

---

H-France Review Vol. 19 (January 2019), No. 17

Elizabeth C. Macknight, *Nobility and Patrimony in Modern France*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018. ix + 291 pp. Tables, notes, bibliography, and index. \$115.00 U.S. (cl). ISBN 9781526120519.

Review by Steven Kale, Washington State University.

Elizabeth Macknight is a senior lecturer at the University of Aberdeen. Having published two books and a number of articles on French nobles in the nineteenth century, she is currently the most prominent historian writing on the subject in the English language. Her first book, *Aristocratic Families in Republican France, 1870-1940* examined the daily lives and attitudes of aristocratic families during the Third Republic with regard to everything from parenting, to sibling relations, to dealing with servants. Macknight argues that nobles were adept at protecting their interests and preserving the integrity of an aristocratic way of life. She also argues against the assumption that nobles ceased to be relevant in the modern world.[1] *Nobles and Patrimony in Modern France* returns to these themes and amplifies them, making use of 195 distinct sets of private family papers housed in departmental archives to show how nobles preserved their properties and family traditions during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

*Nobility and Patrimony* opens, quite appropriately, with the burning of the chateau at Le Malène (Lorèze), owned by Gabriel de Brun de Montesquiou, in November 1793. For noble landowners in France, the Revolution was zero hour in the modern history of their class, with the burning of chateaux becoming a symbol of material loss for a group for whom landownership remained a primary source of income and the core of its identity. The book is centrally concerned with how noble families re-established themselves as landowners and how they maintained their patrimony. The research involves close attention to family decision-making as well as the interaction between nobles, the law, middlemen, and the state. But Macknight is equally concerned with how nobles lived, what they felt, and how they perceived their world. Consequently, this is not a social history or a quantitative study but rather an effort to understand emotions and motivations regarding patrimony, to examine how nobles perceived threats and opportunities, and to account for nobles' attitudes toward their material circumstances.

Macknight's conceptual tools are derived mostly from sociological theories, such as those of Pierre Bourdieu and Monique de Saint-Martin, concerning the conversion and reconversion of capital, cultural fields, gift exchange, and habitus. She combines social history and the history of law to investigate how legal changes impacted the transmission of tangible assets (land, residences) and intangible assets (names, titles, coats of arms, livery colors, hunting fanfares, and family mottos). Equally important to her work are the writings of Maurice Halbwach on the

social framework of memory and the “instruments” used by collective memory to construct an image of the past in accord with the preservation of family traditions in the face of changing social and cultural perceptions. “Both before and after 1789,” she writes, “it was very important to the French nobility to try to keep its ‘framework for family memory’ intact because this constituted families’ ‘traditional armour’ for protecting noble identity” (p. 13).

Amidst the various details of Macknight’s exposition, she makes two primary arguments. First, she claims to offer a new reading of the history of France’s landed elite that aims to radically reverse the assertion that nobles disappeared from modern French history and from the ways in which the French thought about national identity. To bolster her argument, she points to the fact that patrimony concerned not just property, but the larger impact nobles had on society and culture, and on France’s symbolic resources. Patrimony in her account has two meanings: the ensemble of goods to be transmitted to heirs and the historical memory of the nation. The former grounded the persistence of the nobility’s social power, which was admittedly declining, while the latter buttressed its cultural influence, which was sustained by the endurance of aristocracy as an aspiration, and which underwent something of a semiotic renaissance in the context of French consumerism in the post-World War II era. Secondly, Macknight suggests that it was precisely in the era of Republican consolidation and the “end of the notables” that nobles began to mobilize their patrimony through arts associations, lobbying organizations, and the heritage industry to remain culturally relevant by capitalizing on their names, places, artifacts, and the meaning attached to their historical significance.

The book begins with a chapter on how nobles struggled to protect their property during the Revolution, in the wake of the Great Fear, confiscations, and the abolition of nobility as a legal status. She divides her treatment between those who stayed in France and those who emigrated. Although Macknight admits that *émigrés* and nobles who remained in France worried about money and suffered a permanent loss of income, she is less concerned about providing an overall assessment of the economic impact of the Revolution on the nobility than she is with depicting what it was like for them to live through trying circumstances. She uses letters from private archives to recount the trauma of pillage and the emotional impact of the seizure of *émigré* property. Much of what she says about how nobles responded to such events is well known: they took advantage of new divorce laws and changes in inheritance laws to secure fiscal benefits; they petitioned department administrators to have their names removed from the list of *émigrés*, called for the release of suspects and the return of seized property. They shrewdly and rapidly adapted to new legal realities to defend their personal rights. Wives who remained behind repurchased property and extended families provided aid to members in need. Nobles expressed disdain for the new laws and the revolutionary officials who administered them, but they were nevertheless forced to interact more intensely with the government. They regarded new paperwork requirements as harassment and complained repeatedly about delayed responses, deliberate obfuscation, and petty politics. Nevertheless, they found ways to resist the implementation of the new laws and managed to conserve a great deal more documentation than was previously thought. Perhaps the greatest consequence of the Revolution was the creation among nobles of the myth that everything was lost. The damage to nobles’ material fortunes differed from region to region and the fiscal impact of revolutionary legislation played out over many years. But the nobility’s emotional response to the events of the 1790s made it seem to them that the Revolution would always seem “like yesterday” (p. 44).

In 1800, the patrimony of the nobility was worth twenty percent less than it had been sixteen years earlier. Under Napoleon, many held out hope that seigneurial dues would be re-established. In the meantime, nobles had to deal with complicated issues of inheritance set in motion by the Revolution. The sequestration of *émigré* lands was lifted in October 1800. *Émigré* lands not sold as *biens nationaux* were returned to owners. But new legislation on the transmission of property remained, including the abolition of primogeniture and the institution of partible inheritance. Macknight examines how nobles maneuvered through this new terrain and records numerous examples of considerable success related to how nobles made use of provisions concerning the *majorat* (introduced by Napoleon, made obligatory for the peerage under the Restoration, and suppressed in 1848) and *la quotité disponible*. She explores how the apportioning of patrimony worked within families and finds that affection and kinship influenced how nobles navigated evolving legislation. Complications often arose in cases concerning the early transfer of rights, or friction among siblings. Wills and marriage contracts indicate that nobles saw themselves as temporary guardians of a patrimony that would be passed to the next generation, so that aristocratic practices in this regard were distinctive in that nobles preferred to give husbands authority to manage dotal funds and property, and often specified that neither spouse could dispose of either, which stood in contrast to the evolution toward community property agreements among the bourgeoisie. Nobles often gave a preferential legacy (*le préciput*) to the eldest male child to keep a certain amount of the estate out of division. As in the past, nobles continued to deploy controls on exogamy, especially for eldest daughters, where the lack of a suitable endogamous match could risk the family name. In cases of childlessness, lateral kin ties served for the transmission of property. Unmarried nobles often entered religious orders and bequeathed their share to the Church. As nobles were richer than most other social groups, it is not surprising that they were hostile to partible inheritance and sought to mitigate or subvert it.

Two subsequent chapters refine this portrait of noble behaviors and attitudes surrounding the transmission of property by examining the use of adoption, and strategies for dealing with incapacity and debt. With the end of ennoblement in the nineteenth century, nobles were fixated on passing their names to succeeding generations. They pursued a variety of strategies to achieve higher birthrates and ward off demographic decline by using new adoption laws to carry on names and titles that would otherwise have been eliminated. Nobles had to work out ways to incorporate new members without destabilizing family identities. One option was to build a narrative around the adoptee designed to absorb him into preexisting family traditions. Another was to engineer a pact of silence around an adoptee's background to mask illegitimacy. The incapacity of an heir due to illness or disability could also complicate the management of material resources. This was most often addressed under provisions in the 1804 Civil Code relating to *tutelle* and *curatelle* involving procedures for representing or assisting a vulnerable individual's right to property. Chronic indebtedness posed an even greater problem for stable succession and family continuity. Difficulties accessing liquid funds to meet the demands of creditors because of prior debt or loss of capital were constant sources of anxiety, leading to worries about the viability of family ambitions and the security of children's financial future, and magnifying fears created by frequent political crises. Macknight finds a considerable amount of discussion in private papers about the emotional costs of debt and its health effects, along with concern about charitable commitments and expenditures related to the funding of private schools. Borrowing and lending were important to systems of mutual aid among nobles and within families. They patronized specific banks like the Union Générale and reached out to extended kinship networks. Poorer nobles often took salaried positions in historically acceptable careers in the army, the magistrature, and the diplomatic corps to help their families stay afloat. The liquidation of goods

was commonly used to raise cash for reinvestment, to buy stocks, improve estates, or pay off mortgages, especially in the period from 1800 to 1912 and in the interwar period, when rents and land prices fell.

Above all else, nobles in nineteenth- and twentieth-century France remained landowners, and Macknight sees the restoration and maintenance of landed estates as the key to the persistence of an aristocratic lifestyle and the resilience of the aristocracy after each revolutionary crisis. The holdings of French *propriétaires* were smaller in size than those of nobles in other European countries. As a group, French nobles failed to create a powerful means of representing organized “landed interest.” Instead, they concentrated their efforts on the daily routines of estate management and sought to preserve the ligatures of noble power through private education, charitable activities, and by rooting themselves solidly in the thousands of rural communities in which they habitually resided. For Macknight, the two key points about estate management were the knowledge nobles acquired about the fiscal dimensions of the enterprise, and the ways in which estate management connected them to the surrounding community. The most important relationship was that between the landowner and the *régisseur* (steward), especially in cases of absenteeism, which were quite common. Nobles who owned property in Paris relied heavily on *régisseurs* to run their affairs. Those who resided full-time in the countryside relied on *régisseurs* to gain the trust of the community by working with local artisans, procuring services, and hiring agricultural labor. Typically, *régisseurs* helped nobles embed themselves in communities and developed experiences and insights that could be useful to the landowners, with whose families they maintained close ties. Largely as a result of such activity, according to Macknight, labor relations on a noble estate were far less adversarial than in the world at large. Rural laborers felt free to write to nobles about pay and working conditions and agreement was often arrived at by mutual consent rather than by collective bargaining. Distinctive matters such as livery colors, laundry, the inclusion of wine in meals, and where servants would dine were often the subject of such correspondences, alongside issues like wages and the cost of insurance. Macknight notes that relations between landowners and workers were marked by expressions of deference toward nobles and indicate a form of labor relations largely devoid of hostility. She does not entirely downplay labor conflict in rural France but wants to “balance attention to contestation” with evidence of the “ritual acceptance of a world of tradition experienced as natural and taken for granted” (p. 152).<sup>[2]</sup> Deferential language, she writes, made practical sense as a way to cultivate stable relationships in a world where residential patterns changed very slowly, and where social relationships and gender roles were strikingly durable well into the twentieth century.

Chapter six, on residences and gardens, continues themes connecting estate management, money concerns, and generational ties while pointing toward issues Macknight explores toward the end of the book, namely the survival of the nobility through two world wars and the transformation of patrimony into national heritage and commerce in the years after 1945. As with other topics, Macknight approaches the subject of residences and gardens by discussing attitudes and sentiments before examining what nobles did regarding the upkeep of properties. Residences and gardens were important to nobles as venues for sociability, projections of status, and as potential heritage sites. Chateaux were symbols of their attachment to the land, as well as the land’s meaning as a place of pleasure and repose. As with estate management, the upkeep of residences and gardens involved extensive interaction with the wider community, with architects, horticulturalists, designers, and artisans. Their real and sentimental value led some nobles to repurchase property previously owned by ancestors when land prices fell at the end of the nineteenth century. Coveted items associated with homes took on greater value as nobles sought

to govern markers of taste. The desire to inherit or possess family portraits, artworks, crystal ware, and other prized objects sometimes led to battles among siblings and drawn-out negotiations involving sellers and middlemen.

France's first law on historic monuments was passed in May 1887, on the heels of an accelerating process of renovations on chateaux. The law was designed to safeguard residences and objects deemed to have artistic or historic interest and it occasioned an increasing degree of interaction between nobles and the Republic. Nobles registered their property as historic monuments and were thereby required to follow regulations concerning the destruction of buildings, restoration, and renovation. New serial publications appeared to show off grand old homes, allowing nobles to bring public attention to the properties in which they were investing. Meanwhile, associations like *Le Demeure historique* began lobbying on behalf of noble property owners interested in selling or promoting patrimony in order to capitalize on the emergence of heritage tourism and the growing interest in preservation prompted by mass leisure, mass consumption, and the automobile. According to Macknight, nobles as a group played an important role in such activities and benefited from the growing commercial interest in objects and experiences associated with good taste.

Macknight misses the opportunity to make a stronger association between the decline of nobles' political and economic power, the fading of traditional society, and the transformation of noble patrimony in *lieux de mémoires*. Instead of linking heritage to modernity, she emphasizes the ability of nobles to mobilize their cultural capital to maintain and augment their power and influence in the twentieth century by making themselves repositories of national tradition in ways that belied the Republic's monopoly on the definition of patriotism. She rejects Leora Auslander's argument that the bourgeoisie drove consumer demand for historic pastiche furniture in the late nineteenth century because the bourgeoisie was not the dominant social groups when it came to taste and power. Nobles maintained social and cultural authority as private owners of properties admired by non-nobles and crowned with the aura of national heritage (p. 181).<sup>[3]</sup> In other words, noble families used their cultural capital to reinforce the connection between themselves and the national past. Their homes, gardens, and objects became vehicles for the transmission of family memories, status, and importance on the scale of the nation itself.

During the Second World War, chateaux around France suffered considerable damage. They were occupied by German troops and numerous objects were removed. During and after the war, owners scrambled to gather information on the whereabouts of stolen property, especially archives. In the book's last two chapters, Macknight takes up the question of how the world wars changed class relations on and around landed estates, and whether nobles were able to afford to repair damage to property resulting from military operations and wartime neglect. Using Bourdieu's concept of "reconversion," she insists that nobles in the twentieth century became even more committed to their custodial role and their responsibility to transmit national heritage, both to their descendants and to the nation as a whole. They sought to maintain their social position by "reconverting" their capital into forms that were both more profitable and more socially legitimate. In pursuing this goal, they joined their commitment to nurture symbolic capital and perpetuate traditions across generations to political conservatism and Catholic activism by holding on to ancestral homes and participating in politics through centrist and right-wing parties. They resorted to tried and true strategies to "hold the fort" against the tides of history by cutting expenses, adjusting investments, obtaining careers in the military and the

diplomatic service, and promoting agricultural improvement. Some supplemented these familiar methods by pursuing advanced degrees, working in the state's financial administration, and marrying wealthy heiresses. The most common strategies involved either the sale of property or the transformation of chateaux into commercial enterprises. After the turn of the century, more nobles began registered their residences as historic monuments. This required nobles to innovate by developing stronger ties to the state for the protection of patrimony, and to work more systematically with a variety of arts and heritage organizations, which began direct lobbying through inter-ministerial commissions in 1943 to address a broad range of tax and succession issues, and to seek increasing financial aid for repairs, fire prevention, landscaping, and new legislation pertaining to inheritance.

Since 1945, nobles have sought to perpetuate themselves as a group through historic preservation and heritage tourism, aligning themselves with a broader European trend. Pressure groups like the Association d'entraide de la noblesse française redoubled efforts to fight the usurpation of noble patronyms and arms, and showed a growing interest in defining patrimony in terms of both family and cultural assets, a definition of patrimony that gained increasing support from the French public. In the 1980s, the government boosted funding for the Ministry of Culture and proclaimed the Année du patrimoine, during which the French "embraced the idea with an enthusiasm that far exceeded government expectations" (p. 226). According to Macknight, the popularity of preservation magnified nobles' social and cultural importance insofar as they were in a position to exercise considerable influence in matters concerning heritage, due to the fact that the middle class "would dearly have loved to [have] been 'aristocrats' themselves" (p. 227).

Macknight argues that the late twentieth century saw the culmination of a process begun in the previous century, whereby the cultural field of patrimony (in the sense of national heritage) intersected with other cultural fields (travel, tourism, gastronomy) to turn patrimony into a form of big business that serves to propagate the bourgeoisie's "enduring fascination for France's *ancienne noblesse*" (p. 243), thereby raising the value of certified titles of nobility along with nobility's symbolic cachet. The commercial and cultural interests of nobles converged with the state's interest in maintaining the value of the nation's patrimony to create a situation in which a conservative and Catholic aristocracy with a long tradition of anti-republicanism became one of many interest groups partially reliant on government subsidies.[4] Since modern French museums were state institutions founded during the Revolution and formed in part by nationalizing royal collections, pillage, and confiscation of noble and clerical property, nobles chose to turn their chateaux into museums built on private collecting that reflected the desire to preserve items related to family identity. Rather than donate to public institutions or sell items to estate agents employed by wealthy investors, nobles sought to develop the touristic value of their possessions at a time when their efforts were rewarded by longer holidays, increased automobile and train travel, and Hachette's *Guide bleus*.

Macknight sees the commercial use of aristocratic-sounding names and titles in French brands as another avenue for preserving aristocratic influence. Chocolates, foie gras, cognac, champagne, upmarket beauty products, and clothing lines serve in her estimation to propagate an aristocratic aura by cashing in on bourgeois aspirations and the desire to possess markers of taste and class. It suited the nobility to support commercial branding of luxury products because it strengthened the association between the nobility, sophistication, and prestige. By reinforcing the power of symbols associated with the nobility and making them ubiquitous through the routines of shopping, such marketing practices became one of a number of avenues for the nobility "to

---

maintain social frameworks of collective memory, to safeguard patrimony, and to put its own stamp upon interpretations of the past in France” (p. 248).

There are a number of themes that Macknight returns to often in order to highlight their importance. She points frequently to the fact that nobles struggled to maintain their wealth and status throughout the post-revolutionary period, adapting to a changing legal landscape and often helping to shape it, especially with regard to the transmission of property. As a result, they were largely able to recover from the economic blows of the Revolution, which allowed them to maintain a disproportionate role among wealthy elites in the nineteenth century. The persistence of the nobility in the modern era points to the need to study the history of the nobility from a *longue durée* perspective, one that would reveal the nobility’s special relationship to the state, their treatment of the preservation of patrimony as “a long-term project,” and their ability to rise from the ashes (p. 259). She also insists on the distinctiveness of nobles’ lived experience, arguing against André-Jean Tudesq’s subsumption of the study of nobles under the general category of *notables*.<sup>[5]</sup> According to Macknight, the nobility and the bourgeoisie did not share a “single social psychology.” The former was a distinct social category which displayed a greater number of “class-based dispositions” (p. 128) relative to the protection of class identity, which manifested themselves in the cultivation of a collective memory, the storage and transmission of family archives, the passion of genealogy, distinctive practices related to wills and marriage contracts, the collection of objects, and nostalgia for the past.<sup>[6]</sup> At the same time, she argues that nobles should not be studied as a separate group because they maintained links to the surrounding community, especially in the countryside. Noble strategies of estate management built trust and familiarity, created family networks, and implicated nobles in the life of the *pays*. Finally, Macknight shows repeatedly that noblewomen participated in all aspects of noble life as custodians of patrimony: making decisions over family goods, defending their family’s material interests, running estates in the absence of husbands, curating homes and gardens, and supervising employees.

Macknight performs a valuable service by explaining many of the arcane details surrounding the transmission of property. More importantly, she gives a fuller picture of which kinds of sources for studying the French nobility in modern times have survived. Roughly three-quarters of the book is made up of anecdotes drawn from numerous *archives privées*. These sources were accumulated privately over decades and are scattered across the country, either in departmental archives or in private homes. According to Macknight, “[o]ne of the purposes of placing the post-1789 French nobility at the center of inquiry is to show how the wealth of source material available in France can be gathered and exploited for the type of research on nobles, country houses, and landed estates undertaken for other countries of continental Europe and Britain” (p. 10). Instead of using such archives for micro-histories, regional histories, or family histories, Macknight wants to show that they are essential for undertaking a broader study that aims to establish what is typical and what is exceptional.<sup>[7]</sup>

The key question Macknight raises is why we lack a fuller study of the French nobility in modern times when such studies seem to have flourished in other European countries. She argues that the fate of the nobility and issues associated with estate management are historically significant but insists that both subjects have been wrongly dismissed, neglected, and pushed to the margins by historians. In her estimation, historical scholarship on elite landowning in France remained “an almost virgin field” until recently because historians were more interested in the peasant experience, urban history, gender, race, religion, and the rise of the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile, labor

historians ignored the subject of labor relations on noble estates, focusing their attention instead on rural unions. As a result, nobles emerge as peripheral figures in national history, and in the history of rural France in particular, where the dominant themes in histories concerning nobles deal with conflicts over vested interests, tensions between tenants and landlords, violence, and outright rebellion. This results in part from the fact that historians have neglected private archives and have therefore adopted a unidimensional view of power based on land and wealth rather than on the intangible and subtle exercise of control derived from tradition.

In the end, it is not clear which subjects have been neglected beyond those Macknight addresses in her book. She seems to endorse David Higgs's conviction that historians have long been dissuaded from studying nobles by a sort of political prejudice against those who are assumed to identify with their subject matter (p. 193). As someone who studied French legitimists in the 1980s, I can attest that this used to be true. But since the collapse of the revolutionary mystique, the French Right and the modern French nobility, its sociability, its cultural impact, and its politics, have received much fuller attention. Many such works are cited by Macknight herself.[8] At times, Macknight's advocacy for more research on the French nobility has the tone of grievance and special pleading, as when she complains that nobles have been "relegated to the fringes of French rural history" (p. 151), or when she accuses historians of trivializing the subject in their teaching and writing, or when she expresses concern that historians have engaged in a systematic "forgetting" that has obscured non-republican traditions of French patriotism (pp. 263-64). Not only is this patently false, but it leaves aside the more fundamental question of knowing when a subject has received sufficient coverage. Macknight's case for the further study of the French nobility rest in large part on its historical importance, measured by the extent of its wealth, the magnitude of its landholding, its political importance, its social influence, and its impact on French cultural history. And yet, *Nobility and Patrimony in Modern France* offers very little of the sort of concrete sociological detail and aggregate socio-economic data that we would need to measure such importance, the kind of quantitative and qualitative evidence that we already possess in abundance from older works of social history.[9] In order to validate the importance of the nobility in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it is simply not enough to emphasize the profundity of family memories, the drama of inheritance, the preservation of family papers, the congeniality of rural life, the touristic appeal of Loire chateaux, or the popularity of Givenchy handbags. We also need to know why and how the nobility matters.

## NOTES

[1] Elizabeth Macknight, *Aristocratic Families in Republican France, 1870-1940* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).

[2] Macknight is quoting Bourdieu here. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 164.

[3] Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

[4] In 2010, according to Macknight, there were 43,180 historic monuments protected under the law and the Code de Patrimoine. Of that number, 49.5 percent were in private hands and nearly all the rest (43 percent) were owned by communes. The state contribution for protection exceeds that of the private sector by €340 million. In the meantime, income tax deductions to

compensate owners for the cost of maintenance, security, and insurance have grown since the 1950s. For all new monuments, the Ministry of Culture pays for a preliminary study and provides grant funding for up to 50 percent of the cost of work on a structure registered as a historic site. In recent years, Christie's and Sotheby's have engineered sales of family collections, which nobles often arranged in order to help pay the inheritance tax. The state has, therefore, become a major partner for today's chateaux owners.

[5] See A.-J. Tudesq, *Les Grands Notables en France (1840-1849): étude historique d'une psychologie sociale*, 2 vols (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1964).

[6] Macknight finds support for this view in the following works: A. Daumard, *Les Fortunes françaises au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Mouton, 1973); Jean Tulard, *Napoléon et la noblesse d'Empire* (Paris: J. Tallandier, 1979); Eric Mension-Rigau, *Le Donjon et la clocher: nobles et curés de campagne de 1850 à nos jours* (Paris: Perrin, 2003); Claude-Isabelle Brélot, *La Noblesse réinventée: nobles de Franche-Comte de 1814 à 1870*, 2 vols (Paris: Diffusion Les Belles Lettres, 1992); Natalie Petiteau, *Élites et mobilités: la noblesse d'Empire au XIXe siècle (1808-1914)* (Paris: La Boutique de l'histoire éditions, 1997).

[7] Earlier studies by Ralph Gibson and David Higgs noted the problems involved in using public records for the study of the nobility in the nineteenth century. Many of the subjects touched on in Macknight's book are mainly accessible through private archives. See Ralph Gibson, "The French Nobility in the Nineteenth-Century--Particularly in the Dordogne," in *Elites in France: Origins, Reproduction and Power*, ed. Jolyon Howorth and Philip G. Cerny, 5-45 (London: Frances Pinter, 1981); and David Higgs, *Nobles in Nineteenth-Century France: The Practice of Inegalitarianism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

[8] In addition to works by Jean Tulard, Claude-Isabelle Brélot, Natalie Petiteau, and Eric Mension-Rigau cited above, see Suzanne Fiette, *La Noblesse française des Lumières à la Belle Époque: psychologie d'une adaptation* (Paris: Perrin, 1997); Michel Figeac, *Les noblesses en France: du XVIIe au milieu du XIXe siècle* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2013); Christian de Bartillat, *Histoire de la noblesse française de 1789 à nos jours (1789-1989)*, 2 vols. (Paris: A. Michel, 1988-1991); Steve Kale, *French Salons: High Society and Political Sociability from the Old Regime to the Revolution of 1848* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

[9] Just to cite two examples, among many others: Georges Dupeux, *La société française, 1789-1960* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1964) and Christophe Charle, *Histoire sociale de la France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1991).

Steven Kale  
Washington State University  
[kale@wsu.edu](mailto:kale@wsu.edu)

Copyright © 2019 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither

bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172