

---

H-France Review Vol. 16 (September 2016), No. 186

Sarah Horowitz, *Friendship and Politics in Post-Revolutionary France*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2014. xi + 227 pp. Illustrations, figures, appendices, notes, bibliography, and index. \$82.95 U.S. (cl.) ISBN 978-0-271-06192-4.

Review by Siân Reynolds, University of Stirling.

Love, trust, friendship, trauma: historians of the revolutionary and post-revolutionary period have recently been exploring emotions and personal lives more than in the past. The focus has often been the family or sexual relations, but friendship is receiving increasing attention.[1] Sarah Horowitz's erudite book contributes both to this subject and to political studies of the period 1815-1848, a time when France was governed by "a tiny oligarchy" (p. 116). Under the Bourbons, only 90,000 of the wealthiest men in the country had the vote, a number expanded to only 200,000 after 1830. Politics happened largely in Paris, and many of the men involved as political actors at higher levels would have known each other by sight. Some of them were even friends. But could they trust one another? Friendships in such circles are the subject of this book.

These were still quite dangerous times. Although the term "trauma" is used in this study chiefly to refer to the legacy of the Revolution, a wave of disturbances, score-settling, and death or exile sentences marked the second Restoration in 1815, after the Hundred Days, (p. 44), and the practices of surveillance and eavesdropping continued from previous times into the 1820s. Nor was the age of revolution over. In her opening contextualizing chapters, Sarah Horowitz refers to the central problem of trust. After two decades or more of regime change, and in the absence of political parties, she argues, friendship could operate as the not always reliable cement of political groupings and, understandably, trust was its central component.

A pre-publication reader claims on the jacket, perhaps a little tongue in cheek, that Horowitz "brings the world of Facebook into the realm of post-revolutionary France." She has certainly taken social networks as the center of her study: those of Parisian politics during the Restoration and the July Monarchy. And she explicitly refers to the Internet as a stimulus to network analysis in recent historical research (p. 92). Borrowed from sociology with a pinch of mathematics, network analysis has been around in one form or another for some time, and it is here deployed in some detail.[3] "Network" is a keyword throughout, although Horowitz also refers to "factions" and "circles." Interestingly, she avoids the term "coterie," which might have been how some of these networks were viewed from outside, though she does quote Henry James's much later observation that in France "there are more camps and coteries and 'sets' than among Anglo-Saxons" (p. 160).

Her book focuses on the socio-political networks surrounding three well-known and very long-lived figures who spanned the political spectrum in the early nineteenth century: the popular songwriter, Pierre Jean de Béranger (1780-1857), identified as a radical/liberal; the literary lion, François-René de Chateaubriand (1768-1848), taken here to represent (mostly) the right wing in politics;[3] and the establishment politician, François Guizot (1787-1874), somewhere in between—he was after all the man

of the “juste milieu.” The latter two have left copious records of their lives and contacts. For Béranger there is less, and his contacts were not always from high society, but the cast of characters surrounding them is huge (bewildering even) and the research extensive. The names and titles used in the book, especially those of married women, are often long and confusing. Although the three central figures are men, one important and welcome feature of this book is indeed the serious attention it pays to the women with whom they were friendly, and who, Horowitz argues, provided key connections that could crucially traverse political divides.

The sources for her study are deep and varied, the most important being private correspondence: Guizot’s alone runs to thousands of items. The Facebook reference is not quite accurate in the circumstances since these communications were far from fast-reaction ones, and Horowitz says that without this paper trail we would be in the dark. Memoirs, biographies, and fiction from the period are also cited. One long and illuminating passage refers, for example, to the role of friendship in a section of Balzac’s *Illusions perdues* (1839), but this is not the world of Horowitz’s subjects, who are mostly from the social elite, often titled, if not always wealthy.

The apparatus surrounding her findings is impressive, although the book’s layout means one has to work quite hard to apply it. It includes a helpful biographical appendix, covering the chief members of each of the three circles. At the heart of the book, chapter four contains some very detailed organigrammes of the three circles at selected points in time (the late 1820s and the mid-1840s) showing their links and intersections. A second appendix at the end reproduces the same figures with more information, including lists of names identifying the dots on the diagrams. There are too many of these names, however, to appear in what is otherwise a remarkable index, with unusually full analytical subject entries. While the diagrams repay close study and are central to the whole enterprise, I think they must have been more fun to construct than they are to read. Horowitz’s publishers at Penn State have not served her particularly well with them, allowing rather little space on the page and a hard-to-read key. Nor are the notes very user-friendly. Readers of this monograph, most likely specialists, will surely want to see the very interesting notes, but they are not on the page, and they use a short reference system for the bibliography, which means turning to two separate places, all printed very faintly in what looks like 9-point type.

These grouses aside, it is a fascinating book. The structure is not chronological, but thematic (at the risk, perhaps inevitably, of some repetition, and Horowitz also hedges her claims with many scrupulous caveats.) She concentrates primarily on two kinds of relations. The first, and the most fully documented, is friendship between men. Because of the need for trust, such connections were by and large between men who were like-minded politically. Politics therefore looms large in their relations, although one of Horowitz’s findings is that political divisions among the elite abated somewhat in the July Monarchy. But all-male friendships could also be emotionally intense. These men had read Cicero’s *De Amicitiae* and Montaigne’s Essay *De l’Amitié* (“parce que c’était lui, parce que c’était moi”). Horowitz remarks that to us their expressions of love can sometimes (like Montaigne’s) sound erotic, but she also points out the fluidity of attitudes at the time, the widespread celebration of male affection, and also the restraint imposed by political necessity. Her book starts with a particularly close example, that of Béranger and his friend Manuel, who thought alike politically. Neither of them was married, and they would be buried in the same tomb.

If men’s friendships were primarily between political allies, women were not so bound. Precisely because they were formally excluded from politics, Horowitz argues, they were able to maintain links with men from differing political camps. Her second main focus is therefore the friendship that was possible between these men and certain elite women in a position to host social gatherings, here generally referred to as “salons” (a rather slippery term, but maybe the only one we have). Women-only friendships are not considered, since, as Horowitz says, they would require a different book. But she has produced some convincing findings about the degree to which women such as Hortense Allart, Mme de

Brogie, and Mme de Montcalm (to take three with long index entries) were able to provide what she describes in her last chapter as “the bonds of concord” across factional lines. This point is well illustrated by Guizot, writing to Dorothea von Lieven in 1837. He tells her that he cannot maintain friendships with men of political views different from his own, but “you, Madame, should without hesitation make the most of your privilege as a woman; be fair to everyone, good to everyone, friendly to all those who deserve it. What is better or more rare than fairness and friendship?” (p. 110). Interestingly, most of these functional relationships are seen as being between men and women who were not (or no longer) in sexual liaisons. At one point, Horowitz is even tempted to describe the relation between Guizot’s friend Barante and the reassuring duchesse de Dino as “an extended therapy session” (p. 69), and she comments that while men’s friendships with each other might bring “tangible benefits,” those with women could offer “psychic relief” (p. 90).

As this last point illustrates, the value of this book lies in the detail, the quotations, and the examples. My copy is covered in pencil markings, including exclamation marks. For anyone interested in the political culture of this period, there is a mass of informal information, based on close reading of primary sources. These teem with revelations: Perusal of Guizot’s archives reveals, for example, that at a crucial moment in his relations with Adolphe Thiers in 1836, he crossed out the salutation “cher ami et collègue” at the head of a letter as too formal, opting for the warmer “cher ami” as a signal not of actual affection, but that he would play the *part* of a friend and not rock the ministerial boat (p. 112). The sections on epistolary conventions are not the least interesting in the book.

As for some wider claims, it is perhaps hard to be too categorical, as Horowitz readily admits. She argues, for example, that the tactful intervention of women “made the political regimes of the Restoration and the July Monarchy viable.” But at the end of the day, friendship was “an old solution” and not always an effective one “to a new problem” (pp. 156–57). The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 were not problems “that friendship could resolve.” The epilogue takes the story briefly to the time of the Dreyfus affair and could well have gone further to the “république des camarades” and indeed to the present day. The apparently benign gender politics of the circles here described were operating before the existence of parties, and in an accepted context where women were explicitly outside politics (though not necessarily politically uninterested or neutral) and were not seeking admission. Today, when recent scandals have revealed the sexual harassment prevalent in French parliamentary milieu, the gender politics at the heart of the French state are very different, and the persistence of male solidarity, camaraderie, and friendship (if that’s what it is?) are being critically scrutinized by women politicians and feminist observers.<sup>[4]</sup> But this book, densely written though it is, and probably appealing in the first instance to an informed readership, is remarkable for the detail with which it shows us another age: a world of emotion, devotion, affection, and coded communication, at the very heart of the political process in the post-Revolutionary period.

## NOTES

[1] See for example William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feelings: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Denise Davidson, *France after Revolution: Urban Life, Gender and the New Social Order*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007); Denise Davidson and Anne Verjus, *Le Roman conjugal. Chroniques de la vie familiale à l’époque de la Révolution et de l’Empire*, (Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2011); Marisa Linton, *Choosing Terror: Virtue, Friendship and Authenticity in the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), published when Horowitz’s book was already in the press; Ronen Steinberg, “Trauma and the Effects of Mass Violence in Revolutionary France: A Critical Inquiry,” *Historical Reflections/Reflexions historiques* 41, no. 3 (2015): 28–46.

[2] Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie constructed in the 1970s an organigramme of the “cabals” at the court of Versailles not so very different from the ones Horowitz devises for this book, though on a smaller scale. Full disclosure: I translated this chapter, originally written in 1976, in E. Le Roy Ladurie, *The Mind and*

---

*Method of the Historian* (Brighton, Harvester 1981, pp. 149-73). Horowitz does refer to this research, but from the same author's later *Saint-Simon and the Court of Louis XIV*, tr. Arthur Goldhammer, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 2001). See also David Bates and Véronique Gazeau, eds. *Liens personnels, réseaux, solidarités, en France et dans les Iles britanniques, XI-Xe siècle* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2006) which refers on the jacket to "la méthode de la 'network analysis'"; see especially Eric Anceau's chapter: "Emile Ollivier, ses réseaux politiques et le pouvoir sous le Second Empire", pp. 237-66.

[3] Although, as Horowitz rightly remarks, Chateaubriand, a bit of a loose cannon in politics, is not easy to characterize, describing himself in 1831 as "a republican by nature, a monarchist by reason, and a legitimist by honour" (p. 108).

[4] Cf. Robert de Jouvenel, *La République des camarades* (Paris: Grasset, 1914) is about instrumental rather than affective ties. For a long perspective on the *habitus* of male politics, reaching up to the twentieth century, see Delphine Gardey, *Le Linge du Palais-Bourbon: corps, matérialité et genre du politique à l'ère de la démocratie* (Lormont: Le Bord de l'Eau, 2015).

Siân Reynolds  
University of Stirling  
[sian.reynolds@stir.ac.uk](mailto:sian.reynolds@stir.ac.uk)

Copyright © 2016 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 edistribution/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