

[20] Saint-Marc Girardin, *Journal des Débats*, 8 December 1831. For discussion of this article, see Jeremy Popkin, *Press, Revolutions, and Social Identities in France, 1830-35* (State Park: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 1-22.

longest revolt in France between 1830 and 1848, and lased six days. The number of casualties was over 300.[21] The government viewed the uprising as a mere political insurrection of republicans; however, a law on associations, a trial of mutual-aid society leaders and an economic downturn all in the opening months of 1834 sparked the revolt.[22] Republicans, often men of liberal professions, situated within cities, found allegiance with workers in moments of political agitation. These moments were fleeting and did not contribute to long-term alliances. But why were Republicans often sympathetic to the plight of workers who lived in a time of falling wages and increased mechanization not able to construct a philosophy that found support among workers?

Due to a two-year trial held by the chamber of Peer's Tribunal, much of the writings of the republican groups have survived. Republican societies were heavily divided amongst themselves, and members could not agree on issues of private property. One worker stated he was thrown out of a meeting for advocating the abolition of private property.[23] *La Glaneuse,* a publication of the Lyonnais Jacobin faction of the republican party, wrote, marking a thin line between acceptable violence and mob revolt: 'We support insurrection (not riot) … when the people have found it impossible for several years to change legally the order of things."[24] Even the most radical of republicans saw limits to the justification of violence. A rival newspaper, *La Précurseur* viewed "a distinction between a riot, in other words, useless and dangerous uproars, and revolutions

---

[21] For Lyon in 1834, see Robert Bezucha, *The Lyon Uprising of 1834* (Cambridge, Mass,: Harvard University Press, 1974).

[22] *La Bulletin des lois* (Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, 1834), 136.

[23] Joseph Benoit, *Confession d'un proletaire* (Paris: Editions Sociales, 1969 [1871]), 52-53.

[24] *La Glaneuse,* 19 December 1833. The journal began in 1831 as a literary review. After being suppressed by authorities, it re-emerged in the summer of 1832 as an organ of radical republicanism.

which are always legitimate because they emanate from real necessity and always produce results advantageous to civilization."[25] The common trope of sacrificial and regenerative violence of French philosophy advocated by this writer produced a murky water where some forms of belligerence were justified while others were harshly condemned; however, where the line set that distinction was never easy to articulate.

The government placed blame for the April uprising on the republicans and other secret societies, saying workers were either the dupes of these republicans, or even non-participants in the violence. Although workers' grievances were a cause of the insurrection, the government took a paternalist view of the Lyonnais workers, claiming that they were incapable of such revolts. Many workers, who espoused conservative politics, saw their economic grievances as separable from political reform. Some republican societies agitated for universal suffrage and abolition of private property, while one weaver responded that any abandonment of property qualifications for enfranchisement risked tyranny.[26]

The Philosophy of Violence: French Thinkers and the Specter of the Terror

Views of the relationship between the working class and violence in the early nineteenth century changed drastically over the course of a generation. In a police bulletin of 1817, a state official wrote, "The time is gone when one need fear that they [the thousands of individuals who compose the working class] will take to crime. They scarcely even talk of it, and if talk should go beyond the sort of back-chat left over from

[25] *La Précurseur,* 22 August 1833.

[26] Bezucha, *Lyon Uprising of April 1834,* 83.

the Revolution and army life anyone indulging in it is looked upon as a police agent. The populace has learned the meaning of fear, and there is more reserve on the streets than in the fashionable drawing rooms."[27] For those on the right, aggressive behavior was seen to be an expressive action, that merely stated dissatisfaction, while those on the left found a more nuanced view of this violence as instrumental towards achieving a goal of bettering their rather poor lot in nineteenth-century French society.[28] The period from 1815 until 1848 allowed for a new conception of class to dominate the discussion of the order of society, and what informed this paradigm-shifting moment was the cultural discourse surrounding violence at the time.

The writings of the Duc de Saint-Simon became some of the most influential pieces for the remainder of the nineteenth century in France. At the time of his death in 1825, his views were held by a small, devoted set of followers but because of the propagation of his beliefs at major institutions, such as the Ecole Polytechnique, his views by the middle of the century were widely believed in some circles of the nation, especially among officers of the army and civil servants. Saint-Simon sought industrial ideas in order "to find this organic bond so necessary" lost since "the ruin of the theological and feudal powers" under the French Revolution.[29]

---

[27] AN F7, 3837, Police bulletin, Paris, October 1, 1817 quoted and translated in Irene Collins, ed. *Government and Society in France, 1815-1848: Documents in Modern History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970), 67.

[28] This language of expressive and instrumental action is taken from Talcott Parson's *The Social System* (New York: Free Press, 1964 [orig. 1951]), esp. 45-75. Parsons' views of this are used to far different means in my analysis to understand the *conception* of violence, rather than its action. Parsons also used these terms to divide gender roles; something critiqued by succeeding generations of sociologists. See, for instance, Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne, "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology," *Social Problems* 32, no. 4 (April 1985): 301-316; Michel Wieviorka, *Violence: A New Approach*, trans. David Macey (London: Sage, 2009), 88.

[29] Saint-Simon, "Sixth Letter to an American," *L'Industrie*, 1817.

The Left viewed the July Revolution as a mere change of dynasty and not effective social transformation, as Casimir Périer, banker and leader of the *parti de résistance*, insisted. As early as August of 1830, the left-wing newspaper, *La Révolution*, stated that the events of July had created a "new aristocracy," and that the bourgeoisie will see a day "when the workers will demand the rights that have been violated or ignored, and demand them imperatively if no-one has had the foresight to free them peaceably."[30] François Mauguin, a member of the lower house of parliament, stated the purpose of the July monarchy was "ancient memories of glory and humiliation unavenged that accounted for the success of the Three Days."[31] This decade would prove to be a fertile period for the growth of political thought and utopian vision. The series of events from the July Revolution to Lyon's uprisings in 1831 and 1834, and the strong repression of rebellious groups, linked to the dissolution with constitutional monarchy, caused writers to conceptualize their thought in new ways. At the heart of this experience and the new analyses of society's ills, the role of violence proved a strong, haunting presence.

A turning point came in July of 1835, when a disgruntled Corsican, Giuseppe Fieschi, who had served under General Murat, had constructed a *machine infernalle* with the aid of members of the Parisian Société Droits de l'Homme. On July 28, 1835, Fieschi attempted to set off this device, which was composed of twenty gun barrels set to fire simultaneously. The contraption was set off on the Boulevard du Temple, incidentally where many of the city's most popular theaters operated, while Louis-Philippe was

---

[30] *La Révolution*, 11 August 1830.

[31] AP, Chambre des Députés, vol. LXII, 15 January 1831.

leading a procession with his sons.[32] Bullets killed seventeen and wounded numerous others, some of whom had merely gathered to watch the king pass. Fieschi himself was severely wounded when his mechanism fired. Authorities apprehended him easily and by February of the next year, Fieschi was guillotined. His trial uncovered a number of plots to kill the monarch and these underground societies became seen as a hotbed of political dissidence, and the French parliament rushed to pass new laws, which would prosecute these groups.[33]

The September Laws of 1835, after the assassination attempt on Louis-Philippe's life by Fieschi, made all but the mildest statements of opposition to government illegal.[34] The earlier law forbidding associations of greater than twenty in 1834 (passed after the Lyonnais insurrection) had already given authorities larger purview over political participation, but these new laws went further, criminalizing political speech and writings.[35] Republican groups fled to secret meetings at unknown locations in order to avoid the reach of the law. Further assassinations in 1838 by republicans such as Alibaud seemed to confirm in the minds of many that republicans saw violence as the only effective way of furthering their political aim. Republicans, however, contrasted these beliefs with the violence meted out to the working class by state authorities in the streets of Lyon and funeral attendees at the funeral of General Lamarque in 1832. Alphonse

---

[32] A plaque today at Numéro 50 on the Boulevard du Temple marks the site of the assassination attempt.

[33] *Procès de Fieschi et de ses complices* (Brussels: Adolphe Wahlen, 1836).

[34] *Bulletin des lois du Royaume de France, IXe série* (Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, Sept. 1835), 247-262.

[35] *Bulletin des lois* (Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, 1834), 136. See also Carol Harrison, *The Bourgeois Citizen in Nineteenth-Century France: Gender, Sociability and the Uses of Emulation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Lamartine in 1839 famously stated in the Chamber of deputies that "France as a nation is bored! And take care: the boredom of peoples leads easily to upheaval and ruin."[36] This lack of excitement among the French was attributed, in Lamartine's eyes, to the failure of the government to construct a new, coherent policy. This ineffective governing would result in the violence of the lower classes. François Guizot, who became Louis-Philippe's minister in 1840, rallied against any attempts to extend voting rights. "Not only have I no desire to see universal suffrage introduced among us," he railed in the chamber of deputies in 1842, "but I am opposed to every tendency in this direction. I believe it to be harmful and as dangerous to our liberties as to law and order."[37] Guizot's words spoke to the menacing sense of chaos that would result from members of both the middle and working classes in partaking in a system of enfranchisement.

Commentators interpreted acts of violence through a lens of ideology. For utopians and liberals, society pushed workers into an untenable situation, which required a response of aggression. For those on the right, the belligerence of the lower classes was a result of their lack of education and their uncivilized nature. These two views, however, both assumed bloodshed as the reaction of a group of people at the bottom of the French hierarchy. Even left-wing journalists such as Charles Dunoyer in 1835 answered a resounding no the question he posited to his readers: "do you think society owes any reparation to people who are the saddest and heaviest of burdens?"[38] Popular novels of the time portrayed the working-class world as one filled with violence and characters

---

[36] AP Chambre des Députés, Vol. LXX, 10 January 1839.
[37] AP Chambre des Députés, 15 February 1842.

[38] Charles Dunoyer, *Memoire à consulter sur quelques-unes des principales questions que la revolution de Juillet a fat naître* (Paris, n.p., 1835), 128.

with no remorse or guilt. In Eugene Sue's *Les Mysteres de Paris,* Chourineur (literally one who murders victims with a knife) tells Rudolph, the hero of the novel, in a fetid slum in the Cité of Paris that "knifing had become a raging passion." He went on to relate the other victims he killed, including a sergeant and soldiers.[39] Chourineur is relegated to a tenuous existence, struggling to make ends meet in an area of the city ridden with crime.

By the 1840's, many writers and left-wing agitators saw that the current European situation with the working class was untenable, including Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Louis Blanc in his famous *L'organisation du travail* (1839) alleged that work for the poor would result in the decrease of violent crime. "When a man who asks to live by serving society," Blanc wrote, "is fatally reduced to attacking it under the pain of death, his apparent aggression is really justifiable self-defense, and the society which strikes him is not his judge but his assassin."[40] Even a fanciful novel, such as Etienne Cabet's *Voyage en Icarie* (1840) imagined a society devoid of crime due to the abolishment of property.[41] Victor Considerant's *Principes du Socialisme: Manifeste de la démocratie au XIXe siècle*, first published as a journal introduction in 1843, then becoming a stand alone pamphlet in 1847, was a foundational text of early socialism, yet its brand of leftist ideology appears conservative today. Considerant's text was a major source for Marx and Engel's manifesto, but with a significant difference: Considerant believed forcefully in the peaceful generation of a New Order (*l'Ordre Nouveau*) without resorting to violence.

---

[39] Eugene Sue, *Les Mysteres de Paris,* ch. 4 (Paris: Charles Gosselin, 1844), 76.

[40] Louis Blanc, *L'Organisation du travail* (Paris: Administration de Librairie, 1841), 12.

[41] Etienne Cabet, *Voyage en Icarie*, see especially chapter 4. In his imagined polity, government was run by a despot who oversaw the political participation of all of its members.

His explanation as to why the French Revolution occurred stressed how such bloodshed could be avoided in the future.

> But the natural movement of synthesis and inclusion that could have provided an orderly transformation of the Old Society had not been promoted and directed intelligently by the successors of Henri IV, Richilieu and Louis XIV; as the new spirit was not wisely and closely monitored during its powerful expansion, the result was an explosion. The *ancien régime* was violently overthrown, and on its fragments the two principles of right clashed in the most hostile confrontation, creating an explosion long reverberating on European soil, and starting a war whose outcome was already decided by the eternal laws governing the world. When it is time for the past to be transformed, if the pasts resists the inevitable, it will perish in violence.[42]

Similar to other political pronouncements of the time, from Tocqueville to Blanc, Considerant warned the public of the violence that would face French citizens if the dilemma of social inequity is not addressed. For many of the wealthy and landed classes, even prosperous petit bourgeois saw in the agitation of the working class the possibility of revolutionary agitation, which could result in the destruction and loss of property and even life. Conservative newspapers, such as *Le Globe* or the more moderate *Journal des Débats*, aided in the escalation of these fears, calling for the police to persecute and prosecute any such belligerence. "On this matter some stubborn conservatives, fearful ex-liberal pigs," Considerant said in mocking these critics, "do not want to hear any discussion or prediction. They are angry that we have not delicately spared them from the truths that might disturb the moronic slumber of these egotistic consumers."[43] For Considerant, these "former revolutionaries" of 1830 have become "fat and satisfied" turning away from their once radical notions. This solidification of support among former

---

[42] Victor Considerant, *Principes du Socialisme: Manifeste de la démocratie au XIXe siècle* (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1978 [reprint of 1847 edition]), 4. On Considerant, see Jonathan Beecher, *Victor considerant and the Rise and Fall of French Romantic Socialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001) and Michèle Riot-Sarcey, *Le reel de l'utopie: Essai sur le politique au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1982).

[43] Ibid., 14.

liberals spoke to the growth of conservative movements in the 1830's and the entrenchment of liberal (meaning free-market ideology) as the policy of the establishment. Members of the Chamber of Deputies and conservative journalists (who far outnumbered those of more left-wing papers as *Le National* or *Le Charivari*) decried alliances between bourgeois students and republican societies or mutual-aid societies for betraying their families and their class. The very participation in societies, which were assumed to be destructive, were traitors to the nation.

Considerant hoped for an "associational" socialism that did not seek the abolition of property, such as in Proudhon, or even in the communist utopians of Fourier, who had influenced Considerant. Considerant did not even call for universal suffrage or a republic. In a dour paternalistic mode, he advocates instead for a gradual process. "Every member of our nation is endowed at birth with universal rights," he condescended, "but one must allow citizens to exercise rights to govern Society only so far and as much as they attain sufficient competence and capacity to handle safely rights so important and formidable."[44] The pamphlet expressed a means of change that was not revolutionary, violent, nor even political. How his utopian vision would be enacted through the simple act of association remained vague and unclear.

At political banquets leading to the revolution of 1848, agitators like Alexandre Auguste Ledru-Rollin mocked the idea that granting rights to workers meant "anarchy, revolution, bloodshed." Invoking the need for free markets, Ledru-Rollin claimed that workers were turning to crime and prostitution because the government forced manufacturers and factory owners to lower wages in order to break even.[45] Alexis de

---

[44] Ibid., 47.

Tocqueville warned his fellow parliamentarians in January of 1848 that "it is true that [the working classes] are not tormented by political passions as such, to the extent that they once were; but do you not see that that little by little opinions and ideas are spreading in their midst which are not aimed simply at overturning this law or ministry or government, but at society itself, shaking it to the very foundations on which it rests today? … I believe at this moment we are sleeping on a volcano."[46]

This rhetorical conceit of finding non-violent solutions to a problem that would erupt into revolution if not addressed was continued with one of the most famous pamphlets of the period: Michelet's *Le peuple* (1846). In it, Michelet analyzed the effects of newly industrial society in July Monarchy France. He attempted to expose many of the stereotypes of the lower classes as dangerous to be mere phatasmagoria: "Amongst the most disorderly, the most vicious, and the most wretched, I have found a mine of sentiment and warmth of heart rarely met with in the wealthier classes."[47] Michelet divided his piece into two parts: the first exposed the differing levels of society and their varying oppression by capital, while the second proposed a solution to the violence endemic to such a system. His solution to such a troubling hierarchy of wealth and poverty is merely love. The antipathy bubbling under the surface of society in Michelet's mind can be effaced with a simple turn to compassion. Michelet himself seems unconvinced of this answer. "Here, a serious objection arises," Michelet wrote in

[45] AN BB 30, 296, Report taken from the *Messenger du Nord,*10 September 1847.
[46] AP, Chambre des deputes, 27 January 1848.

[47] Michelet, *Le Peuple*, 15.

consternation, " 'How shall I be able to give people faith when I have so little myself?' Look into yourself, consider your children—there you will find France."[48]

Michelet answered in one word how France could solve its growing tensions among the masses who were beginning to recognize the great inequalities between the classes: simply, love. As Edmund Wilson said in his now classic, *To the Finland Station,* "The second half of *The People* [entitled "Of Enfranchisement by Love"] seems as ridiculous to us today as the first half seems acute."[49] Instead of following his reasoning to find a radical means for bettering the case of workers, Michelet claims love will raise those workers from their cursed positions.[50] His happily naïve sentiment was perhaps derived from the fear of a nation torn asunder by those who hoped to abandon the chains of economic enslavement through aggressive means. He fought this dread by claiming anger's opposite but close bed partner as the solution. Michelet avoided the problem of answering such a widespread problem in a worthy manner, instead supplying a facile solution, simply because of his fear of violence.[51]

Whence this perpetual fear of violence among some of France's most important philosophers? It was a combination of the political and social memory of the Terror and the pseudo-scientific belief that aggression was one of the "natural passions" of man. For French theorists of the early nineteenth century, images of 1793 with guillotines stained

---

[48] Jules Michelet, *Le Peuple*

[49] Edmund Wilson, *To the Finland Station: A Study in the Writing and Acting of History* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1972 [orig pub. 1940]), 34.

[50] Michelet, *Le Peuple.* 103.

[51] This fear of mob violence seeped into the historiography of republicanism in the twentieth century. See for instance, the influential works of Georges Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain en France de 1814 à 1870* (Paris, 1900); Gabriel Perreux, *Aux temps sociétés secretes. La Propagande républicain au début de la Monarchie de Juillet, 1830-35* (Paris: H. Sée, 1931); Louis Chevalier, *Classes laborieuses et classes dangereuses* (Paris: Plon, 1958).

with blood lived on. Any turn to bellicosity by the people would result in thousands dead, killed ruthlessly. From Considerant to Blanc, even Proudhon and Michelet, pacifism was crucial to their solutions to societal problems, simply because they did not want to come under attack from conservatives for wanting to "revive the days of "93," a common phrase found in police records regarding the actions of political agitators.[52] Or, as Considerant said a bit less tactfully, "all the wealthy dolts … hear 1793 when they hear Progress mentioned."[53] This is why the formulations of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in *The Communist Manifesto* were so shocking and novel to nineteenth-century readers. Marx professed a regenerative value of violence, not a new proposition which could be found even in the conservative writer, Joseph de Maistre, but Marx saw that the way to cure such ills was only through the power of revolution.[54] In France, only the seemingly most radical socialists advocated violence. Few prominent thinkers in France through the 1840's advocated the use of force, partly due to the political exigencies, which delegitimized any such notion, but also because of the laws passed after the 1835 assassination attempt which made such calls to arm illegal and punishable by prison time.[55]

---

[52] See for instance, AN BB 21, 184, Report regarding political crimes from Minister of the Police to Minister of the Interior, 22 August 1826.

[53] Considerant, *Principles of Socialism*, 34.

[54] On theories of regenerative violence, see Jesse Goldhammer, *The Headless Republic: Sacrificial Violence and Modern French Thought* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005). Although Goldhammer's argument of how these theories of violence have formed a significant strain in French philosophy is forceful, his first chapter on the Revolution consists of slight analysis of pamphlets with narrow evidence. See also René Girard's problematic and conservative, *Violence and the Sacred,* trans. Patrick Gregory (Baltimore: ohns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

[55] *Bulletin des lois du Royaume de France, IXe série* (Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, Sept. 1835), 179.

Many French thinkers, from Blanc, to Proudhon to Considerant, were consistently sympathetic to the plight of workers, striving for a new society that valued the labor of artisans and the benefits to teaching occupations to the urban poor. These men did not fear the violence of the lower classes in the way state authorities or more conservative theorists tended to visualize the dangers of greater enfranchisement of rights granted to classes who did not own property. They stressed that the violence that would erupt from an uprising of the disenfranchised was created not by the uncivilized status of workers, but by the social forces around them that cried out for rectification. The discursive system of honor that permeated the thoughts of virtually all of these writers stressed that acts of emasculation were *points d'honneur*, which required an aggressive reaction to prove one's inherent masculinity. Workers needed to perform violence to maintain their male pride in the face of the continuing dishonor meted out to them by a state insensitive to their needs, and a by a society unwilling to aid them.

Only Auguste Blanqui participated in armed resistance to the state, and his involvement with the Société des Saisons would result in his imprisonment for almost a decade. His radicalism frightened many who saw in these neo-Jacobins among the peasantry, artisans, and what would be seen as an angry, bloodthirsty mob intent on death and the destruction of private property. Blanqui's inspiration came from the example of François Babeuf (1760-1797), the agitator of the Revolution, whose *Société des Égaux* sought to rectify the economic crises under the Directory. His radical notions led to his arrest and execution, but he found renewed fame in 1828 with the publication of Buonarroti's *Conspiration des Égaux*, which became a foundational text for many leftist thinkers during the pre-1848 days. Blanqui's trial in 1832 put on vivid display the

adversarial nature of much of Blanqui's thought. He addressed the judges as "enemies" and ridiculed the court's allusions to 1793 and the Jacobins as a "scarecrow" (*épouvantail*) to frighten the public.[56] Blanqui stated in bombastic language that "this was a war between rich an poor: the rich have wanted it thus because they are aggressors."[57] The violence bubbling in the urban landscapes of Paris was not due to the masses but created by those who controlled the resources of the country. The jury acquitted the other fourteen defendants in this trial of the fifteen in a matter of minutes but Blanqui's speech during the trial was stated to be class warfare and inimical to the functioning of the state. Blanqui served six years in prison. After his release, he agitated further, attempting to organize the Parisian "masses" to revolt in 1839. Blanqui's severe statements on the need to usher out the current regime became a lesson to radicals seeking a more moderate position and oratory skill.

Flora Tristan, one of the few female writers to contribute to radical thought on workers' rights, proposed differing methods of forging a new society. Most famously, Tristan placed the fate of women at the forefront of her analysis, but her understanding of violence had some differing shades from male utopians and radicals. Her personal history spoke of the sexual violence many women suffered at the hands of the men closest to them. Tristan's husband, André Chazal, a painter and lithographer, fought with her for close to a decade over possession of their children. Through a variety of public attacks, including Tristan's accusations of incest on the part of her husband with their daughter, Chazal's public shaming resulted in Chazal's attempt upon her life when he shot her in

[56] *Défense du citoyen Louis Auguste Blanqui devant la cour d'assises* (Paris: n.p., 1832), 15-16.

[57] *Ibid.,* 10.

September 1838.[58] The aggressive behavior of her husband reinforced Tristan's calls for the betterment of the female sex. In her roman-à-clef of 1838, *Méphis*, she recounted a tale of passionate love torn asunder by society's misunderstandings. The mysterious stranger, named Méphis (short for Mephistopheles), who woos a young woman of society is described as having an "athletic build" in stark contrast to his "expression of suffering."[59] He goes on to recount tales of the poor of Paris, where men who fall on hard times turn to drink and beating their wives, "lives without joy."[60] Tristan's writings pointed to a violence that was always male and hard to contain. Women in a new age were supposed to "inspire men," and "reflect divine enlightenment" in order to "improve the lack of moral and often professional instruction."[61] While she, unlike the male political and social writers of the time, focused on the effects of this belligerence on women, she saw it rooted in natural causes. Society and the state had to minimize this nature, rather than understand violence in new ways.

Workers were constrained and flummoxed by a culture that abhorred the violence of the lower classes but simultaneously conferred manhood through acts of male bravado. In effect, attempts by writers to restrain laborers from agitating for political gains resulted in the perceived emasculation of these men. Even writers of more progressive schools of thoughts worried themselves over the possible political consequences of forwarding physical reactions to state and moneyed oppression of the subordinate orders. The days of

---

[58] Key works on Tristan include, Beik (ed.), *Flora Tristan, Utopian Feminist* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1993); Dominique Desanti, *Flora Tristan, la femme revolté* (Paris: Hachette, 1972); Claire Goldberg Moses, *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984). Jules L. Puech, *La Vie et l'oeuvre de Flora Tristan* (Paris: Marcel Rivière, 1925).

[59] Flora Tristan, *Méphis,* vol. I (Paris: Ladvocat, 1838), 101.

[60] *Ibid.,* vol. I, 227.

[61] *Ibid.,* vol. II, 91.

1848 demonstrated the paradox of political activism of July Monarchy France. The Prince of Joinville referred to his father's reign as "nothing but an innumerable succession of such [assassination] attempts, some of which came to birth, while others miscarried."[62]

1848: The End of a Dream

By 1848, the dreams of transforming the nation seemed unattainable. Republicans had faced a dramatic defeat in the June days of that year's revolution. Classicists had managed to chase the Romantics off the stage of the Comédie-Française in 1843, when Hugo's *Les Burgraves* was a commercial and critical failure.[63] By this point, many artists had taken a new turn in the politics of aesthetics: "art for art's sake" became the credo of writers like Théophile Gautier. For Gautier, art should maintain a privileged and exalted place in the world, far from the harming effects of quotidian politics. This was a drastic turn for a man like Gautier who had been so enthusiastic over the political meanings of Hugo's poetry and prose, but it allowed for bourgeois bohemians to experiment with their masculinity as poets, where they would not need to think of the disdainful duty of running society. In 1847, the conquest of Algeria was complete, as the largest coterie of resistance fighters had been defeated soundly. North Africa remained one of the key holdings of the French Empire and a place where fantasy and masculinity was linked, but the possession of the Maghrib led to a further hunger for more colonial possessions

---

[62] Joinville, *Memoirs*, 78.

[63] On Hugo, see Bernard Degout, *Le sablier retouné: Hugo et le débat sur le "Romantisme"* (Paris: Honoré Campion, 1998); Christian Jensen, *L'evolution du Romantisme: L'année 1826* (Geneva: Droz, 1959); Graham Robb, *Victor Hugo* (New York: Norton and Co., 1997); André Maurois, *Olympio: A Life of Victor Hugo*; Anne Ubersfeld, *Le roi et le buffon: Etude sur le théâtre de Hugo* (Paris: Colin, 1989); Odile Krakovitch, *Hugo Censuré*.

across the world, from Mexico to Southeast Asia. Most importantly, by mid-century, even though the bourgeoisie was widely reviled as "tasteless philistines" by bohemians, their dominance was assured and the dichotomy of worker and bourgeois male seemed immutable and natural. These men believed that violence was a constitutive part of universal manhood. They performed violence and cultural representations of men portrayed hostile men, further establishing the link between maleness and aggression. If laborers were provided the same ability to define themselves as men through brutal acts, the ordering of society could disintegrate. Defining men through bloodshed and viciousness had serious social implications.

For authorities of the state, any such thought represented a serious danger to the nation, which would have to be stopped at all costs. The fear of violence emerging from the working class or the indigent poor required repressive measures on the part of the state. One of the most effective measures resulted in the implementation of procedures developed in Algeria. Cavaignac and Bugeaud, who were the most violent of state authorities during 1848, first found fame for forcefully putting down Algerian riots, even initializing the use of "razzias" (raids), now a common French word developed from an Arabic word of the Maghrebi-Algerian dialect.[64] Bugeaud's innovation was to utilize "native" forms of violence on their enemies, a policy further iterated in French wars in Indochina, West Africa, and South America (French Guyana).[65]

---

[64] Brower, *A Desert Named Peace*, 36.

[65] This search for combating "natives" through a language of violence and war they could understand found implementation among the British in India, the Americans against Native American tribes, and the Americans in Vietnam, Afghanistan and Iraq in most recent memory.

The short-lived Second Republic did not prove to be the utopia that the republican members of French urban centers, nor the workers of the nation, longed for. The brutal repression of 1851 and Napoléon III's coup d'état ended any dreams and sent the republican underground for another two decades.[66] As Louis-Napoleon said after the coup: "The so-called 'republican bourgeoisie' violently protested against my act. The conservative bourgeoisie, however, found in the coup d'état a guarantee of governmental security and were not displeased with what had happened. But the 'liberal party,' which claimed to look upon the name republic as a guarantee of political liberty, feared a dictatorship in other hands than their own. In a word, the whole situation was very confused…"[67]

[66] On the repression, see John Merriman, *The Agony of the Republic*; Ted Margadant, *French Peasants in Revolt*. On the politics of the Second Empire, see Philip Nord, *The Republican Moment*; Sudhir Hazareesingh, *From Subject to Citizen*.

[67] Quoted in Comte de Fleury, *Memoirs of the Empress Eugénie* (New York: Appleton, 1920), 59.

CONCLUSION

With the violent suppression of the rebels of 1848, and the subsequent coup d'état of Napoléon III, France fell under a new imperial regime. Its own collapse in 1871 would lead to a renewed sense of emasculation among many Frenchmen. During the tumultuous early decades of the Third Republic, the number of duels rose and Europe marched into a series of conflicts in Africa and finally a cataclysmic war in 1914. The Third Republic achieved new insights into the masculinization of violence. The "culture of defeat" that arose after 1870 called on the entire French nation to fight the "degeneration" that was at hand.[1] A rebirth of sport, religious revivalism, and the need to return to more traditional family values dominated the social politics of the day. Many bemoaned the loss of some unknown past and called on the men of the nation to act more like men, and women to produce more children.[2] An upsurge in dueling occurred from low points reached in the late 1840's and early 1850's.[3] The young men born in the 1850's seemed to be reenacting the youth that their fathers had lived in the 1820's and 1830's.

---

[1] Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat*; Robert Nye. *Crime, madness, Politics in Modern France: The Medical Concept of National Decline* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).

[2] Eugen Weber, *France Fin-de-Siecle* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), ch. 11.

[3] Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor*, ch. 5.

The history of nineteenth-century France is often told as a grand narrative leading to the creation of the Third Republic; every attempt to forge a republic, every secret society, was a step towards this creation. The oppression of mutual-aid societies and republican groups simply sent them underground to fester and grow before blossoming into the republic that came into being out of the ashes of the Commune. What this tidy story ignores are the myriad of political possibilities that existed over the course of the nineteenth century: the radicals who endorsed constitutional monarchies; the imaginative writers who created utopias with vibrant peasant economies; and those who continued to advocate for a strong monarchy that upheld God's law, even long after the Third Republic's existence was assured.

Only hindsight makes historical events seem inevitable. Many of the writers popular in the Third Republic began this tradition of celebrating the triumphalism of the republic. Historians have continued this tradition. Traditional Marxists have seen the Third Republic as the final apotheosis of the bourgeoisie, while more conservative authors have seen the forces of the market invisibly working towards the production of the republic that is the mark of progress. Even Pierre Nora's massive study, *Les Lieux de Memoire*, seems to find sites important to the history of Third Republic to be the most important repositories of the shared history of the nation.[4] From these historical writings and from writings of *républicains*, an image of the nineteenth century has been fashioned that privileges the post-1870 period. The bustling business of publishing memoirs continued apace during the early years of the Third Republic. Pro-republic writers, especially male ones, such as Victor Hugo and Théophile Gautier, spoke of their lives as the culmination of knowledge and experience that would lead to the creation of the

[4] Pierre Nora, *Les lieux de memoire,* 4 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1984-1992).

Republic. Those who fought against the republic spoke nostalgically of a lost gloried past. These writers, however, shared a specific way of speaking of their formative years. The experience of violence became a key episode in their narratives of becoming men. Men could only become men by engaging in acts of aggression. These works offered as proof the calm rationalization that often occurred during hostile behavior. This self-fashioning, in turn, helped young men born in the 1850's or later to understand themselves in a similar manner, creating a self-repeating cycle of youths entering manhood through aggressive behavior.

Romantics, such as Gautier and Dumas, penned memoirs that placed their greatest developmental moments in the late 1820's. Gautier did the most to ensure the memorialization of the "battle of Hernani" in a series of articles published in 1872. In these pieces, he wrote of "being enrolled in those youthful bands that fought for idealism, poesy, and freedom in art, with an enthusiasm, a bravery, and a devotion unknown nowadays… it is the duty of those who formed part of the Grand Army of literature to relate their forgotten exploits"[5] Gautier utilized a military metaphor to stress the importance of the fights he waged, and deployed a tone of mourning to memorialize those who died in the succeeding years, such as Gérard de Nerval and Alfred de Vigny. His memoirs, in turn, remembered, and, in fact, helped rewrite the cultural history of French Romanticism. Other memoirs, published in subsequent years, such as those of Alexandre Dumas and Hugo's wife, Adele Foucher, confirmed these views. The nostalgia of these writers for the period of their lives when they were in their twenties shifted the understanding of succeeding generations.

---

[5] Gautier, Histoire de la romantisme, 15. This was first published in *Bien Public*, 3 March 1872.

Popular novels of the period portrayed men awash in battles negotiating their identity. From Bel Ami in Maupassant's eponymous novel (1885) to Alain-Fournier's *Le Grand Meaulnes* (1913), male literary characters battled each other in duels and brawls. In Mirbeau's decadent novel of 1886, *Le Calvaire,* the protagonist, Jean Mintié, takes a journey from the provinces to Paris in pursuit of glory and masculine identity. After participating in the Franco-Prussian war, killing a soldier and watching the German man die in his arms even "planting [his] lips on that bleeding face, streaming with crimson gore," he goes to Paris in search of literary glory.[6] Women, however, thwart his attempts to forge a male identity. At the close of the novel, after a series of outbursts caused by and directed at women, Mintié admonishes a laborer he sees on the street.

> I was overcome with anger. I felt like going up to him, grabbing him by the collar and shouting at him, 'What are you doing here, you fool? Why are you looking at those women like that? Those women are an insult to your torn overalls, your tired and aching arms, the whole of your poor body crushed by its daily tribulations. When the revolution comes, you think that by killing soldiers and priests, and those who are poor and suffering like yourself, you'll be avenged on the society that oppresses? And has it never occurred to you to erect scaffolds for these wicked creatures, for these savage beasts that rob you of your bread, your sunshine… Can't you see? The society that grinds you down, strives to make ever more heavy the chains that shackle you to eternal poverty, protects and enriches them. It transforms your drops of blood into gold to cover the slack breasts of these wretches. It is so they can live in palaces that you wear yourself out, that you die of hunger, or get your skull cracked on the barricades.[7]

In this stunning passage, Mirbeau laid the blame for the ills plaguing society solely on the female sex. Mintié calls on men to unite against women, laying aside all political qualms in order to defeat the nation's true evil. The imagery of the barricades

---

[6] Mirbeau, *Le Calvaire,* trans. Christine Donougher (London: Daedalus, 1995), 69. Alterations to translation.

[7] *Ibid.,* 218.

that Mirbeau evoked here places the fears of working-class violence as a ruse to obscure the real causes of violence. After Mirbeau's narrative of men being driven mad by the whims of feminine charms, the reader has noticed that the games women employ to better their own position leaves their pursuers destitute and feminized. The political troubles of the Third Republic in its opening decades surrounded national masculine identity affected by the humiliating defeat in the war of 1870. The *Revanche* sought to inspire men to find new means of fashioning virile male bodies and creating new vigorous French children, in opposition to the increased militarization of the Germans. Discourses around education and maleness centered on the shame of such a devastating loss to the Prussian forces.[8] Mirbeau's novel echoed these political discourses. Men are naturally violent but their violence is sparked by careless and superficial women. If women behaved themselves, less violence would be necessary.

In the 1890's, one of the biggest successes in the world of theatre was Edmond de Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac*.[9] The play seemed to harken back to the heights of Victor Hugo's fame in the 1830's. The play was written in Alexandrine verse (often without the caesurae that Hugo famously ignored) and told the story of a seventeenth-century duelist and playwright with a protruding proboscis, who is certain he will not find love with the beautiful Roxane. Once again, dueling and elevated verse returned to the stage of the Théâtre de la Porte Saint-Martin, and theatregoers flocked to see this new piece with over 400 performances in the late 1890's. For these audiences, the return of the romantic

[8] See for instance, Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh, eds., *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* (Manchester and New York: University of Manchester Press, 2004); Patricia Tilburg, *Colette's Republic: Work, Gender and Popular Culture in France, 1870-1914* (New York: Berghahn, 2009); Joanna Bourke, *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

[9] Edmond de Rostand, *Cyrano de Bergerac* (Paris: Flammarion, 2007).

heralded a new search for masculine authority through the act of the duel. Along with celebrated political duels, the practice experienced an upsurge in the opening decades of the Third Republic, and plays and novels continued to celebrate the ritual for the meaning it conferred on its participants.

The Third Republic's stability was often threatened by the claims of politicians of masculine identity. Whether during the Boulanger Affair of the 1890's, or the Dreyfus Affair at the turn of the twentieth century, the fragile coalition shaping the republican regime seemed to be unable to fashion any long-lasting success. Its persistence until 1940 seemed to defy the scorn of so many of its own politicians, convinced it would fall at any politically tumultuous event. The ambivalent relationship to violence inherent in the social imagination may have been the weak but binding force holding this framework together. Both the right and left shared the firm belief in the constitutive effect of aggression on transforming boys into men combined with a fear to heightened forms of collective action on part of the lower classes. Although the republic persisted through the bloody years of the First World War, the breaking of the Maginot Line in 1940 sealed its demise in a matter of weeks.[10]

Part of the difficulty with grappling with the meaning and practice of violence came from the political weariness around historical precedents of great bloodshed. For conservatives in the nineteenth century, the French Revolution would remain a model to understand how political grievances turn into rule of a violent mob throughout the succeeding decades. On both sides of the Atlantic, many in high positions of government feared the descent into madness laid out by this example. The United States Congress

---

[10] See Julian Jackson, *The Fall of France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

passed the Smith Act in 1940, which made advocating for the violent overthrow of the U.S. government to be illegal.[11] As Hugo Black stated in his dissenting opinion to *Brown v. Louisiana* (1966), where he believed the court had gone too far in acquiescing to the desires of protesting civil rights activists: "But I say once more that the crowd moved by noble ideals today can become the mob ruled by hate and passion and greed and violence tomorrow… The peaceful songs of love can become as stirring and provocative as the Marseillaise did in the days when a noble revolution gave way to rule by successive mobs until chaos set in."[12] Generations of historians have concerned themselves with this very question of how the events of 1789 led inexorably to the Terror of 1793.[13] Although many of the conservatives of the Third Republic glorified the duel, the notion of working-class politics was always synonymous with aggressive mobs. Writers bemoaned the loss of lives and communities through war, but their characters fostered a sense of heroic tragedy through their belligerent acts. Few novels or memoirs failed to mention acts of hostile behavior as key moments of masculine growth. The Revolution became simultaneously a symbol of the regenerative aspect of sacrifice and of the downfall of civilization into the depths of animalistic passions.[14]

On the opposite side of the political spectrum, revolutionaries built on this model as a warning of how reform and progress could be derailed. Across the globe, agitators

---

[11] The law was overturned under a Supreme Court Decision, *Yates v. United States* and *Watkins v. United States* (both 1957). Geoffrey Stone, *Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime from the Sedition Act of 1798 to the War on Terrorism* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 2004), 255.

[12] Quoted in Morton Horwitz, *The Warren Court and the Pursuit of Justice* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998), 43.

[13] For some of the more popular extensions of this thought, see Crane Briton, *Anatomy of a Revolution,* Arno Mayer, *The Furies*; and Simon Schama, *Citizens*.

[14] See for instance, Joseph de Maistre, *Essai sur le Prinncipe Générateur des constitutions Politiques* (Paris: Société Typographique, 1814).

from Lenin in Russia, Ho Chi Min in Vietnam, Nkrumah in Ghana, Pol Pot in Cambodia, and Lumumba in Zaire harkened back to the French Revolution for inspiration in both political idealism and the suppression of differing opinion. This paradoxical image of the Revolution as simultaneously liberating and oppressive has always created great unease among ruling elites, fearful of empowered groups to call for revenge of previously unaired grievances. The history of political movements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is deeply invested (and troubled) by its relation to the brutal impulses of aggression.

The work of Norbert Elias has dominated how we understand the relationship of violence to the growth of the state. Writing in the troubled times of the 1930's, Elias focused on the transition from the medieval period, stressing the rise of a culture of civility. Books of etiquette forbid violence to the nobility, fostering a state where only the monarch held the power to call on his subjects to take up arms for the good of king and country. This model, however, does not deal with the persistence of violence within the state in the modern period, especially within the upper echelons that Elias pointed to as lessening these rates. As Stuart Carroll, a vocal critic of this model for the early modern period, has argued, "the state learned how to manage violence better, not eradicate it."[15] Levels of bloodshed remained but were often justified as necessary to proper functioning of the government. In the twentieth century, as Max Weber instructed long ago, the state held "a monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force in the enforcement of its order."[16] Thus, the fascist states of interwar Europe and Soviet Russia were able to

---

[15] Carroll, *Violence and Bloodshed in Early Modern France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 321.

[16] Weber, *Politics as a Vocation* (New York: Hackett, 2004 [1919]), 33.

marginalize outsiders, create enemies, and construct brutal means to annihilate their perceived adversaries. The undercurrent of this bloodshed was the notion that all men could topple into violence. From Freud to Bataille, from the surrealists to conservative politicians, famous writers of the period pointed to the drives of destruction and sexuality that framed much human behavior.

The cultural definition of male violence became self-evident scientific "fact" in the nineteenth century, but, now in the twenty-first century, the assuredness of that verity has been called into question by researchers themselves. Recent studies have pointed to the fallacy of many cultural stereotypes of gender. A team of researchers in Zurich created a study that seemed to deny the link between testosterone and aggression.[17] Sociobiology has attempted to reify gender concepts by discovering Western gendered relations within the behaviors of animals.[18] Evolutionary psychology, as popularized on daytime talk shows, posit that men act the way they do because as cavemen they were "hardwired" for survival. Thus, men care not a whit for intimacy, monogamy, or gentleness. Of course, these translations of science to the popular media and sensationalized programs are bastardizations; however, even eminent scientists, like Richard Dawkins, continue to believe that our actions are often dictated by the "selfish gene" or cultural memes that we transfer in a similar fashion. Although scientific studies have been unable to show the biology of masculinity, the stereotypes persist within the Western cultural imagination.

---

[17] Eisenegger et al. "Prejudice and truth about the effect of testosterone on human bargaining behaviour." *Nature* 463, Nov. 2009: 356-359. An earlier study in 1995 at UCLA found that low levels of testosterone may actually induce more negative behaviors than high levels. See Natalie Angier, "Does Testosterone Equal Aggression? Maybe Not," *New York Times*, 20 June 1995.

[18] Roger Lancaster, *The Trouble with Nature: Sex in Science and Popular Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

In France, the persistence of the fear of violence among those seemingly unable to control their impulses appeared renewed during the riots of 2005. Two Franco-Muslim youths, while returning home from a soccer game in Clichy-sous-Bois, a banlieue in the east of Paris, fled police in an attempt to avoid a patrol that required identity papers and questioning. No evidence pointed to the young men as having committed any crime. When the teenagers ran, they hid in an electrical substation and were subsequently electrocuted.[19] Their pointless deaths sparked a nationwide series of riots, where numerous cars were burned in suburban areas across France. Many of the participants were young men who were first- or second-generation immigrants from North Africa.[20] Their discontent at their exclusion from jobs and the racist mutterings of political figures, most notably those of Jean-Marie Le Pen, led to a general feeling of antipathy within ghettoes where these immigrants are confined, a situation portrayed by Matthieu Kassovitz's film *La Haine* (1995). Nicolas Sarkozy, at the time the Minister of the Interior, stated that the state would take a "zero tolerance" approach to rioters after the fourth night of sustained civil unease, dispatching police to stop marauders. With almost 9,000 vehicles burned by the end of the riots, many French were convinced that the blame lay not with the state and its policies towards recent immigrants but rather among the immigrants who refused to acculturate themselves to "French civilization."[21]

---

[19] Thomas Crampton, "Behind the Furor, the Last Moments of Two Youths," *New York Times,* 7 November 2005.

[20] Stéphane Beaud and Olivier Masclet, "Des 'marcheurs' de 1983 aux émeutiers de 2005, deux générations sociales d'enfants d'immigrés," *Annales Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 61 (October 2006): 809-844.

[21] "Nicolas Sarkozy sort renforcé de la crise des banlieues," *Le Monde*, 17 November 2005. "France Extends Laws to Curb Riots," *BBC News,* 16 November 2005.

This notion of the lack of civilization among immigrants became popular not only among the leaders of the state, who were impelled by politics to dismiss the actions of the mainly Muslim youths as anti-French and easily conquered, but also by novelists and commentators, trickling down to the average, even liberal, members of Parisian society. A taxi driver in the summer of 2006, in discussing the events with me on a ride from Charles de Gaulle airport, referred to the rioters as “hooligans,” “voyous” and “vandales,” who simply could not thank the French for all they had done for them. Muriel Barberry’s *L’élégance du hérisson* (2006), published the summer after the riots, encapsulated this view that French notions of civility had not been sufficiently imbibed by their newer inhabitants. As a sympathetic character stated in a moment of epiphany: “How can you exist if you do not know who you are? … Or if you’re the son of immigrants but also the citizen of an old, conservative nation? You burn cars, because when you have no culture, you’re no longer a civilized animal, you’re a wild beast. And a wild beast burns and kills and pillages.”[22] Here, the same discourse around men as violent beasts reappears as a way to explain and understand the political travails of a group marginalized by society and the state.

The peculiar effects of Islamophobia wreak havoc on political coverage. The Western media bemoan the upsurge of violence in the area, and portray protesting mobs, often as uncivilized packs of animals. Recent films, such as Kathryn Bigelow’s *Zero Dark Thirty* (2012) and Ben Affleck’s *Argo* (2012) have further cemented these representations. Yet, when it comes to foreign policy in both Western Europe and the United States, a chest-beating jingoism is often required by candidates regardless of ideological position. French Socialist President François Hollande surprised the media

---

[22] Muriel Barbery, *L’élégance du hérisson* (Paris: Gallimard, 2006), 257.

and world leaders when he launched attacks against jihadists in northern Mali in early 2013. He embroiled French forces in a war that he assured the public would be quick and effective but has dragged on beyond his timeline of "weeks" in a fashion eerily similar to George W. Bush's prognostications of his invasion into Iraq.[23] Recent terrorist attacks in Syria or Libya are portrayed as the result of Islam's turn to violence, begging the question that conservative historian Bernard Lewis posed as the title of his post-9/11 work on the Middle East, *What Went Wrong?*[24] The build-up to the invasion of Iraq in 2003 saw no such condemnation of violence on the part of the right, who were the most virulently opposed to Shari'a law, the construction of mosques, or Muslim immigration. Instead, George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, and Donald Rumsfeld attempted to convince the American people and Congress that such a military action would be greeted by the Iraqis as an "act of liberation." This analysis, however, misses the fact that the hostilities of the region were not a product of an anti-modernist, fundamentalist strain of the religion, but rather that the fundamentalism and the hostilities were the product of modernity, capitalism and imperialism. For commentators, the image of restless uncivilized mobs is easier to understand than the much more difficult attempt to grapple with the global effects of policies that often implicate Westerners.

Yasmina Reza's play *Le Dieu de Carnage* (2006), a success on both sides of the Atlantic, garnering Tony and Olivier Awards, mocked the bourgeois passions of two families who come together to discuss a fight that their sons had on a playground. The

---

[23] Bruce Crumley, "the War in Mali: does France have an Exit Strategy?," *Time* (February 26, 2013): 36-37.

[24] Bernard Lewis, *What Went Wrong? The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East* (New York: Harper, 2003). See also, Aamin Maalouf, *In the Name of Identity: Violence and the Need to Belong*, trans. Barbara Bray (New York: Penguin, 2000). A more balanced approach can be found in Amartya Sen, *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (New York: Norton, 2006).

fathers come to bond over their own reminiscences of gang warfare in their respective childhoods. The mothers find this nostalgia shocking. In the closing moments of the play, one male character harangues the opposing mother for being "part of that same category of woman—committed, problem-solving. That's not what we like about women, what we like about women is sensuality, wildness, hormones. Women who make a song and dance about their intuition, women who are custodians of the world depress us—even him, poor Michel, your husband, he's depressed."[25] Even a couple with seemingly liberal views continues to uphold the ideology of separate sexes with gender roles linked to sex and maintain the insurmountable boundaries between the two. Those who try to subvert the line between the sexes will find that they have lost all of the virtues of their sex.

Journalists, novelists, filmmakers, politicians and academic researchers have come to see violence as an often inevitable reaction. But is it inevitable? Does the turn to the aggressive have its own societal impulses? Maybe if men were not culturally defined as belligerent, and celebrated for these acts, perhaps it could be avoided in more instances. The hypocrisy of a state that forbids violence but practices it in its own right leads citizens to view violence as an appropriate and necessary tool for protest. Frantz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* has been criticized for celebrating violence but Fanon points to this idea that men who must learn to speak in the language of the colonizer must use violence.[26] The Western left, since the demise of groups such as Baader-Meinhof (Red Army Faction), the Palestinian Liberation Organization, and the Weather Underground, has renounced the role of violence, but far-right, neo-Nazi groups have

[25] Yasmina Reza, *God of Carnage*, trans. Christopher Hampton (London: Faber and Faber, 2008), 65.

[26] Homi Bhabha believes this misreading is a result of Sartre's original preface to the piece. See Bhabha, "Foreword," 2004 edition of Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 2004), xxi.

formed in Greece, the United States and Britain in recent years. Groups of sovereign citizens in the United States believe no federal or state laws apply to them, thus permitting them what they perceive as their right to assassinate federal tax officials and state troopers.[27] The re-election of Barack Obama to the presidency in November of 2012 has convinced more mainstream groups, such as the National Rifle Association, that he is certain to roll back civil liberties and end the American citizens' right to bear arms, sparking a national surge in gun sales.[28] Although general crime rates have declined over the last twenty years, many are convinced (partly by incessant, biased coverage on news outlets, such as FoxNews) that nefarious criminals, almost always male, and often of African or Hispanic descent are intent on bloodshed.

The representations of male violence in the twenty-first century United States bear striking similarities with those of nineteenth-century France. A sense pervades newspaper coverage of the moral uprightness of groups of (white) men who will protect women, children and the institutions of the state from mobs of workers and disenfranchised racial groups, who have no idea how to curb their violence. Women are mere victims of assault, who must protect themselves from assailants hoping to ravage their bodies. Cultural products, movies and video games today, plays and novels then, celebrate and romanticize acts of aggression. Men of adolescent age are congratulated for besting an opponent in a fistfight in the 2010's; French youths proudly displayed their wounds from duels in the 1840's. A sense of unique and rugged individualism colored

---

[27] "Sovereign Citizens: A Growing Domestic Threat to Law Enforcement," *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* (September 2011), 10-12.

[28] Michael Cooper, "Sales of Guns Soar in U.S. as Nation Weighs Tougher Limits," 11 January 2013.

these Frenchmen's sense of personal duty and familial honor, and continues to do so today.

There must be a way outside of this process, but it requires going beyond the notion that men are inherently and naturally violent. Our culturally determined understandings of violence simultaneously celebrate certain forms of aggression, from personal revenge to armed military invasions, while dismissing broad swathes of collective action on the part of workers or minorities as "violence," even if no harm to bodies is produced. Making sense of the myriad uses and meanings of violence will prompt commentators, politicians, and writers to ask, what does violence accomplish? A history of masculinity must ponder how aggression intersects with acts of hostility. The calm rationality of the bourgeois man lies on top of a roiling sea of socially constructed conflicting impulses. By recognizing the violent underpinnings of white maleness, the historian can begin to tease out a new history of violence that narrates much of the modern world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

AN	Archives Nationales (CARAN)
AP	Archives Parlementaires
AHR	*American Historical Review*
BNF	Bibliothèque Nationale de France
CAOM	Centre des Archies d'Outre Mer
FHS	*French Historical Studies*
JMH	*Journal of Modern History*

Archival Sources

Archives Nationales, Paris. F7, Police. F7 6692-6695. Theater, departments, 1815-1830.
_____. AJ 13, Opera. AJ 13 182, Opera, Administrative Records, 1830-1848.
_____. BV21, Graces. BB21 285-320. Graces accorded.
_____. BB24, Graces. BB24 195-205. Graces rejected.
_____. F7, Police. F7 6704-6707. Seditious writings and objects, 1814-1830.
_____. F7, Police. F7 6742. Newspapers.
_____. F7, Police. F7 6678-6784. Political Situation in Departments in 1830.
_____. F18, Theaters. F18 597. Dramas, 1813-1829.
_____. F18, Theaters. F18 604-607. Melodramas, 1815-1830.
_____. F18, Theaters. F18 618-619. Tragedies, 1822-1830.
_____. F18, Theaters. F18 662-667. Vaudevilles, 1825-1830.
_____. F18, Theaters. F18 668. Fragments of plays, 1800-1827.
_____. F21, Beaux-Arts. F21 966-995. Procès-Verbaux de censure théâtrale, 1804-67.

Bibliothèque Nationale de l'Arsenal. Arsenal Fonds Rondel.
Cromwell. Rf 27 644..
Hernani. Rf 27 664.
Marie Tudor. Rf 27 698.
Henri III et sa cour. Rf 25 195.
Christine. Rf 25 195.
Don Juan de Marana. Rf 25 720.
Marion de Lorme. Rf 27 718.
Pamphlets against Victor Hugo. Rf 28 354.
Parodies d'*Hernani*. Rf 27 674.
Parodies de *Marion de Lorme.* Rf 27 724.
Poetry around *Hernani*. Rf 27 693.

Centre des Archives d'Outre Mer
F80 385 Personnel
F80 411 Conflits
F80 586 Police Surveilance
F80 631 Secret Societies
F80 725 Statistiques
F80 1600 Theatres Algeria
F80 1670 Conquest

Newspapers
L'Artisan
L'Atelier
Le Bulletin des Lois
Le Conservateur du littérature
Le Constitutionnel
L'Echo de la Fabrique
Le Gazette des Tribunaux
La Glaneuse
Le Globe
L'Industrie
Le Journal de Maine-et-Loire
Le Journal des Débats
Le Moniteur Universel
La Précursor
La Révolution
La Ruche Populaire

Printed Sources

Archives Parlementaires de 1787 à 1860. Paris: P. Dupont, 1867.

Albert, Maurice. *Les Théâtres des Boulevards (1789-1848)*. Paris: Société française d'impremerie et de librairie, 1902.

Alletz, Edouard. *Les maladies du siècle*. Paris: Gosselin, 1836.

D'Aurevilly, Jules Barby. *Du dandyisme et George Brummel* [*sic*]. Paris: Gallimard, 1964.

Ballanche, Jean-Simon. *Essai sur les institutions sociales.* Paris: Fayard, 1991 (reprint of 1818 and 1830 texts).

Balzac, Honoré de. *Oeuvres completes*. Paris: Seuil, 1953.

_____. *Sarrasine*. Paris: Livre de Poche, 1991.

Baudelaire, Charles. *L'Art romantique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

______. *La fanfarlo*. Paris: Editions de la Sirène, 1918.

Benoit, Joseph. *Confession d'un proletaire.* Paris: Editions Sociales, 1969 (1871).
Blanc, Louis. *L'Organisation du travail.* Paris: Administration de Librairie, 1841.

Bonnafont, Jean-Pierre. *Douze ans en Algérie, 1830-1842.* Paris: Editions Jacques Gandini, 2005 (1846).

Borel, Petrus. *Champavert, contes immoraux.* Paris: Montbrun, 1947.

Brantôme (Pierre de Bourdeille). *Des dames galantes.* Paris: Garnier Frères, 1872.

Brazier, Nicolas. *Histoire des Petits Théâtres de Paris depuis leur origine.* New York: Burt Franklin, 1969 (orig pub. 1838).

Brillat de Savarin, J.A. *Essai historique et critique de duel, d'après nos moeurs et notre legislation.* Paris: n.p., 1819.

Broussais, François-Joseph-Victor. *De l'irritation et la folie*. Paris: Chez Delaunay, 1828.

Büchner, Georg. *Woyzeck*. Leipzig: Reclam, 1954.

Cabet, Etienne. *Voyage en Icarie*. Paris: n.p., 1839.

Carette, Ernest. *Exploration scientifuque de l'Algérie pendant les années 1840, 1841, 1842.* New York: Kessinger Publishing, LLC, 2010 (Reprint of 1853 edition).

_____. *Recherches sur l'origine et les migrations des principales tribus de l'Afrique Septentionale et particulèrement de l'Algérie*. New York: Nabu Press, 2010 (Reprint of 1923 French edition).

Casseux, Michel. *L'art de la savate*. Paris: n.p., 1832.

Chatauvillard, Comte de. *Essai sur le duel*. Paris: Chez Bohaire, 1836.

Chateaubriand, *Atala René.* Paris: Flammarion, 1964.

_____. *Génie du christianisme*. 3 vols. Paris: Plon, 1839.

Chesterfield, Lord. *Advice to his Son, on Men and Manners.* London: Scott, Webster, and Geary, 1836.

Clermont-Tonnerre, Aimé-Marie-Gaspard . "Le Rapport du marquis de Clermnont-Tonnerre, ministère de la guerre, sur une expedition à Alger (1827)," ed. Paul Azan, *Revue Africaine* 70 (1929): 216.

Colton, Charles Caleb. *Lacon, or Many Things in Few Words, Addressed to Those who Think.* London: A. Spottiswoode, 1837.

Considerant, Victor. *Principes du Socialisme: Manifeste de la démocratie au XIXe siècle*. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1978.

Cournol, Hippolyte. *Le Majorat.* Paris: n.p., 1827.

Cousin, Victor. *Cours de l'histoire de la philosophie*. Paris: Didier, 1841.

_____. *Elements of Psychology*. Boston: 1834.

Cuvier, Georges. *Le règne animal*. Paris: n.p., 1817.

Défense du citoyen Louis Auguste Blanqui devant la cour d'assises. Paris: n.p., 1832.

Delavigne, Casimir. *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris: Didier, 1846.

Daumas, Eugène. *Les Chevaux du Sahara et les moeurs du desert.* Paris: Lévy, 1858.

_____. *Le Grand Désert: Itineraire d'une caravane du Sahara au pays des Negrès*. Paris: Chaix et Cie, 1848.

_____. *Moeurs et coutumes de l'Algérie.* Paris: Hachette, 1853.

Dumas, Alexandre. *Mes Mémoires*. Paris: Michel Lévy, 1863.

______. *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris: Seuil, 1975.

Dunoyer, Charles. *Memoire à consulter sur quelques-unes des principales questions que la revolution de Juillet a fat naître.* Paris: n.p., 1835.

Duvivier, Franciades. *Algérie: Quatorze observations sur le dernier mémoire du Général Bugeaud.* Paris: Adamant, 2004. Orig. 1842.

Eichtal, Gustave de and Ismaÿl Urbain, *Lettres sur la race noire et la race blanche.* Paris: Chez Paulin, 1839.

Esquirol, Etienne. *Mental Maladies: A Treatise on Insanity*. Trans. E.K. Hunt. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1845.

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. *Grundlage des naturrechts*. Leipzig: Christian Ernst Gabler, 1797. Translated as *Foundation of Natural Right* by Michael Baur. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Fleury, Comte de. *Memoirs of the Empress Eugénie.* New York: Appleton, 1920.

Fougeroux de Campigneulles, Arnaud. *Histoire des duels, anciens et modernes.* Paris: Libraire Joubert, 1838.

Galois, Evariste. "Analyse algébrique. Démonstration d'un théoreme sur les fractions continues périodiques," *Annales de Gergonne* 19 (1828-29): 294-301.

Gauny, Gabriel. *Le philosophe plébéien*, ed. Jacques Rancière. Paris: Maspéro, 1983.

Gautier, Théophile, *Mademoiselle de Maupin*. Paris: Flammarion, 1966.

_____. *Oeuvre complètes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1955.

_____. *Souvenirs du Romantisme*. Paris: Charpentier, 1877.

_____. *Voyage Pittoresque en Algérie*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1973.

Geddes, John. *Reflexions sur le duel et sur les moyens les plus efficaces de le prévenir.* Paris: n.p. 1828.

Goldsmith, Lewis. *Statistics of France.* London: Hatchard and Son, 1832.

Guizot, François. *Cours d'histoire modern.* Bruxelles: Société Belge de Librairie, 1850.

Halevy, Léon. *Le Duel.* Paris: Carpentier-Mericourt, 1826.

Helvétius, *Oeuvres Complètes*. 3 volumes. Paris: Serviere, 1795.

Houssaye, Arsène. *La couronne de bleuets.* Paris: E. Dentu, 1880.

Hugo, Adèle. *Victor Hugo raconté par Adèle Hugo*. Paris: Plon, 1985.

Hugo, Victor, *Hernani*. Paris: Garnier, 1999.

_____. *Oeuvres complètes*. Paris: Robert Laffont, 1985.

Idéville, Comte de. *Marshal Bugeaud.* Paris: E. Didier, 1882.

Joannidès, *La Comédie-Française.* Paris: Plon, 1889.

Joinville, Prince de. *Memoirs.* Trans. Mary Lloyd. New York: MacMillan, 1895.

Karr, Alphonse. *Sous les tilleuls.* Paris: Librairie de Charles Gosselin, 1832.

Livingston, Edward. *A System of Penal Law for the United States of America.* Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1828.

Mackay, Charles. *Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds.* New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1932.

Maistre, Joseph de. *Essai sur le Prinncipe Générateur des constitutions Politiques*. Paris: Société Typographique, 1814.

Matthews, Brander. *French Dramatists.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881.

_____. *The Theatres of Paris*. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1880.

Michelet, Jules. *Le Peuple.* Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1885.

Mirbeau, Octave. *Le Calvaire.* Paris: Boucher, 2003.

Montagnac, Colonel de. *Lettres d'un Soldat: neuf Années de Campagnes.* Paris: Librairie Plon, 1885.

Montaigne, Michel de. *Les essais*. 3 vols. Paris: Folio Classique, 1999.

Murger, Henri. *La Vie Bohème.*

Musset, Alfred de. *La confessions d'un enfant du siècle*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973.

Nadaud, Martin. *Mémoires de Léonard, ancien garçon maçon.* Bourganeuf: Duboueix, 1895.

Nerval, Gérard de. *Oeuvres Complètes*. 3 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1936.

Perdiguier, Agricol. *Mémoires d'un compagnon*. Geneva: Duchamp, 1855.

Pétition adressé à la Chambre des Députés par Madier de Montjau suivie de considerations constitutionelles par M.-A. Jay. Paris: n.p., 1820.

Procès de Fieschi et de ses complices. Brussels: Adolphe Wahlen, 1836.

Les Révolutions du XIXe siècle, ed. Maurice Agulhon. Paris: EDHIS, 1974.

Reynaud, Pellesier de. *Années algériennes*, Vol. III. Algiers: Brachet, 1839.

Richard, Charles. *Du gouvernement arabe et de l'institution qui doit l'exercer.* Algiers: Bastide, 1848.

Roches, Léon. *Trente-deux ans à travers l'Islam*. Paris: Editions Didier, 1882.

Rostand, Edmond de. *Cyrano de Bergerac*. Paris: Flammarion, 2007.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Julie, ou la Nouvelle Héloïse*. Paris: Flammarion, 1999.

Sabine, *Notes on Duels and Duelling.* Boston: Crosby, Nichols and Co., 1855.

Saint-Arnaud, Jacques Leroy de. *Lettres du Maréchal de Saint-Arnaud*, 2 vols. Paris: Levy, 1855.

Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin. *Volupté*. Paris: Flammarion, 1976.

Saint-Hilaire, Isidore Geoffroy. *Histoire générale et particulière des anomalies de l'organisation chez l'homme et les animaux, des monstruosités, des variétés et vices de conformation, ou traité de teratology*, 3 vols. Paris: J.B. Ballière, 1832-37.

Saint-Simon, Henri and Augustin Thierry. *De la reorganisation de la société européenne*. Paris: A. Égron, 1814.

Sand, George. *Indiana*. Paris: Garnier, 1976.

Scribe, Eugène. *Bertrand et Suzette, ou un Mariage de raison.* Paris: Chez Robert, 1845.

Signol, Alphonse de. *Apologie de Duel*. Paris: n.p., 1828.

_____. *Le Duel.* Paris: Barba, 1828.

Stendhal (Henri Beyle). *L'Amour*. Paris: Seuil, 1955.

_____. *Le Rouge et le noir.* Paris: Gallimard, 1972.

______. *Racine et Shakespeare.* Paris: Treston, 1988.

Sue, Eugene. *Les Mystères de Paris.* Paris: Charles Gosselin, 1844.

Tarde, Gabriel. "Le duel," *Etudes pénales et sociales.* Paris: Masson, 1892.

Taylor, Isaac. *Advice to the Teens, or Practical Helps Towards the Formation of One's Own Character*. London: Fenner, 1818.

Twain, *A Tramp Abroad.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1903.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *De la colonie en Algérie*. Paris: Editions Complexe, 1997.

Tristan, Flora. *Méphis*. Paris: Ladvocat, 1838.

Truquin, Norbert. *Mémoires et Aventures d'un prolétaire.* Paris: Maspéro, 1977 [1888].

Urbain, Ismaÿl. *L'Algérie française.* Paris: Seguier, 2002.

_____. *L'Algérie pour les Algérien.* Paris: Seguier, 2000.

Vidocq, François. *Mémoires de Vidocq, Chef de la police sureté jusqu'en 1827.* Paris: Tenon, 1828.

Vigny, Alfred de. *Oeuvres complètes.* 2 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1948.

Weiss, Jean-Jacques. *Le théâtre et les moeurs.* Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1889.

Zola, Emile. *Thérèse Raquin*. Paris: Gallimard, 1952.

Secondary Works

Abi-Mershed, Osama. *Apostles of Modernity: Saint-Simonians and the Civilizing Mission in Algeria*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

Abun-Nasr, Jamil. *A History of the Maghreb.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Accampo, Elinor. "The Rhetoric of Reproduction and the Reconfiguration of Womanhood in the French Birth Control Movement, 1890-1920," *The Journal of Family History* 21, no. 3 (1996): 20-41.

Adamson, Kay. *Political and Economic Thought and Practice in Nineteenth-Century France and the Colonization of Algeria*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon, 2002.

Ageron, Charles Robert. *Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine, 1830-1988.*Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1991.

Agulhon, Maurice. *Le Cercle dans la France bourgeoise (1810-1848).* Paris: Collin, 1977.

_____. *The Republic in the Village: The People of the Var from the French Revolution to the Second Republic.* Trans. Janet Lloyd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Albouy, Pierre."Le mythe de l'androgyne dans *Mademoiselle de Maupin*," *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France,* no. 4 (July-August 1972): 600-608.

Alexander, Amir. *Duel at Dawn: Heroes, Martyrs and the Rise of Modern Mathematics.*

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Alexander, R.S. *Bonapartism and the Revolutionary Tradition in France: The Fédérés of 1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres, 1991.

Allen, James Smith. *Popular French Romanticism*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1984.

Aminzade, Ronald. *Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Appadurai, Arjun, ed. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1969.

Aronson, Elliot. *The Social Animal*. Eighth Edition. New York: Freeman, 2004.

Astruc, Alexandre. *Evariste Galois*. Paris: Flammarion, 1994.

Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Nina. *French Images of the Greek War of Independence, 1821-1830*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Auslander, Leora. *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Bann, Stephen. *Parallel Lines: Printmakers, Painters and Photographers in Nineteenth-Century France.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

Baron, Yves. *Les Duels dans le Calvados au XIXe siècle,* mémoire de maitrise, Caen, 1982.

Barrot, Olivier and Raymond Chirat. *Le Théatre Boulevard: Ciel mon mari!* Paris: Découvertes Gallimard, 1998.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Trans. John Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1980.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Beaud, Stéphane and Olivier Masclet. “Des ‘marcheurs’ de 1983 aux émeutiers de 2005, deux générations sociales d’enfants d’immigrés,” *Annales Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 61 (October 2006): 809-844.

Beecher, Jonathan. *Victor Considerant and the Rise and Fall of French Romantic Socialism.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Bell, David. *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2007.

Bell, Eric Temple. *Men of Mathematics.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986.

Berenson, Edward. *Populist Religion and Left-Wing Politics in France, 1830-1852*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

_____. *The Trial of Madame Caillaux.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Bertier de Sauvigny, Guillaume. *Au soir de la monarchie: histoire de la Restauration.* Third ed. Paris: Flammarion, 1955.

Bezucha, Robert. *The Lyon Uprising of 1834: Social and Political Conflict in the Early July Monarchy.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Billacois, François. *The Duel: Its Rise and Fall in Early Modern France.* Trans. Trista Selous. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Blanning, T.C.W. *The Romantic Revolution: A History*. New York: Modern Library, 2011.

Blaufarb, Rafe. *The French Army, 1750-1820: Careers, Talent, Merit*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Blewer, Evelyn. *La Campagne d'Hernani: edition du manuscript du souffleur.* Saint-Pierre-du-Mont: Eurédit, 2002.

Boime, Albert. *Art in an Age of Counterrevolution, 1815-48.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

_____. *The Social Structures of Economics*. Trans. Chris Turner. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.

Brahimi, Denise. *Opinions et regards des Européens sur le Maghreb aux XVIIème et XVIIIème siècles.* Algiers: Société Nationale d'Edition et de Difussion, 1978.

Braudy, Leo. *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity*. New York: Knopf, 2003.

Brenner, Clarence D. *The Théâtre Italien: Its Repertory, 1716-1793.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.

Brooks, Peter. *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, James, Melodrama and the Mode of Excess.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Brower, Benjamin Claude. *A Desert Named Peace: The Violence of France's Empire in the Algerian Sahara*, 1844-1902. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Brown, Frederick. *Theater and Revolution*. New York: The Viking Press, 1980.

Brown, Gregosy S. *A Field of Honor: Writers, Court Culture, and Public Theater in French Literary Life from Racine to the Revolution.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Brown, Howard and Judith A. Miller, ed. *Taking Liberties: Problems of a New Order from the French Revolution to Napoleon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Brown, Stephen Gregory. *A Field of Honor.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationhood and Citizenship in France and Germany.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Brunchschwig, Henri. *Mythes et réalités de l'imperialisme colonial français.* Paris: Colin, 1960.

Buckley, Matthew. *Tragedy Walks the Streets: The French Revolution in the Making of Modern Drama.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge, 1991.

Canaday, Margot. *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Canguilhem, Georges. *The Normal and the Pathological.* Trans. Carolyn Fawcett and Robert Cohen. New York: Zone Books, 1991 (orig pub. 1966).

Carlson, Marvin. "*Hernani*'s Revolt from the Tradition of French Stage Composition," *Theatre Survey* 3, no. 1 (May 1972): 1-27.

_____. *The Theater of the French Revolution.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966.

_____. *French Stage in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Caron, Jean-Claude. *L'été rouge: Chronique de la révolte populaire en France, 1841*.

Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 2002.

_____. *Générations romantiques: Les étudiants de Paris et le Quartier Latin, 1814-51.* Paris: Colin, 1991.

Carroll, Stuart. *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Allan Sheridan. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Chai, Leon. *Romantic Theory: Forms of Reflexivity in the Revolutionary Era.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Chandler, James. *England in 1819.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Charle, Christophe. *La République des universitaires.* Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1994.

Charnow, Sally Debra. *Theatres, Markets and Politics in Fin-de-Siècle France*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Chauncey, George. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940.* New York: Basic Books, 1995.

Chaussinard-Nogaret, Guy, et al. *Histoire des élites en France du XVIe au XXe siècle*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1991.

Cheney, Paul. *Revolutionary Commerce: Globalization and the French Monarchy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Chesnais, Jean-Claude. *Les morts violentes en France depuis 1826*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1976.

Chevalier, Louis. *Classes laboreuses et classes dangereuses*. Paris: Plon, 1958.

Chevalley, Sylvie. *La Comédie-Française: hier et aujourd'hui*. Paris: Didier, 1979.

Cheyne, Michelle. "*Le Monument National*: Aesthetic Political Conflict in the Reception of Romantic Dramas (1813-1848)." Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 2003.

Chu, Petra ten-Doesschate and Gabriel P. Weisberg, ed. *The Popularization of Images: Visual Culture under the July Monarchy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Clancy-Smith, Julia. *Rebel and Saint: Muslim Notables, Populist Protest, Colonial*

Encounters (Algeria and Tunisia, 1800-1904). Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Clark, Anna. *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Clark, T.J. *The Painting of Modern Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Clément, Catherine. *Opera: The Undoing of Women*. Trans. Betsy Wing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Cohen, Richard. *By the Sword: A History of Gladiators, Musketeers, Samurai, Swashbucklers and Olympic Champions.* New York: Random House, 2002.

Coller, Ian. *Arab France: Islam and the Making of Modern Europe, 1798-1831.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Collingham, H.A.C. *The July Monarchy: A Political History of France 1830-48.* New York: Longman, 1988.

Collins, Randall. *Violence: A Micro-sociological Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. 2nd Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Cooper, Barbara T. "*Le Docteur Noir*: A French Romantic Drama in Blackface." *French Forum* 28, no. 1 (Winter 2003): 77-90.

Corbin, Alain. *The Foul and the Fragrant: Odor and the French Social Imagination.* Trans. Miriam Kochan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.

_____. *Life of an Unknown*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

_____. *Time, Desire and Horror: Towards a History of the Senses*. Trans. Jean Birrell. Cambridge: Polity, 1995.

_____. *Village Bells: The Culture of the Senses in the Nineteenth-Century French Countryside*. Trans. Martin Thom. New York: Columbia University, 1998.

_____. *The Village of Cannibals: Rage and Murder in France, 1870*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.

_____. *Women for Hire: Prostitution and Sexuality in France after 1850.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Crais, Clifton and Pamela Scully. *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus: A Ghost Story and a Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Crary, Jonathan. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century.* Boston: MIT Press, 1992.

Crawford, Katherine. *European Sexualities, 1400-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

_____. *The Sexual Culture of the French Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Daniels, Barry V., Ed. *Revolution in the Theater: French Romantic Theories of Drama.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood press, 1983.

Darnton, Robert. *The Great Cat Massacre: And Other Episodes in French Cultural History.* New York: Basic Books, 1984.

_____. *Mesmerism and the End of the French Enlightenment.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Daumard, Adeline. *La bourgeoisie parisienne de 1815 à 1848.* Paris: Albin Michel, 1996.

Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1800.* . Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Davidson, Denise. *France after Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

_____. *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.

_____. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Dayen, Daniel. *Martin Nadaud: Ouvrier, maçon, deputé*. Paris: Souny, 1998.

Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle.* Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books, 1995.

DeJean, Joan. *The Reinvention of Obscenity: Sex, Lies and Tabloids in Early Modern France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

_____. *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Denby, David. *Sentimental Narrative and the Social Order in France, 1780-1820.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Desan, Suzanne. *The Family on Trial in Revolutionary France*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Desanti, Dominique. *Flora Tristan: La femme révoltée.* Paris: Hachette, 1972.

Devlin, Judith. *The Superstitious Mind: French Peasants and the Supernatural in the Nineteenth Century.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Diefendorf, Barbara. *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth-Century Paris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Dinshaw, Carolyn. *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999.

D'Oria, Michèle Sajous. *Victor Hugo e il melodramma italiano*. Bari: Cassa Piccini, 2002.

Draper, Frederick. *The Rise and Fall of French Romantic Drama.* London: Constable & Co., 1923.

Duplantier, Raymond. "Les duels à Poitiers et dans la Vienne au cours de la première moitié dud ix-nouvième siècle," in the proceedings of the *Société des antiquares de l'ouest*, 22. Jan. 1950: 1-18.

Easton, Malcom. *Artists and Writers in Paris: The Bohemian Idea, 1803-1867*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1964.

Edelstein, Dan. *The Terror of the Natural Right: Republicanism, the Cult of Nature, and the French Revolution.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Evans, Donald Owen. *Social Romanticism in France: 1830-1848*. New York: Octagon Books 1969.

Fabian, Johannes. *Out of Our Minds: Reason and Madness in the Exploration of Central Africa.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth.* Trans. Richard Philcox. New York: Grove, 2004.

Fleury, Georges. *Comment l'Algérie devint française, 1830-48.* Paris: Perrin, 2008.

Ford, Caroline. *Divided Houses: Religion and Gender in Modern France.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

_____. "Reforestation, Landscape Conservation, and the Anxieties of Empire in French Colonial Algeria," *American Historical Review* (April, 2008): 341-362.

Forth, Christopher. *The Dreyfus Affair and the Crisis of French Manhood*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Forth, Christopher and Bertrand Taithe, ed. *French Masculinities: History, Culture and Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1995.

_____. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Huntley. New York: Pantheon, 1971.

_____. *The Order of Things*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1970.

Freeman, Elizabeth. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities and Queer Histories.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2008.

Friedland, Paul. *Political Actors: Representative Bodies and Theatricality in the Age of the French Revolution.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Fritzsche, Peter. *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Frobert, Ludovic. *Les Canuts ou la démocratie turbulente: Lyon, 1831-1834.* Paris: Editions Tallandier, 2009.

Furet, François. *Revolutionary France: 1770-1880.* Translated by Antonia Nevill. Madden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1988.

Gallagher, Catherine and Thomas Laqueur, eds. *The Making of the Modern Body: Sexuality and Society in the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Garrioch, David. *The Formation of the Parisian Bourgeoisie, 1690-1830.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Gengembre, Gérard. *Le Théâtre français au dix-neuvième siècle.* Paris: Armand Colin, 1999.

Gerhard, Anselm. *The Urbanization of Opera: Music Theater in Paris in the Nineteenth Century*. Trans. Mary Whitall. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Gilligan, James. *Violence: Reflections on our Deadliest Epidemic*. New York: Putnam, 1996.

Ginisty, Paul. *Le Mélodrame*. Paris: Louis-Michaud, n.d.

_____. *Le Théâtre Romantique.* Paris: Editions Albert Morance, 1922.

Gildea, Robert. *Barricades and Borders: Europe, 1800-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

_____. *Children of the Revolution: The French, 1799-1914.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008.

_____. *Education in Provincial France, 1800-1914.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

_____. *The Past in French History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Gilmore, David. *Manhood in the Making*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. Trans. John and Anne Tedeschi. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Gluck, Mary. *Popular Bohemia: Modernism and Urban Culture in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Goblot, Jacques. *La jeune France libérale: le Globe et son groupe littéraire, 1824-1830*. Paris: Plon, 1995.

Goldhammer, Jesse. *The Headless Republic: Sacrificial Violence and Modern French Thought*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Goldstein, Jan. *Console and Classify: The French Psychiatric Profession in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

_____. *The Post-Revolutionary Self: Politics and Psyche in France, 1750-1850.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Goodman, Dena. *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Grunchec, Philippe. *Le grand prix de peinture: les concours des Prix de Rome de 1797 à 1863*. Paris: Ecole Nationale Supérieure des beaux Arts, 1983.

Guillet, François. *La mort en face: Histoire du duel de la Révolution à nos jours.* Paris: Aubier, 2008.

Gullickson, Gay. *Unruly Women of Paris: Images of the Commune*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Habermas, Jurgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1994.

Hacking, Ian. *The Taming of Chance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Haine, Scott. *The World of the Parisian Café.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998.

_____. *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives*, New York: New York University Press, 2006.

Halsall, Albert. *Victor Hugo and the Romantic Drama*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Hannoum, Abdelmajid. *Violent Modernity: France in Algeria*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Harrison, Carol. *The Bourgeois Citizen in Nineteenth-Century France: Gender, Sociability, and the Uses of Emulation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Harsin, Jill. *Barricades: The War of the Streets in Revolutionary Paris, 1830-1848.* New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Harvey, David. *Paris: The Capital of Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Haywood, Ian. *Bloody Romanticism: Spectacular Violence and the Politics of Representation, 1776-1832*. London: Palgrave, 2006.

Hazareesingh, Sudhir. *From Subject to Citizen: The Second Empire and the Emergence of Modern French Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Hemmings, F.W.J. *Culture and Society in France, 1789-1848*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987.

_______. *Theatre and State in France, 1760-1905.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

_____. *The Theater Industry in Nineteenth-Century France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Heuer, Jennifer Ngaire. *The Family and the Nation: Gender and Citizenship in Revolutionary France, 1789-1830*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *The Age of Revolution: 1789-1848.* New York: Mentor Books, 1962.

Houbre, Gabrielle. *La discipline de l'amour: l'éducation sentimentale des filles et des garçons à l'âge du romantisme.* Paris: Plon, 1997.

Houdaille, Jacques. "Pertes de l'armée de terre sous le premier Empire, d'après les registres matricules," *Population* 27 (1972): 27-50.

Howarth, W.D. *Sublime and Grotesque: A Study of French Romantic Drama*. London: Harrap, 1975.

Hughes, Michael. *Forging Napoleon's Grande Armée: Motivation, Military Culture and Masculinity in the French Army, 1800-1808*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.

Hunt, Lynn. *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Isherwood, Robert. *Farce and Fantasy; Popular Entertainment in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Jackson, Julian. *Living in Arcadia: Homosexuality, Politics, and Morality in France from the Liberation to AIDS*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Jardin, André and André-Jean Tudesq. *Restoration and Reaction, 1815-1848.* Trans. Elborg Forster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Jaume, Lucien. *La liberté et la loi: Les origines philosophiques du liberalism.* Paris: Fayard, 2001.

Jay, Martin. *Refractions of Violence.* New York: Routledge, 2003.

Johnson, James. *Listening in Paris*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Jones, Howard Mumford. *Revolution and Romanticism.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Belknap Press, 1974.

Jouanna, Arlette. *Le devoir de révolte: La noblesse française et la gestation de l'Etat moderne, 1559-1661*. Paris: Fayard, 1989.

Julien, Charles-André. *Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine: la conquête et les débuts de la colonisation (1830-71).* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964.

Kalifa, Dominique. *Les crimes de Paris: lieux et non-lieux du crime à Paris au XIXe siècle*. Paris: Bibliothèques de Paris, 2000.

_____. *L'Encre et le sang: Récits de crimes et société à la Belle Epoque.* Paris: Fayard, 1995.

_____. *Naissance de la police privée: Détectives et agencies de recherches en France, 1832-1942*. Paris: Plon, 2000.

Kateb, Kemal. *Européens, "indigènes," et juifs en Algérie, 1830-1962*. Paris: Editions de l'Institut National d'Études Démographiques, 2001.

Keane, John. *Violence and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kennedy, Emmet, et al. *Theater, Opera and Audiences in Revolutionary Paris: Analysis and Repertory*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1996.

Kiernan, V.G. *The Duel in European History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Kocka, Jürgen. "The Middle Classes in Europe," *JMH* 67, no. 4 (Dec. 1995): 783-806.

Krakovitch, Odile. *Hugo Censuré: la liberté au théâtre au XIXe siècle.* Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1985.

Kriegel, Annie. "Generational Difference: The History of an Idea," *Daedalus* 107, no. 4 (Fall 1978): 23-38.

Kroen, Sheryl. *Politics and Theater: The Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France*. Berkeley: Unviersity of California Press, 2000.

Kudlick, Catherine. *Cholera in Post-Revolutionary Paris: A Cultural History.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Laforgue, Pierre. *1830: Romantisme et histoire*. Paris: Eurédit, 2002.

Lancaster, H. Carrington. *The Comédie Française, 1680-1701: Plays, Actors, Spectators, Finances*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1941.

_____. *French Tragedy in the Reign of Louis XVI and the Early Years of the French Revolution, 1774-1792.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1953.

Landes, Joan. *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Latour, Bruno. *On the Modern Cult of the Factish Gods.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Laurent, Franck. *Victor Hugo face à la conquête de l'Algérie.* Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose, 2001.

Lawrence, Bruce and Aisha Karim, ed. *Violence: A Reader*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2007.

Lecomte, Louis-Henri. *Histoire des theaters de Paris: Le Théâtre de la Cité*. Paris: H. Daragon, 1910.

Lehmann, Jean-Pierre. "Léon Roches—Diplomat Extraordinery in the Bakumatsu Era: An Assessment of his Personality and Policy," *Modern Asian Studies,* vol. 14, no. 2 (1980): 275-305.

Lehning, James R. *The Melodramatic Thread: Spectacle and Political Culture in Modern France.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007.

Lilti, Antoine. *Le monde des salons: Sociabilité et mondalité à Paris au XVIIIe siècle.* Paris: Fayard, 2005

Loudcher, Jean-François. *Histoire de la savate, du chausson et de boxe française (1797-1978).* Paris: L'Harmattan, 2000.

Lough, John. *Paris Theatre Audiences in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Lough, John and Muriel. *An Introduction to 19th Century France*. London: Longman Group, 1978.

Love, Heather. *Feeling Backwards: Loss and the Politics of Queer History.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Loewy, Michael and Robert Sayre. *Romanticism against the Tide of Modernity*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy*. Trans. Jeremy Gaines.

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Magraw, Roger. *France, 1800-1914: A Social History*. London: Longman, 2002.

Mainardi, Patricia. *Husbands, Wives, and Lovers: Marriage and Its Discontents in Nineteenth-Century France*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Mansel, Philip. *The Court of France, 1789-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

_____. *Paris Between Empires: 1814-1852*. London: Phoenix Press, 2001.

Mansker, Andrea. " 'Mademoiselle Arria Ly Wants Blood!': The Debate over female Honor in France. *FHS* 29, no. 4 (Fall 2006): 621-647.

Manuel, Frank. *Prophets of Paris.* New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Marcus, Sharon. *Apartment Stories: The City and the Home in Nineteenth-Century Paris and London.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Marder, Elissa. *Dead Time: Temporal Disorders in the Wake of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Margadant, Jo Burr. "Gender, Vice and the Political Imaginary in Postrevolutionary France: Reinterpreting the Failure of the July Monarchy, 1830-1848," *AHR* 104. No. 4 (December 1999): 1460-96.

Margadant, Ted. *French Peasants in Revolt: The Insurrection of 1851*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Marrinan, Michael. *Romantic Paris: Histories of a Cultural Landscape, 1800-1850*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Martin, Brian Joseph. *Napoleonic Friendship: Military Fraternity, Intimacy and Sexuality in Nineteenth-Century France.* Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire Press, 2011.

Maslan, Susan. *Revolutionary Acts: Theater, Democracy and the French Revolution*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Mason, Laura. *Singing the French Revolution: Popular Culture and Politics, 1789-1799.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Maurois, André. *Olympio: The Life of Victor Hugo*. Translated by Gerard Hopkins. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Maza, Sarah. *The Myth of the French Bourgeoisie: An Essay on the Social Imaginary, 1750-1850.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.

_____. *Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Celebres of Prerevolutionary France*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

McClary, Susan. *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

McCord, James. "Politics and Honor in Early Nineteenth-Century England: The Dukes' Duel," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 62, no. 1 (1999): 88-114.

McCormick, John. *Popular Theatres of Nineteenth-Century France.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Mellor, Anne. *Romanticism and Gender*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Merrick, Jeffrey and Bryant T. Ragan, eds. *Homosexuality in Modern France*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Merriman, John, *The Agony of the Republic: Repression of the Left in Revolutionary France, 1848-51*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

_____, ed. *1830 in France*. New York: New Viewpoints, 1975.

_____. *Police Stories: Building the French State, 1815-1851*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Miller, Judith. *Mastering the Market: The State and the Grain Trade in Northern France, 1700-1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Moers, Ellen. *The Dandy: Brummel to Beerbohm*. New York: Viking Press, 1960.

Mollier, Jean-Yvesn Martine Reid and Jean-Claude Yon. *Repenser la Restauration.* Versailles: Nouveau Monde Editions, 2005.

Moses, Claire Goldberg. *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: State University of New York Press, 1984.

Muchembled, Robert. *A History of Violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2012.

Muir, Edward. *Mad Blood Stirring: vendetta in Renaissance Italy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Naugrette, Florence. *Le Théâtre romantique: histoire, écriture, mise en scène*. Paris: Seuil, 2000.

Newman, Edgar. “The Blouse and the Frock Coat: The Alliance of the Common People of Paris with the Liberal Leadership and the Middle Class during the Last Years of the Bourbon Restoration.” *JMH* 46, no. 1 (March, 1974): 26-59.

_____.“The Historian as Apostle: Romanticism, Religion and the First Socialist History of the World.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56, no. 2 (April 1995): 239-261.

_____. “Republicanism During the Bourbon Restoration in France, 1814-1830.” Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1969.

Nord, Philip. *The Republican Moment: Struggles for Democracy in Nineteenth-Century France*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Nye, Robert. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

O’Boyle, Lenore. “The Problem of an Excess of Educated Men in Western Europe, 1800-1850,” *JMH* 42, no. 4 (Dec. 1970): 471-495.

Oliver, Richard. *Charles Nodier: The Pilot of Romanticism.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1964.

Outram, Dorinda. *The Body and the French Revolution: Sex, Class, and Political Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Pao, Angela C. *The Orient of the Boulevards: Exoticism, Empire and Nineteenth-Century French Theater.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.

Parsons, Talcott. *The Social System*. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Pasco, Allan. *Revolutionary Love in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-century France.* Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

_____. *Sick Heroes: French Society and Literature in the Romantic Age, 1750-1850.* Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1997.

Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Perreux, Gabriel. *Aux temps sociétés secretes. La Propagande républicain au début de la Monarchie de Juillet, 1830-35.* Paris: H. Sée, 1931.

Pilbeam, Pamela. *The 1830 Revolution in France*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1991.

_____. *Constitutional Monarchy in France, 1814-1848*. New York: Longman, 1999.

_____. *French Socialists before Marx: Workers, Women and the Social Question*. Toronto: McGill Queens University Press, 2001.

_____. *Republicanism in France, 1814-1871*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995.

Pinkney, David. *Decisive Years in France, 1840-47*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

_____. *The French Revolution of 1830.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

Poovey, Mary. *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Popkin, Jeremy. *Press, Revolution, and Social Identities in France, 1830-1835*. University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Porch, Douglas. *The History of the French Foreign Legion.* New York: Harper, 1990.

Price, Munro. *The Perilous Crown: France between Revolutions, 1814-1848.* London: Macmillan, 2009.

Prochaska, David. *Making Algeria French: Colonialism in Bone, 1870-1920.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Prost, Antoine. *L'Enseignement en France (1800-1967)*. Paris: Colin, 1968.

Rabinow, Paul. *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Rancière, Jacques. *The Nights of Labor: The Workers' Dream in Nineteenth-Century France*. Trans. John Drury. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

Ratcliffe, Barrie M. "Saint-Simonism and Messianism: The Case of Gustave d'Eichthal," *FHS* 9 (1976): 484-502.

Reddy, William. *The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Postrevolutionary France, 1814-1848*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

_____. *Money and Liberty in Modern Europe: A Critique of Historical Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

_____. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Richardson, Joanna. *Théophile Gautier: His Life and Times*. London: Coward McCann, 1959.

Riot-Sarcey, Michèle . *Le reel de l'utopie: Essai sur le politique au XIXe siècle.* Paris: Albin Michel, 1982.

Robb, Graham. *Balzac: A Biography.* New York: W.W. Norton & Inc., 1994.

_____. *Victor Hugo*. London: Picador, 1997.

Root-Bernstein, Michele. *Boulevard Theater and Revolution in Eighteenth-Century Paris.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1984.

Rorabaugh, W.J. *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Ruedy, John. *Modern Algeria: The Origins and Development of a Nation,* 2nd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Ruff, Julius. *Violence in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

_____. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Sahlins, Peter. *Forest Rites: The War of the Demoiselles in Nineteenth Century France*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Samuels, Maurice. *The Spectacular Past: Popular History and the Novel in Nineteenth-Century France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Schechner, Richard. *Performance Theory.* Second Edition. New York: Routledge Classics, 2003.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery.* Trans. Jefferson Chase. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003.

Schorske, Carl. *Fin-De-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York: Vintage, 1980.

Schwartz, Vanessa. *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siècle Paris*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

_____. *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

_____. *The Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Seigel, Jerrold. *Bohemian Paris: Culture, Politics, and the Boundaries of Bourgeois Life, 1830-1930.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1996.

_____. *The Idea of the Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Sennett, Richard. *The Fall of Public Man*. New York: Knopf, 1977.

Sewell, William. *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Sessions, Jennifer. *By Sword and Plow: France and the Conquest of Algeria*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.

_____. "Making Colonial France: Culture, National Identity and the Colonization of Algeria, 1830-1851." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2005.

Siegfried, Susan. *The Art of Louis-Léopold Boilly*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Sinha, Mralinha. *Colonial Masculinity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Shovlin, John. *The Political Economy of Virtue: Patriotism and Politics of Luxury in Eighteenth-Century France.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Skuy, David. *Assassination, Politics, and Miracles: France and the Royalist Reaction of 1820*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003.

Sohn, Anne-Marie. *Sois un home! La construction de la masculinite au XIXe siècle.* Paris: Seuil, 2009.

Solomon-Godeau, Abigail. *Male Trouble: A Crisis in Representation.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1999.

Sonn, Richard. *Anarchism and Cultural Politics in Fin-de-Siècle France.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

Spang, Rebecca. *The Invention of the Restaurant: Paris and Modern Gastronomic Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Sperber, Jonathan. *The European Revolutions, 1848-5*, second ed. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Spierenburg, Pieter, ed. *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998.

Spitzer, Alan. *The French Generation of 1820.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

_____. *Old Hatreds, Young Hopes: The French Carbonari Against the Bourbon Restoration.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Starr, Paul. *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Stora, Benjamin. *Algeria, 1830-2000: A Short History.* Trans. William B. Quandt. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Sullivan, Anthony Thrall. *Thomas Robert Bugeaud: France and Algeria, 1784-1849*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1983.

Surkis, Judith. *Sexing the Citizen: Morality and Masculinity, 1870-1914*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Tackett, Timothy. *When the King Took Flight*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Unviersity Press, 2004.

Talmon, J.L. *Romanticism and Revolt: Europe, 1815-1848*. New York: Harcourt Brace, Inc., 1967.

Terni, Jennifer. "A Genre for Early Mass Culture: French Vaudeville and the City, 1830-1848," *Theatre Journal* 58, no. 2 (May 2006): 221-248.

Thompson, C.W., ed. *French Romantic Travel Writing: From Chateaubriand to Nerval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage, 1966.

Thompson, Victoria. *The Virtuous Marketplace: Women and Men, Money and Politics in Paris, 1830-70*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Tilburg, Patricia. *Colette's Republic: Work, Gender, and Popular Culture in France, 1870-1914.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.

Tilly, Charles. *The Politics of Collective Violence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Tindall, Gillian. *The Journey of Martin Nadaud*. London: Chatto, 1999.

Travers, Seymour. *Nineteenth-Century French Theatrical Parodies: A Compilation between 1789-1914*. New York: King's Cross Press, 1941.

Trigiani, Marie. "*Livrets de Mise en Scène* from Nineteenth-Century Productions of Romantic Drama: Staging Violence in Alexandre Dumas' *Henri III et sa cour* and Victor Hugo's *Marie Tudor*." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001.

Ubersfled, Anne. *Le Drame romantique.* Paris: Lettres, 1993.

_____. *Le Roman d'Hernani*. Paris: Comédie-Française-Mercure de France, 1985.

_____. *Le Roi et le Bouffon: Etude sur le théâtre de Hugo de 1830 à 1839.* Paris: Librairie J. Corti, 1974.

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. *A Midwife's Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard, 1785-1812*. New York: Vintage, 1991.

Vallurt, Rajeshwari. *'Surfacing' the Politics of Desire: Literature, Feminism, and Myth*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Vick, Brian. *Defining Germany: The 1848 Frankfurt Parliamentarians and National Identity.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Vickery, Amanda. "Golden Age of Separate Spheres? A Review of the categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *Historical Journal* 36, no. 2 (1993): 383-414.

Vigarello, Georges. *A History of Rape: Sexual Violence in France from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, trans. Jean Birrell. London: Polity Press, 2001.

Vincent-Buffault, Anne. *The History of Tears: Sensibility and Sentimentality in France.* London: Macmillan, 1991.

Wahrman, Dror. *Imagining the Middle Classes: The Political Representations of Class in Britain, 1780-1840.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

_____. *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Waresquiel, Emmanuel de. *Un groupe d'hommes considérables.* Paris: Fayard, 2006.

Waresquiel, Emmanuel de and Benoît Yvert. *Histoire de la Restauration, 1814-1830.* Paris: Perrin, 2002.

Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976.

Weil, Kari. *Androgyny and the Denial of Difference.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.

Weill, Georges. *Histoire du parti républicain en France, 1814-1870.* Paris: Resources, 1980 [1928].

Weiner, Dora. *Raspail, Scientist and Reformer*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Wiener, Martin. *Men of Blood: Violence, Manliness, and Criminal Justice in Victorian England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Wieviorka, Michel. *Violence: A New Approach*. Trans. David Macey. London: Sage Publications, Ltd., 2009.

Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Williamson, George. "What Killed August von Kotzebue? The Temptations of Virtue and the Political Theology of German Nationalism, 1789-1820," *JMH* 72, no. 4 (December 2000): 890-943.

Wilson, Edmund. *To the Finland Station: A Study in the Writing and Acting of History.* New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1972.

Wing, Nathaniel. *Between Genders: Narrating Difference in Early French Modernism.* Cranbury, NJ: Rosemont Publishing Group, 2004.

Winock, Michael. "Scènes de guerre à Paris: la Bataille d'*Hernani,*" *L'histoire*, no. 240 (Feb. 2000): 15-18.

Wohl, Robert. *Generation of 1914*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Wren, Keith. *Hugo: Hernani and Ruy Blas.* London: Grant and Cutler, Ltd., 1983.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Yon, Jean-Claude. *Eugène Scribe: la fortune et la liberté.* Saint Genouph: Libraire Nizet, 2000.

Zamoyski, Adam. *Holy Madness: Romantics and Revolutionaries, 1770-1871*. New York: Penguin, 2001.

Zarobell, John. “Framing French Algeria: Colonialism, Travel, and the Representation of Landscape, 1830-1870. Ph.D. diss., University of California Berkeley, 2000.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Violence*. New York: Picador, 2008.