

H-France Review Vol. 19 (November 2019), No. 217

Stewart McCain. *The Language Question under Napoleon*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. Tables, figures, notes, bibliography and index. Xv + 307 pp. \$109.99 U.S. (hb). ISBN: 978-3-319-54935-4.

Review by Paul Cohen, University of Toronto.

In a series of works first published in the 1980s and early 1990s, and since become historiographic classics, Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm, and Terence Ranger argued that nationalism was a recent, nineteenth-century invention, and that older narratives positing modern nation-states to be political and cultural forms whose origins could be traced far and continuously back in time were nothing short of “invented traditions.”[1] Looking back over three decades of scholarship, these clearly represent a watershed in the scholarly understanding of the history of nationalism, a fierce warning against the dangers of teleology and anachronism. Historians of France, for their part, had not waited for Anderson *et al.* to begin arguing for the specifically modern character of French national identity. First published in 1976, Eugen Weber’s *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France* has come to occupy a similar place in the historiography on French national identity.[2]

The history of language has played a central role in this historiographical turn. The Third Republic’s great philologists and literary scholars integrated the history of the French language into the story of a precociously unified national community, tied together by a vernacular and a strong central state. Holder of the chair in medieval language and literature at the Collège de France, the Romance philologist Gaston Paris sketched out the medieval foundations for this narrative.[3] From his perch at the Sorbonne, where he held the chair in the history of the French language, Ferdinand Brunot piloted the mammoth *Histoire de la langue française*, a sprawling, deeply researched work of erudition which laid out a doxa for the French language’s role in French history that has largely held to this day.[4] Auguste Brun, one of Brunot’s many students who worked on the *Histoire de la langue française*, published a series of important studies analyzing how the French monarchy imposed French on the Occitan-speaking south in the early modern period.[5]

If nation-states and the nationalist ideologies that legitimate them are recent inventions, as Anderson *et alia* maintained, then the entire doxa that Brunot and his colleagues had patiently built up concerning the place of language in the history of France needed to be challenged. Already in 1924, in a review essay of Auguste Brun’s *thèse*, the co-founder of the *Annales* Lucien Febvre attacked narratives that privileged state action to account for cultural change, arguing that it was the French language’s increasing social and cultural prestige which drew elites to it,

not royal fiat. Indeed, Febvre, who took a particular interest in language, laid out an ambitious sociocultural program for the history of language.[6]

Fittingly, it was a trio of third-generation *Annales* historians who finally took up Febvre's long-ignored call when, a year before *Peasants into Frenchmen* was published, Michel de Certeau, Dominique Julia, and Jacques Revel produced their groundbreaking study of language policy and the production of ethnolinguistic knowledge during the Revolution, *Une politique de la langue*.[7] In it, they underscored just how radical a break the Jacobin project to disseminate French throughout France and stamp out its regional idioms really was with the politico-linguistic order that had come before. A reordering of French society along democratic and egalitarian lines, they argued, entailed overturning a linguistically stratified Old Regime social order. The Jacobins themselves saw their project to homogenize France's linguistic cultures as a profound rupture with the Old Regime. As the abbé Jean-Baptiste Grégoire put it in 1794, the same year that he presented his report on how "to annihilate the patois and ... universalize the use of the French language" to the Convention, he warned his fellow citizens of the dangers of sociolinguistic plurality: "bientôt renaîtra cette aristocratie qui jadis employait le patois pour montrer son affabilité protectrice à ceux qu'on appelait insolemment les petites gens. Bientôt la société sera réinfectée de gens comme il faut; la liberté des suffrages sera restreinte, ... et ... entre deux classes séparées s'établira une sorte de hiérarchie. Ainsi l'ignorance de la langue compromettrait le bonheur social ou détruirait l'égalité." [8]

Since then, a growing body of scholarship has fleshed out this picture. Weber himself acknowledged the Revolutionary origins of French linguistic nationalism, and devoted a chapter in *Peasants into Frenchmen* to the Third Republic's efforts to spread French through schooling.[9] *Occitanistes* set out to explore the rich corpus of Occitan-language texts produced in the early phase of the Revolution, when the official policy was to accommodate, rather than combat, linguistic plurality through the systematic translation of all political texts.[10] In his study of the invention of French nationalism in the Revolution, David Bell argued that it was precisely the close association of regional tongues with the Catholic clergy, who in the Old Regime had pursued an aggressive policy of preaching and catechizing in local vernaculars, that invested them with political charge and drew Jacobins' ire in the Revolution's radical phase.[11] Early modernists have sought to reconstruct a historical sociology of a profoundly multilingual France, to historicize the political relationship between French and Crown, and to map the political and cultural matrix in which the *Académie française* took shape and pursued its activities.[12]

Though old myths die hard, and the traditional narrative positing the existence of a continuous, long-term, state-piloted language-planning policy focused on disseminating French remains a staple of most discourse on the question,[13] the best works on the question have (at least in my view) convincingly demonstrated the significance of the Revolution as a profound break in the political conception of language.

Stewart McCain's richly researched and thought-provoking new book is the latest contribution to the scholarly conversation on the Revolutionary invention of French linguistic nationalism. In it, he proposes to focus on a relatively underexamined chapter in this broader story—the fate of state-sanctioned language planning under Napoléon. While this is not entirely untilled ground, McCain's is the first comprehensive, book-length treatment of the subject. He also frames his monograph as a contribution to a broader renewal of our understanding of state-formation in the Napoleonic period, following Stuart Woolf, Isser Woloch, Michael Broers, Rowe

and others who make the case for seeing the Consulate and Empire as decisive chapters in state-formation and modernization.[14] But this is above all a sustained case for bringing the Napoleonic regime into the story as a decisive crucible in which modern French language planning took shape.

The book's argument is as simple as it is significant: "a form of linguistic imperialism was a feature of French political and social power structures during the Napoleonic period" (p. 5). McCain proposes to analyze state language-planning efforts in France and its annexed territories in a broader social context, underscoring its negotiated character and the complex realities of a multilingual world. In his first introductory chapter, he lays out a methodological approach inspired first by Broers's notion of "cultural imperialism," second by the concept of "diglossia" first developed by Charles Ferguson, one of the founders of sociolinguistics, to describe societies in which different languages or linguistic registers of varying prestige are associated with distinct social groups,[15] and finally Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of the use of language as an instrument of social domination.[16] Drawing on a rich array of archival sources, McCain shows that while the Napoleonic regime was committed to "linguistic imperialism" (p. 5), actual policy was brokered and put into practice by a range of local elites who, facing a range of cultural, pragmatic, and political pressures, left considerable slack in order to accommodate linguistic difference.

McCain's second chapter analyzes government efforts to gather information on language practice in France as a manifestation of the kind of state-centered gaze that James Scott argues is a characteristic feature of modernity.[17] To this end, he makes good use of two remarkable sources. The first are the reports on each *département* compiled by the *Bureau de la Statistique*, based on reports filed by prefects, which furnished ample linguistic evidence. The second is the titanic investigation into regional tongues that was piloted between 1806 and 1812 by Charles Coquebert de Montbret, as head of the Interior Ministry's *Bureau de la Statistique*, with the help of his son. These sources represent a prolongation of sorts of the ethnolinguistic inquiry launched by Grégoire in 1790 (and studied by de Certeau, Julia, and Revel), the manifestation of an altogether novel state desire to gather information on language practice in order to better modify it. While Coquebert's enterprise has already been studied, notably by Robert Merle and Sven Ködel in an important recent study (the latter oddly not cited here), McCain makes an interesting case that these rich sources communicate a kind of post-Enlightenment, post-Revolutionary epistemology, aimed at documenting rural backwardness in order to ameliorate society and forward the cause of progress.[18]

Chapter three trawls this same corpus of sources (and especially Coquebert's remarkable study) for material with which to sketch a sociolinguistic portrait of the Empire. McCain demonstrates just how multilingual and socio-linguistically stratified Napoleonic France was, and how weighed upon local notables were by social pressure to adopt prestigious forms of French. He also underscores how some local notables took pride in local languages, seeing in them a kind of "patrimony" studied and even celebrated in institutions like the *Académie celtique* (p. 99).

McCain's discussion in chapter three of just how deeply rooted in local experience contemporaries' conceptions of dialectal boundaries were is especially interesting. As he makes clear, the source material offers a remarkable window into contemporary linguistic epistemologies and ways of seeing. In his telling, the Coqueberts' linguistic enquiry embodies a fascinating confrontation between, on the one hand, an elite form of linguistic knowledge,

exemplified by the merging scientific categories of language and dialect, and, on the other, the linguistic categories mobilized by their informants to describe their local vernaculars, grounded on village or neighborhood. McCain is to my mind less convincing when he chalks up the finely grained distinctions drawn by Coqueberts' local informants to "the tendency of locals to draw fine distinctions between the speech of geographically proximate groups, defining the limits of linguistic communities on the basis of local social distinctions and urban rivalries" (p. 70). Localized definitions of language in fact enjoyed a long history in both learned and vernacular culture in France, characterized by their fluidity, reflective of the lived experience of significant dialectal variation, and even celebrated in elite literary production.[19]

It is also not entirely clear to what extent the Coqueberts' own categories really embodied the language/dialect categories of modern linguistics (according to McCain, "they organised languages according to their formal linguistic features" [p. 68]). In the Coqueberts' own figures for the number of speakers of various languages in France, they grouped Occitan and Francoprovençal together under "French ... in its different dialects and patois," while classifying Basque, Breton, Flemish, German, and Italian in separate categories (pp. 46, 68). Why lump French, Occitan, and Francoprovençal together—which most linguists today would classify as distinct Romance languages—but not their Romance cousin Italian? While they clearly occupy a significant place in the history of the construction of modern linguistic knowledge, the Coqueberts' categories also echo a set of longstanding early modern classificatory regimes that mixed formal linguistic features (Romance affinities) with political realities (Occitan was a language of the French kingdom) and value-laden sociolinguistic hierarchies (as less prestigious idioms, Occitan and Francoprovençal might not merit broad language categories of their own).[20]

Turning to the institutions with which the Napoleonic regime set out to disseminate French, McCain explores the place of language in formal education in chapter four. The Convention had voted the creation of a national state school system that would have been charged with putting the Jacobin linguistic project into practice, but this largely remained a dead leader thanks to political instability and lack of money. As McCain ably retraces, under the Directory, the Consulate, and the Empire, the state patiently built a national (fee-paying) school system, and a centralized educational infrastructure and university system charged with managing and staffing it, that was charged (in theory at least) with spreading French. In reality, McCain documents numerous examples of linguistic accommodation—teachers using local tongues in the classroom to help children who did not understand French for example, a pragmatic approach to juggling multiple idioms in the classroom similar to what Jean-François Chanet uncovered in his important study of schooling during the Third Republic.[21] Interestingly, McCain shows that linguistic accommodation went considerably further in the Napoleonic period. In the Rhin-et-Moselle, for example, under pressure from the local community and desperate for families who could pay full freight, the prefect authorized the use of German in the *lycée* (pp. 138-139).

Chapter five explores the role of the army in the spread of French. If Napoleonic officials saw in military service a means to Frenchify Imperial subjects, sociolinguistic facts on the ground forced them to take measures to accommodate linguistic differences within military units. For McCain, while the army doubtless served as a crucible for the dissemination of French, the necessities of making a multilingual social organization function created pragmatic imperatives, and commanders in fact made extensive efforts to accommodate linguistic difference within the ranks.

In chapter six, McCain turns to language practice in the judicial system. In his telling, courts were not just weapons in the campaign to impose uniformity of law across the Empire, but in that to impose French as well. The chapter is especially convincing in how the court system, and the requirement that legal personnel speak, read, and write French in particular, created significant pressures on local elites to learn French. Throughout, courts had no choice but to engage in a complex negotiation of written and spoken expression, of the constraints of legal procedure, and of the vagaries of oral testimony. McCain documents how efforts to impose French on judicial practice encountered numerous problems on the ground, ranging from pragmatic difficulties of intercomprehension with non-francophone populations to active resistance from local communities. In response, French authorities adopted a range of accommodations, which took the form of exceptions, postponements, and even formalized bilingualism in some courts. His research here is impressive, and the evidence for extensive negotiation and compromise in the courts is compelling.

But McCain goes further, arguing that the use of French as an official idiom of law and judicial practice, on the one hand, and the accommodation of the linguistic capacities of people called to testify, on the other, represented something of a novelty, a “French legal model” forged during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods (p. 193). Such an argument elides important continuities between early modern and Napoleonic judicial practice. To be sure, he briefly acknowledges Old Regime precedents (p. 205), but McCain makes no mention of the abundant legislative and jurisprudential apparatus that regulated legal translation in early modern courtrooms (most notably the linguistic dispositions of Louis XIV’s 1670 Criminal Ordinance). For McCain, “It is unclear why the issue of language, so prominent in the discussion over appointments of *greffiers* in non-francophone annexed territories and the Basque- and Breton-speaking areas of western France, should be obscure in Romance-speaking France” (p. 198). This distinction was however already deeply embedded in the Old Regime judicial system, and the monarchy and its officers were quite explicit that Occitan, because it was so closely-related to French and embedded in communities in which polyglot elites were perfectly comfortable in both, did not fall under the dispositions governing judicial translation.^[22] For this reason, McCain is mistaken when he remarks that courts in the Occitan-speaking south who eschewed interpreters ran the risk of seeing their decisions overturned on procedural grounds (p. 204). To a very real extent, McCain’s material suggests that what he calls the “French model” was itself modeled on a well-defined Old Regime framework for judicial translation.

Chapter seven’s analysis of the Catholic Church’s use of language formulates the book’s perhaps most surprising argument. Despite the pastoral imperative to shepherd a multilingual flock in its various vernaculars, the Church in the Napoleonic period in fact proved little inclined to preach and catechize in local tongues, in sharp contrast (as McCain points out) to the role that the French Church played later in the nineteenth century as a great defender of regional cultures. He accounts for this by pointing to the clergy’s desire to mark itself off from the lower orders by embracing the language of social distinction. What is less clear in McCain’s telling is how an institution that had been so deeply committed to evangelization and pastoral care in local vernaculars under the Old Regime could shift linguistic gears so quickly.^[23] Might the violent shocks endured by the Church during the Revolution, the loss of numerous priests to exile or the Terror, and the transformation of clerical recruitment during the Revolution and after the Concordat sever the Church’s vernacular institutional memory? The examples of ecclesiastical resistance to the vernacular documented here call for further study.

McCain's book makes a convincing case for the importance of the Napoleonic period—long a neglected chapter in the canonical history of the French language—in the construction of a recognizably modern national language policy in France. For those wedded to the notion that the real project to use French to unify France only began in earnest with the Third Republic's *hussards noirs*, as Eugen Weber argued (tempered as it happens by a commitment to linguistic accommodation, as Chanet cautioned), McCain has shown the Napoleonic regime to have been a decisive precursor, building an administrative, educational, and judicial infrastructure committed, at least nominally, to linguistic unity, upon which the Third Republic could later build. His research demonstrates the archives' remarkable potential for shedding light on the social history of language in this period. *The Language Question under Napoleon* will be required reading for scholars interested in the intersection between language, nationalism, and state formation in France.

But McCain's book also begs an important question, one that is never really posed, and is therefore left unanswered. Its very title evokes the famous, polymorphous *questione della lingua*: the debates first waged by Italian humanists over which of the many literary forms of Italian was best, whether one should serve as a standard across the peninsula (and if so, which one?); and the later, very different arguments over language, Italian identity, and the vexed question of Italian unity and nationhood. A version of the *questione della lingua* was imported across the Alps into France in the sixteenth century, largely inspired by Italian models but whose terms were modified to resonate with the French context (most notably with Joachim Du Bellay's *Deffence et Illustration de la langue française*). In the Renaissance case, this was a literary debate about the appropriate medium and form of literary expression. The issue was political only to the extent that its protagonists enjoyed princely patronage and placed their pens in the service of their lords. As de Certeau, Julia, Revel, Bell and others have shown, it is only with the Revolution that the much broader project of using French to unify the national community as a whole came into being. The notion of a *questione della lingua*, then, needs to be understood not as a self-evident process—the natural rise of national vernaculars in state- and nation-formation, say—but as a historical interrogation, a historically specific and contingent linguistic problem.

So why precisely did the Napoleonic Regime seek to impose linguistic homogeneity? What precisely was the nature of this “cultural imperialism”? There can be no doubt that “Unifying the language of what was a linguistically diverse population was clearly a priority for the Napoleonic regime ... For the Napoleonic administrator, state building, the unification of the diverse territories of the Empire and the integration of its culturally diverse populations was a mission” (pp. 273-274). But what precisely did this mission entail? What place was linguistic unity to play in the Imperial polity under construction? What were the ultimate goals and objectives of its architects? Full linguistic homogeneity? The spread of French among elites? The creation of a francophone administration across the Empire? Was multilingualism an acceptable perspective in the long term, and if so, on what terms? McCain never provides a full-blown rationale for its language-planning policies, instead invoking a range of rationales—“centralization,” “modernization,” “integration,” “homogenisation”—which are never defined. These may well have been the rationales and motivations of the Napoleonic regime, but we need to know more about the political and linguistic modernity that drove this project.

To a real extent, McCain's argument rests on the presumption that, once the Jacobin policy on language had been laid down under the Convention, the French state simply pursued it during the Directory, Consulate, and Empire. In his telling, the abbé Grégoire's “admonitions to

regenerate the population of France through a shared tongue appeared more pertinent than ever as the expanding borders of the Empire made its population ever more linguistically diverse” (pp. 84–85). But Grégoire conceived of the ambition to spread French and stamp out the patois as a means to create a democratic and egalitarian republic, to facilitate the dissemination of new laws, and to make free debate and discussion among all citizens possible. Why did the commitment to French persist as the franchise narrowed under the Directory, or as the very principle of representative government was done away with, the nobility recreated, and a police state instituted under Bonaparte? McCain acknowledges as much: “The Napoleonic regime shared this vision of education as a tool for shaping the population, although the values to be inculcated alongside patriotism were dynastic loyalty and social order, rather than democratic liberty” (p. 118). The ways in which the relationship between linguistic unity and political community were reconceptualized between the Jacobin First Republic and the Napoleonic regime remain insufficiently unexplored here.

McCain evokes other explanations which are more consistent with the rationalities of an authoritarian state. The dissemination of French was intended “to facilitate the exercise of government of business,” and “Those employed by the Napoleonic state to oversee the country’s education system shared a vision of the school as a handmaiden of a broader project of cultural imperialism intended to bind a linguistically diverse population to the state” (pp. 102, 142). Here then, is a language ideology fit for a police state—deploy a common tongue in order to create pliable, obedient subjects. But it is one that shared little in common with Grégoire’s vision.

It is possible, too, to discern in McCain’s material a more complex vision at work in state policy and practice towards linguistic plurality. Consider the mechanisms of linguistic accommodation so wonderfully documented here. McCain typically analyzes these as deviations from a language-planning norm (linguistic unity), forced on the state by local resistance and the pragmatic realities of an uncomprehending local populace. But rather than explain these accommodations away as products of “negotiation,” might we not see them as consistent with an explicit and self-conscious acknowledgment that the Imperial polity was—and was destined to remain—a multilingual community (albeit one in which French would play a preeminent and uncontested role)? Such an approach would make it easier to account for why, in 1809, French authorities issued a decree declaring that “the peoples of the department of Tuscany are, of all the peoples of old Italy, those who speak the most perfect Italian dialect, and that *it is important for the glory of the Empire* and for that of letters that this elegant and fecund language be spread in all its purity” (p. 192, reviewer’s emphasis).

Such an approach might also offer a fuller explanation for the Coqueberts’ research on local tongues. For McCain, the departmental statistics on language and Coqueberts’ study provide a road map to the “ideological character” of the Napoleonic language project (p. 275). But it is also possible to read these in very different terms. Themselves deeply skeptical of the state’s capacity to modify language practice in any substantive way (as McCain himself acknowledges [p. 52]), the Coqueberts, seem almost to have been running a private ethnolinguistic research enterprise out of the *Bureau de la Statistique*, one animated by an antiquarian thirst for personal knowledge. It was a project they would pursue long after the regime shut the *Bureau* down in 1812 (for its incapacity to produce information in a timely manner), ultimately publishing the fruits of their investigation under the July Monarchy. In this view, the remarkable Coquebert archive offers insight not into the way the state saw language, but rather how learned elites did—and how, to a very real extent, they embraced a (sociolinguistically stratified) plurality of tongues.

For all its (considerable) merits, then, McCain's book also represents a missed opportunity. What is absent here is an intellectual and cultural history of the idea of French as national and official language in the Napoleonic period. To a certain extent, the book takes for granted that the commitment to the dissemination of French "transcended the political divisions of the Revolution" (p. 123). That some kind of language project traversed the period between 1789 and 1815 and its repeated regime changes, represents something of a historical conundrum. *The Language Question under Napoleon* underscores the need for a detailed understanding of how French was repeatedly reimagined as a necessary element of various political projects after Thermidor.

NOTES

[1] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins of Nationalism* (1983), 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1992); Eric Hosbsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (1983) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[2] Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870-1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976). On the book's importance in the historiography, see the dossier on "Revisiting Eugen Weber's *Peasants into Frenchmen*" published in *French Politics, Culture and Society* 37, no. 2 (2009).

[3] On the historical importance of Gaston Paris, and Romance philology more broadly, see Bernard Cerquiglini, *Une Langue orpheline* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 2007).

[4] Ferdinand Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à nos jours*, 13 vols. (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1905-1953). On the work's importance, see Jean-Claude Chevalier, "L'Histoire de la langue française de Ferdinand Brunot," in *Les lieux de mémoire*, III, *Les France*, 2, *Traditions*, ed. Pierre Nora (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), pp. 421-59.

[5] Auguste Brun, *L'Introduction de la langue française en Béarn et en Roussillon* (Paris: Edouard Champion, 1923); Auguste Brun, *Recherches historiques sur l'introduction du français dans les provinces du midi* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1923). See also Auguste Brun, *Parlers régionaux. France dialectale et unité française* (Paris: Didier, 1946).

[6] Lucien Febvre, "Politique royale ou civilisation française? Remarques sur un problème d'histoire linguistique," *Revue de synthèse historique* 38 (1924): 37-53, reviewing Brun's *thèse*, *L'Introduction*, as well as Brun, *Recherches historiques*. For Febvre's broader interest in language, see also Febvre, "Langue et nationalité en France au XVIIIe siècle," *Revue de Synthèse Historique* 42 (1926): 19-40, and the section on "La Linguistique" in Febvre, *Combats pour l'histoire* (1952) (Paris: Armand Colin, 1992).

[7] Michel de Certeau, Dominique Julia, and Jacques Revel, *Une Politique de la langue. La Révolution française et les patois: L'enquête de Grégoire* (1975) (Paris: Gallimard, 2002).

[8] Quoted in De Certeau *et al.*, *Une Politique*, p. 303.

[9] Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen*, ch. 6.

[10] Henri Boyer, Georges Fournier, Philippe Gardy, Philippe Martel, René Merle, and François Pic, eds., *Le Texte occitan de la période révolutionnaire (1788-1800): Inventaire, approches, lectures* (Montpellier: Section française de l'Association Internationale d'Études Occitanes, 1989).

[11] David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), ch. 6. See also: David A. Bell, "Nation-Building and Cultural Particularism in Eighteenth-Century France: The Case of Alsace," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 21, no. 4 (1988): 472-90; David A. Bell, "Lingua Populi, Lingua Dei: Language, Religion, and the Origins of French Revolutionary Nationalism," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 51 (1995): 403-37.

[12] See for example Danielle Trudeau, *Les Inventeurs du bon usage (1529-1647)* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1992); Paul Cohen, "Courtly French, Learned Latin, and Peasant Patois: The Making of a National Language in Early Modern France," Ph.D Dissertation, Princeton University (2001); Hélène Merlin, "Langue et souveraineté en France au XVIIe siècle: La production autonome d'un corps de langage," *Annales HSS*, no. 2 (1994): 369-94; Christian Jouhaud, *Les Pouvoirs de la littérature. Histoire d'un paradoxe* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000); Hélène Merlin-Kajman, *L'Excentricité académique. Littérature, institution, société* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001); Paul Cohen, "Langues et pouvoirs politiques en France sous l'Ancien Régime : cinq anti-lieux de mémoire pour une contre-histoire de la langue française", in Serge Lusignan, France Martineau, Yves Charles Morin, and Paul Cohen, *L'Introuvable unité du français. Contacts et variations linguistiques en Europe et en Amérique (XIIe-XVIIIe siècle)* (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2011), pp. 109-143.

[13] See for example Douglas A. Kibbee, "L'Hégémonie du français, l'hégémonie d'un certain français : statut et corpus de la langue française," in Salikoko Mufwene and Cécile Vigouroux, eds., *Colonisation, globalisation et vitalité du français* (Paris: Odile Jacob, 2014), pp. 279-310.

[14] Stuart J. Woolf, *Napoleon's Integration of Europe* (London: Routledge, 1991); Isser Woloch, *The New Regime: Transformations of the French Civic Order, 1789-1820s* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1994); Michael Broers, *Napoleonic Imperialism and the Savoyard Monarchy, 1773-1821: State Building in Piedmont* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1997); Michael Rowe, *From Reich to State: The Rhineland in the Revolutionary Age, 1780-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[15] For a guide to sociolinguistics that explores the notion of diglossia, see Robert Bayley, Richard Cameron, and Ceil Lucas, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

[16] Pierre Bourdieu, *Ce que parler veut dire. L'économie des échanges linguistiques* (Paris: Fayard, 1982).

[17] James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), who briefly discusses the language question in early modern France, pp. 72-73.

[18] Robert Merle, *Visions de l'« idiome natal » à travers l'enquête impériale sur les patois (1807-1812)—Langue d'oc, catalan, franco-provençal (France, Italie, Suisse)* (Canet: Trabucaire, 2010); Sven Ködel, *Die Enquete Coquebert de Montbret (1806-1812). Die Sprachen und Dialekte Frankreichs und die Wahrnehmung der französischen Sprachlandschaft während des Ersten Kaiserreichs* (Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press, 2014).

[19] See for example Paul Cohen, “Qu'est-ce que c'est que le français? Les destins d'une catégorie linguistique, XVIe-XVIIIe siècle,” in *Repenser l'histoire du français?*, ed. Dominique Lagorgette (Chambéry: Éditions de l'Université de Savoie, 2015), pp. 139-62.

[20] See for ex. Cohen, “Qu'est-ce que c'est que le français?”; Paul Cohen, “Torture and Translation in the Multilingual Courtrooms of Early Modern France,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (2016): 899-939.

[21] Jean-François Chanet, *L'École républicaine et les petites patries* (Paris: Aubier, 1996).

[22] See for example Cohen, “Torture and Translation.”

[23] See for example: Christian Anatole, “La réforme tridentine et l'emploi de l'occitan dans la pastorale,” *Revue des Langues Romanes* 77 (1967): 1-29; Jean-B. Séguy, “Langue, religion et société : Alain de Solminihac et l'application de la réforme tridentine dans le diocèse de Cahors (1637-1659),” *Annales de l'Institut d'Études Occitanes* 5, no. 1 (1977): 79-110; Jean Eygun, “L'Occitan dans la pastorale catholique au XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. Premières recherches dans les diocèses gascons,” *Lengas* 31 (1992): 39-68; Bell, “Lingua Populi, Lingua Dei”; Dominique Deslandres, *Croire et faire croire. Les missions françaises au XVIIe siècle (1600-1650)* (Paris: Fayard, 2003).

Paul Cohen
University of Toronto
p.cohen@utoronto.ca

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