Britain and Britons in Emigrant Retrospective Self-narratives

The prolific writer of autobiographical narratives, Joseph Alexis Walsh, published his *Souvenirs* in 1845. He stated "*On ne passe pas dix ou douze ans dans une terre, quelqu'étrangère qu'elle soit, sans y pousser de profondes racines; quand on la quitte, il y a de profonds déchirements* [one does not spend ten or twelve years in a land, as foreign as it is, without growing deep roots there; one feels deeply heartbroken upon departure]".[1] His perception of repatriation as a second uprooting is unique in emigrant self-narratives. Walsh descended from an Irish Jacobite family settled in Angers since 1685, exceptionally active in the mid-eighteenth century Scottish uprising, that had made its way up France's military nobility while amassing a fortune in the West Indies.[2] In 1790, his father joined the counter-revolutionary armies across the borders; the eight-year old boy followed the rest of his family to the Netherlands, where he attended the English Jesuit College in Liège.[3] In January 1793, the College was repatriated to England.[4] Walsh grew up exiled in Great Britain, and returned to a pacified France in 1802.[5] After the Restoration of 1815, he became a fervent advocate of Legitimist theories. Following 1830, he took the position of editor in chief of *l'Echo de la Jeune France*, a self-styled journal of improvements by Christianity. Drawing on the failures of Ultra-Monarchism under Charles X, this conservative press organ targeted a young-adult audience in favour of revised Legitimist theories. This explains that many of Walsh's statements in his *Souvenirs* stand out from the usual Legitimist nationalist propaganda.

Hard-core Legitimism had regularly denounced British charitable, political, and military efforts in 1793–1815, as machinations to weaken France.[6] This propaganda impacted on the narration of up to twenty-five years of a relatively uneventful cohabitation between exiled Frenchmen and the British host society. Despite his unabashed patriotism, Walsh recognised the importance and benefits of the asylum offered by the British government and civil society to the then despairing exiled Frenchmen.

The majority of the texts examined in this chapter include anecdotes about the writer or an acquaintance, as well as stories on the emigrant group in the host country. These explored, explained and emphasised the boundaries between the righteous self, as an individual and an emigrant, and the unscrupulous others, a cast comprising political opponents, foreigners or entire States. As historians, how should we use self-narratives written after the experience of emigration to understand the intricate relationship between the emigrants, British civil society and authorities, and revolutionised France? How can we bring to light the interactions and interrelations between emigrant and British cultures, when returned emigrants conspicuously underlined and displayed identity differences in their narratives? Until Karine Rance's thesis on self-narratives of noble émigrés in Germany, the genre had been used as an unambiguous and under-contextualised key source to describe emigrant lives between 1789 and 1815. Hence, the current understanding of the emigrants' everyday life in the British Isles is mainly based on the constancy and similarity of examples drawn from a limited and homogeneous compilation of self-narratives. The ambiguities of the genre, sorted under the umbrella terms *Émigré* memoirs or *mémoires d'Emigration*, were not fully questioned. These terms are often misleadingly used to describe a few passages or chapters in a longer and more complicated text, encompassing pre-revolutionary stories as well as tales of returned emigrants in Restoration France. The use of these examples structured and preserved the aristocratic identity of exile at the time of the Revolution. Reduced to stereotypes, the emigrant group, and by opposition the host too, displayed a cohesive identity in the eyes of the observer. Such reading, based on the imperviousness of identities, in particular of national identities, undermines the diversity of migrant experiences and the role of cohabitation in reshaping emigrant and British cultures. Therefore, it is imperative that the historian using self-narratives as primary sources interrogates the impact of the writing and publishing contexts on narrative strategies. Having defined an investigative method, this chapter

will then examine particular instances of narrative discourses on the emigrant-British relationships, in chronological and topical terms. It argues that these discourses borrow from earlier patriotic and cosmopolitan topoi in French literature while being influenced by early nineteenth century discourses on the *patrie* and the nation. It will finally underline the retrospective construction of a historical-national consciousness in returned emigrant discourses.

CHALLENGING MEMORY

Karine Rance proposed a strict methodology to study émigré self-narratives. It is based on the recognition of three determining comprehensive moments: the process of emigration, the writing context and that of publishing.[7] Emigration writing is based on the traumatic experience of relocation. The concept of trauma is evidently anachronistic to emigration; yet it is now considered in social science as a timeless analytical category.[8] In the seminal *Mémorialistes de l'exil*, François Jacob and Henri Rossi introduced the notion that relocation at the time of the French Revolution was at once geographical, social, economical, intellectual and ethical.[9] Self-narratives deal with this traumatic past as an act of remembrance. But, when the time to write comes, this same past has become illusionary, as well as anachronistic, and the author amnesic.[10] Madame de la Tour du Pin mentioned she had little method, and that, aged fifty, her memories were strongly diminished.[11] Discussing the relevance of the title *Souvenirs*, the dramatist Arnault insisted in his preface on the partiality and subjectivity of the act of remembrance. He aimed to present the reader with what he remembered of himself and of others.[12] He suggested the use of the English word 'Reminiscence', as a collection of personal anecdotes, would be better than the almost scientific French *Mémoires*.[13] Bouillé went even further by suggesting that the history of emigration had "*dégénérée en commérage* [degenerated into gossip]" and became fictionalised.[14] The difficulty to remember seems furthermore increased by refuge and uprooting. In 1843, the Comtesse de Boigne affirmed that "*Parfois, il m'a fallu piocher contre ma douleur sans pouvoir la soulever* [I sometimes had to pickaxe against my pain, as I was unable to lift it]".[15]

All the self-narratives presented in this chapter were written after their authors returned to France, with the exception of that of the Comte de Jarnac who died in London in 1812.[16] The earliest narratives considered were written in the 1790s, the latest in the 1850s. This lapse of time

causes a first problem in narrative consistency between the experience and the memory of the experience occurring decades later. Following Paul Ricoeur's precepts, Karine Rance demonstrated that at the time of writing, emigrant authors of self-narratives were still the same individuals, *Idem* (the invariable same), but yet different or *Ipse* (the variable same).[17] While writing, the memoir writers reminisced about their participation in emigration, but the sum of the experiences they had between their exile and the writing process contributed to the formation and transformation of their memories. Since their return to France, emigrants' personal situations and the structures influencing their behaviours and thoughts had further been subjected to continuous changes. Their relationship with their British friends, benefactors, and allies had changed too. Moreover, memory is inevitably tainted by the context of its production. The previous chapter established that the memory of emigration was the subject of a propagandist battle in Restoration then Orleanist France. The émigré group was a political outsider from the moment it left France to its successful return in 1815. Following the Restoration of the Monarchy and the Congress of Vienna, this same group regained its socially dominant position in France. Its relation to the then host country turned from that of a recipient of benevolence and strategic ally to that of a challenger in a renewed European political context. This is why self-narrations should be read as a reinvention of the émigré/emigrant public persona.

A similar awareness of the publishing context is required when studying self-narratives, especially in the absence of original manuscripts.[18] Publishing modifies the status of self-narratives by offering to a large public a private manuscript allegedly and initially destined for close relatives and friends. The anthropologist and specialist of the social production of nationalist memory in traumatic situations, Liisa Malkki insists that "rather than be silent or apologetic about the editing process, a theoretically principled ethnography must be self-conscious and explicit about the motives and justifications for its editing strategies".[19] In other words, the act of editing is not innocent. In this sample of self-narratives, publishers and editors have often felt authorized to modify manuscripts and first editions in the absence of the latter, in light of political, literary and historiographical fashions. In 1825, the Comtesse de Genlis wrote her *Mémoires inédits sur le Dix-Huitième siècle et la Révolution française depuis 1756 jusqu'à nos jours*.[20] Her publisher, Ladvocat, had much expertise in publishing *Mémoires*. According to a claim posterior to the Comtesse's death, Ladvocat had pushed the novelist to add several

comments and extracts to her manuscript for commercial reasons.[21] Georgette Ducrest, her niece, maintained the *Mémoires* were initially 160 pages. Ladvocat's edition includes 10 volumes, each containing between 350 and 420 pages.[22] The publisher's unscrupulous methods were not unknown to Ducrest herself, as she had accused him of having added apocryphal letters attributed to Joséphine Bonaparte to a manuscript she sold him.[23]

The example of Madame de Genlis gives further evidence that some self-narratives had a life beyond their author's. In 1855, Georgette Ducrest produced a revised and abridged edition of her aunt's narrative. Her publisher, Gustave Barba, specialised in illustrated best sellers.[24] Ducrest was ruined at the time of publication; her husband, the harpist Bochsa, had fled to London after a corruption scandal. She might have paid off her debts with this new edition. She admits she did not consult her aunt's original manuscript. Instead, she extracted the 160 pages she considered original from Ladvocat's edition. She also changed the title to *Mémoires de Mme de Genlis sur la Cour, la Ville et les Salons de Paris.* The title chosen by Genlis and Ladvocat set the narration as a reflection on the self and its experience of times of historical significance. This new and commercial title suggested it was a corpus of gossips on the elite of a recent past. Worthy of note, Ducrest and her aunt did not share similar political views. After she returned to France in August 1800, Genlis presented herself as a constitutional monarchist and had not associated publicly with the Imperial court.[25] Her niece had first supported Bonaparte and served Joséphine, before offering her services to the Restored monarchy.[26] All these elements should cast doubt on the authenticity of the text she edited. Yet, and as the rest of the chapter will argue, these retrospectives and altered memories should not be categorised as true or false, but studied for what they are: retrospectively and strategically constructed memories on emigration with a purpose to explain and justify the choices made by and imposed on their writers at a crucial historical moment.

Emigrant Didacticism

Whether examined as single literary objects or as an intertextual corpus, one of the most obvious characteristics of emigrant self-narratives is their didacticism. It appears in inventories and repetitions, variations on these repetitions, lists of names, places and situations, as well as several references and quotations. Collectively and individually, emigrant narrations

create an order, what Liisa Malkki has designated as a "fundamental cosmological sense".[27] Finding the place of Britain in the emigrant cosmology necessitates a synchronic and a diachronic reading of the *Mémoires* and *Souvenirs*. Grouped by topic, narrative passages relating to emigration in Great Britain highlight the exiles' feelings of difference and victimisation—rarely admiration. They also reveal influences at stake in the evolving political construction of the émigré-type in the nineteenth century. Far from being alien to writers' narrative strategies, the use of topoi might in fact conceal the representation of a chronological development in the relations between the emigrant community, as portrayed, and the British society. These same retrospective passages on the stay in Britain will be read in a second time in the chronological order in which they happened to unearth the genesis of identity discourses.

The first narrations of emigration in Great Britain were erudite. They included precise military journeys and seemingly chronological relations of decades-long exiles in Europe. Akin to travel literature, these self-narratives were exemplary of a practice "valued for its literary and philosophical dimensions".[28] As such, descriptions of Great Britain as a host country mobilised commonplaces. The experience of a foreign country was rationalised through conscious and unconscious references to eighteenth-century cultural, literary, philosophical and even scientific productions. This discourse was partly inherited from that of cosmopolitan pre-revolutionary Salons, frequented by the eldest generation of the emigrant writers and foreign visitors.[29] Those who had been adults in the 1770s had witnessed the birth of a patriotic vocabulary based on the growth of national consciousness following the Seven Years War.[30] An undifferentiated list of complimentary and derogatory national stereotypes highlights the returned emigrants' understanding of their world. Several seem directly inherited from eighteenth-century patriotic prejudices. These stereotypes were often worded by simple and uncommented remarks, embedded in the body of the text. The playwright Arnault simply used the derogatory term "English Roastbeef".[31] The Marquise de La Tour du Pin and Théodore de Lameth fled France 'very badly dressed'.[32] The first was disguised as an English Lady; the second was garbed in a British commoner costume. A patriotic anecdote reported by Walsh states that the Opera dancer Didelot would not let anyone but a French tailor stitch his costumes.[33] Another commonplace since the Seven Years War was that of the superiority of French beauty. Libertine courtier Tilly and Versailles' official portraitist, Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun, both alluded to this.[34] British customs

and cultural habits were in fact often attacked in narratives. Returned writers favoured allusions to the presumed insularity of their hosts, hinting at the absence of continental manners in Britain. Vigée-Lebrun was in Bath with her friend Madame de Beaurepaire in the late 1790s. She cast herself as the victim of a situation in which two elderly and provincial noblewomen treated them with "*une morgue gothique*" [gothic arrogance].[35] This literary cliché could be altogether interpreted as the aesthetic posture of an artist trained in classical portraiture and the determined affirmation of the painter's *ancien régime* identity. It is a posture of victimisation in which the painter presents herself as persecuted by vile xenophobia. In fact, in the 1790s, the Gothic Genre was heavily used as a "hostile symbol of all things French: Catholicism, fashion and enthusiasm".[36]

Commonplaces sometimes mutated into an ethnological discourse on types designated as 'the French' and 'the Briton'. A commonly used method of description was opposition through comparison. Like Madame Vigée-Lebrun, many commenters have disserted on the difference between French cheerfulness in exile and British gloominess. Walsh mocked the English aristocracy, spending its wealth on tea and *Spleen* [melancholy].[37] He went as far as stating that *"du sein de leur opulence et de leur comfortable home"* [within their wealthy environment and comfortable home], the British elites would envy the impoverished emigrants for their *joie de vivre* and resilience in distress. This is not without reminding Isaac Cruikshank's 1792 etching *French happiness; British miseries,* where poverty in revolutionary France is contrasted to abundance in constitutional Britain.[38] However, in the discourse of the returned exile, the situation is reversed, and happiness transformed into a national symbol transcending exile and poverty. Using a similar rhetorical device, libertine Alexandre de Tilly described his host country in a twelve-page pseudo-scientific passage entitled a "lesson in antithesis".[39] He aimed to demonstrate by logic the superiority of the French character:

> *Rien ne démontre à mon gré, si mathématiquement, la supériorité incontestable des Français, que l'injustice de nos voisins, à qui nous avons eu l'orgueil noble et impolitique de donner sans cesse toute espèce de louanges, celles mêmes qu'ils méritent le moins.*
>
> [In my opinion, nothing demonstrates more mathematically the indisputable superiority of the French than the injustice of our neighbours to whom we had the noble and impolitic pride to give ceaselessly all kinds of praises—even those they deserve the least].

The tone used in self-narratives was often self-conscious and rationalising. Hence, the hyperbole was rarely used to describe the host country and society. Théodore de Lameth's narration is scrupulously didactic; however the description of his arrival in London sets a change in his tone. London was grandiose, and he could not praise its judiciary system enough: "*Quel respect pour les formes! Quels soins en faveur des accusés! Quel désir dans les organes de la loi de ne trouver que des innocents dans les prévenus!* [Such a respect for the forms! Such care in favour of the accused! Such a desire in the legal mechanisms to see the defendants first as innocent!]".[40] It is unclear whether this description was that of an idealistic and anglophile revolutionary or that of an exile from the Terreur. Lameth had been close to the General Lafayette and member of the moderate *Feuillants*. He had been involved in projects to save Louis XVI and denounced the September massacres. He took refuge in London between October 1792 and January 1793, and returned to France in a last-ditch attempt to save the king. Lameth was the only author in the corpus examined who reported being threatened with a trial. He described the situation as such: his landlady Mrs Stuart was abused by her husband.[41] Lameth ran to rescue her. He explained that as a Frenchman, he could not bear witnessing a defenceless woman being strangled. Still, this anecdote was used to introduce a lesson on the superiority of English jurisprudence.[42]

Direct conflicts between the emigrants and the British population were rarely mentioned in retrospective self-narratives. When stated, they ranged between inhospitality and xenophobic statements. The Marquis de Bouillé, famously Anglophobic, criticised the coldness of his English acquaintances. His father had welcomed them in his home in France; these contacts would not repay his hospitality when the Bouillé family was left impoverished in London.[43] The ultra-royalist dramatist Arnault pointed to daily insults tolerated by the French community in London.[44] Britons' inhospitality and discourtesy had been common stereotypes in continental Europe before the French Revolution.[45] Constitutionalist and cosmopolitan writers described a very different experience of their British host. Horace Walpole warmly welcomed his old friend Rohan-Chabot de Jarnac and his son at Strawberry Hill.[46] The d'Osmond family spent several blissful weeks in Yorkshire, invited in the household of Sir John Legard.[47] During her first stay in England, Madame de Staël often met with her mother's friend, the British historian of the Roman Empire, Edward Gibbon.[48] In all the self–narratives studied, emigrants

were rarely portrayed as victims of xenophobic and physical vio-
lence. If so, the violent behaviours reported always originated from the
British side. For instance, the dramatist Arnault narrated in a colourful
scene how a drunken Englishman attacked him on the carriage back to
Dover.[49] Exhibiting with national pride a rack of mutton, the Englishman
attempted to force Arnault to admit the superiority of British meat over
French frogs. Obtaining no answer, the man violently forced the return-
ing emigrant "out of the confession required by his patriotism". This
picaresque commonplace, possibly the product of Arnault's imagination,
is not dissimilar to 1779 Gillray's print entitled *Politeness,* where a ste-
reotypical beef-eating Englishman verbally assaults a French frog-eater.[50]
On another occasion, a British theatre porter mimicked the French king
à la lanterne in front of the dramatist.[51] This time, the scene resembles
a post-1792 etching by Thomas Rowlandson, *A Frenchman plundered*,
in which several pickpockets robbed an elegantly dressed French noble-
man as he makes his way out of King's theatre.[52] The closeness between
Arnault's memory and popular English prints might indicate that emi-
grant memoir writers invented their own tropes. British memoir writers
have also referred to violence towards the French emigrants: the courti-
san Harriette Wilson narrated how, one day in the early 1800s, she and
her emigrant friends were attacked in a theatre in Portsmouth: "all the
sailors in the gallery began hissing and pelting us with oranges; […] we
were followed by a whole gang of tars, on our way to the inn. They called
us Mounseers, German moustache rascal and bloody Frenchmen".[53] In
this particular case, they were not attacked because they were French but
because they spoke a foreign language and wore foreign clothes.[54]

   In self-narratives, violence mostly originates from an anonymous mob.
The English mob described by returned emigrants differs from the pre-
revolutionary description of English crowds. In pre-revolutionary France,
Jean Jacques Rutledge's *Le Babillard* and Louis-Sébastien Mercier's
notorious *Tableau de Paris* contrasted the Parisian crowd with popu-
lar London.[55] Both texts describe a so-called English Plebeian. While
the Parisian people are referred to as an unenlightened mass, Londoners
are considered moderate and their patriotic feelings enlightened. Post-
emigration narratives challenge this perspective. It can be argued that the
returned emigrants' view of the London mob reflected their own preju-
dices about the French revolutionary crowd: massive, anonymous, violent
and bloodthirsty. The trauma of emigration and counter-revolutionary
discourses had shaped their characterisation of all popular gatherings.

Amongst description of violence, boxing comes as a leitmotiv in returned emigrant literature. A passage in Vigée-Lebrun illustrates this: she describes the sport as a "horrid sight"; she compared it to historical times of "barbarism and extermination".[56] In comparison, a Franco-American traveller in England in 1811 named Louis Simond and the translator Auguste Defauconpret who had reached London in 1815 praised the nobility of the sport and its egalitarian status.[57] In the mirror of emigrant self-narratives, the mob appeared as an antagonistic reflection of the self.

The underlying portrait of the emigrant-victim emerges behind the description of encounters with British communities. The portrayal of an isolated, misunderstood and suffering self underlined the dignity and heroism of the writers. In their narratives, French writers are always beyond the suspicion of intolerance or wrongdoings. Many moderate and Constitutionalist royalist writers went to great length to distance themselves from the royalist émigrés and the crowd of courtiers gathered around the heirs to the crown, whom they accused of disrespecting their hosts. Depiction of the latters' shameful behaviour in Britain, while their home country was engulfed in a political and social crisis, demonstrated by contrast the moderates' probity and good character. Madame de Boigne certainly felt humiliated when Madame de Léon and her friends wasted their savings in expensive parties or mixed with some vulgar *filles* under the mortified eye of the British bourgeoisie or when the rich Madame de Vigné swore in front an Englishman.[58] Yet, Boigne declared, the behaviour of a minority did not affect the outstanding reputation that the silent majority of emigrants had built in Britain.[59] Madame de La Tour du Pin left London and the émigrés (read Legitimist aristocrats) to meet with French nobles from lower ranks and lesser political influence. These accusations and the moralising tone used by some returned emigrants derive from the necessity to justify their actions as individuals and as a group to future generations. Emigrants had presented themselves as the victims of Providence, a succession of wrong choices and the violence of the *sans-culotte*; in their narratives they also presented themselves as the victims of a decaying French leadership and aristocracy. Exhibiting their honourable acts and modesty in exile, these writers aimed to convince themselves and their readers that they were just the innocent victims of an uncontrollable fate.

Old and new tropes were often reinforced with a comprehensive and logical narrative structure. It underlined the evolution of the relations between the emigrant and British communities. The chronology adopted

in narrating the French emigration to Great Britain resembles that of a French classical tragedy in five acts: first, authors exposed their decision to choose Britain as a shelter. They later described their arrival on the British shores and the first encounters with customs officers and villagers in southern England. The third moment illustrated a relatively peaceful settlement, usually in an urbanised area (between the arrival and the years 1794–1795) where the emigrants would live from their work and British allowances; the peaceful cohabitation was however threatened by the counter-revolutionary defeat of Quiberon in summer 1795, and climaxed with the crystallisation of tensions between the emigrant community and the British government. In the denouement, these emigrant stories always ended with an apprehensive repatriation to France, or a departure to another host country.

The examination of self-narratives does not single out one factor or a set of factors explaining the choice of Great Britain as a haven for emigrants. Because of the heterogeneity of the group and the lengthy timeline, choice and chance often played equal parts in the writers choosing Britain as their destination.[60] Some emigrants had pre-existing links with the host country. Jacobite descendants, such as the La Tour du Pin, Boigne and Walsh, had living relatives and an established support network in the British Isles. Despite these links, Great Britain had been a second choice for all three of them: the Walsh family had first gone to the Netherlands and La Tour du Pin to the United States. A few financial pulls were also mentioned: Gauthier de Brécy had participated in the rebellion in Toulon.[61] As such he was entitled to a pension from the British State with the condition that he would relocate from Italy to England. Britain was a centre for counter-revolutionary politics and cultures: the Marquis de Bouillé and his father arrived in London to publish counter-revolutionary pamphlets. While he decided against the journey to Britain and went to Ypres instead, the abbé de Fabry, a refractory clergyman from Saint Omer, made arrangements for his departure to London around September 1791.[62] He was familiar with the English language and literature, and had translated in France "the volume of Mr. Burke"—presumably the 1790 *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. The majority of the authors who had been officers in the *ancien régime* armies crossed the Channel to form new regiments and launch an attack on France following the failure of the *Armée des Princes* and *de Condé*. Seven noble officers, amongst them Villeneuve, Contades and Marcillac, arrived in the British Isles after a long journey in Eastern Europe, when

the *Armée de Condé* was integrated within the British army in 1795. Put together, self-narratives also highlight a large spectrum of relations with British culture before the Revolution. A correlation between liberal politics and exile to Great Britain prevails in self-narratives by civilians. However, emigrant's prejudices might not have been the sole basis in choosing a shelter. It would, in fact, be presumptuous to affirm that while ultra-royalists went to fight in Germany or took refuge in Austria, all Anglophile constitutional monarchists and *Monarchiens* took shelter in the British Isles. However, all *Monarchien* and moderate memoir writers who took shelter in England extensively discussed the pre-revolutionary amicable, philosophical and intellectual relationship with their British peers. Describing a cancelled attempt to take shelter in England, Madame de Genlis spoke about her "particular taste" for this country.[63] Lameth was attracted by "*le spectacle de la liberté d'un grand peuple, de la liberté individuelle écrite au front du moindre citoyen* [the spectacle of the freedom of a great race, of individual freedom carved in the forehead of each and every citizen]".[64] Presented as a choice, the explanations given in civilian *memoirs* for reaching Britain, or avoiding it, suffer from too many biases to be truthful. They are extremely stylised, and the writers usually insist on minor factors explaining the choice of their shelter country. They furthermore leave little room to chance, in spite of the urgency to find a shelter in times of violent repression against the Counter-Revolution.

The miscellany of reasons cited in self-narratives reflects diversity in how emigrants have retrospectively perceived their participation in emigration. In fact, the reasons to take shelter in Britain, as given by returned writers, might be the product of politically motivated systems built during and after emigration, justifying the author's posture and decisions at a crucial moment. Rohan-Chabot first arrived in Ireland in October 1789 to settle matters concerning his Irish wife's estates. He joined the counter-revolutionary armies on the continent in late 1791 and, discouraged by Legitimist politics, returned to the British Isles in 1793. The starting date of his emigration differs between his private letters and his *Mémoires;* this, perhaps, exposes a migratory project fluctuating according to his audience as well as political and personal circumstances. The 1791 date indicates that military duties were his motivation. Yet, Rohan-Chabot had not returned to France since 1789 despite his statements that he had applauded the early years of the Revolution. The lines between personal journey and political exile are

often blurred in self-narratives, and many, amongst those who came to Great Britain, present their departure from France as apolitical. Madame de Genlis never used the word emigration to define her sojourn in Great Britain. She preferred the word "voyage" [travel]. Similarly, military officers, often writing in the early years of the Restoration, went to great length in affirming they did not flee France. Instead, they inferred that their choice to leave was conscious and in obedience of their code of honour.[65] In doing so, they further distanced themselves from the failures of the Legitimist project: like Rohan-Chabot, four other military writers said they arrived in Britain in early 1793, before the French counter-revolutionary armies were defeated. Chateaubriand famously affirmed, yet in retrospect, that he understood the counter-revolutionary fight was doomed.

The description of arrivals in Great Britain is quite revealing about the emigrant's relations with their hosts. Ominous and symbolical storms are aplenty in self-narratives; many emigrants lost their lives in the Channel, and the shipwreck survivor's personal fate was compared to that of mythological heroes. First encounters with the British population often reinforce the feeling of oppression distilled throughout by the writers, at present described in narratives as refugees. The Gauthier de Brécy family were unusual in being welcomed with a gift of sugar, tea and Champagne by a military acquaintance working for the British customs.[66] Often, the encounter with customs officers or small town populations represents the first conflict between an anonymous British crowd and French noble emigrants. Local populations were accused of exploiting emigrants with the complicity of unprincipled administrators. Arnault reported that he had to pay the British smugglers who brought him to England from France a high price to insure their fidelity.[67] Collectively, self-narratives emphasise the administrative battles faced by emigrants, especially after the British Parliament voted the Aliens Act on 7 January 1793 forcing all foreigners to register at customs. French traveller Jean-Pierre Grosley had praised the British customs in the 1770s; in the 1780s La Rochefoucault considered that it would be impossible for anyone to "receive and look after strangers better than the English generally do".[68] After 1793, British immigration policies played an important role in shaping émigré and refugee identities. The *Aliens Act* was not per se commonplace in emigrants' self-narratives but it was perceived by those fleeing France as an additional humiliation. Rarely named, it was referred to in several anecdotes where both customs officers and local populations

appear guilty of persecuting the impoverished displaced population. In 1797, the Marquise de la Tour du Pin was shocked by the rude behaviour of customs officers at first. She stated:

> *À la vue de mon passeport, que je présentai au bureau chargé de les vérifier – Alien Office – on me demanda si j'étais sujette du roi d'Angleterre, et sur ma réponse affirmative, on me dit que je devais me réclamer de quelqu'un de connu en Angleterre. Ayant nommé sans hésiter mes trois oncles: Lord Dillon, Lord Kenmare et Sir William Jerningham, le ton et la manière des employés changèrent aussitôt.*[69]

> [When they saw my passport that I presented to the office in charge of verifying them—Alien Office—I was asked if I was a subject of the King of England. And, on my positive answer, I was told I should claim kinship to someone famous in England. Naming without hesitation my three uncles—Lord Dillon, Lord Kenmare and Sir William Jerningham—the tone and manner of the employees suddenly changed]

The General d'Andigné was not lucky enough to be of British descent. After wandering for two days in the snowy streets of Harwich, he reported in his *Mémoires* that:

> *Un commissaire augmentait encore notre embarras en prétendant ne pouvoir nous laisser partir sans une autorisation. Il nous la faisait attendre deux ou trois jours, et nous la délivrait ensuite pour un schilling. Cette contribution, légère en apparence, devenait onéreuse, vue qu'elle nous faisait prolonger notre séjour à Harwich, dont les habitants nous rançonnèrent impitoyablement. Ces tracasseries, je dois le dire, étaient contraires à l'esprit du gouvernement. Elles cessèrent aussitôt qu'il en eût connaissance.*[70]

> [An officer increased our embarrassment claiming he could not let us leave without authorisation. He made us wait for another two to three days, and then delivered it to us for a shilling. This contribution, apparently small, would become expensive, since it was making our stay in Harwich longer. The inhabitants blackmailed us without any pity. I must admit that these issues were contrary to the spirit of the government. It stopped as soon as the authorities heard about it]

In his accusation, d'Andigné spared the British government from being associated with these plebeian thieves. The government put an end to the scheme as soon as it was uncovered. This comment as well as the relative silence on the *Alien Acts* by emigrants could be the sign of the

emigrants' acceptance of Pitt's policies in response to Terrorist France. Some perceived the activities of the Aliens Act favourably as it facilitated the dismissal of revolutionary spies. Bouillé praised the British government for chasing "the bandits of all countries who had principally arrived from France" but blamed the authorities for confiscating his father's sword.[71]

Their first difficulties overcome, the majority of writers set off to London. At that point in the narration, the discourse on the host's reception of emigrants often converts into a highly politicised critique of the British relief system. With no exception, self-narratives refer to emigrants reaching September 1792 as indigent. Several paragraphs highlight the distress of the emigrant population, with allegorical cases of dying women and children. Many hoped to receive financial help from the British relief Committee to French refugees. The French revolutionaries were always held responsible for the emigrants' misery. However, some writers affirmed that Great Britain had a particular interest in being hospitable and generous to the newcomers.[72] The *émigré schilling*—the name given to the average allowance received from government by an adult emigrant per day—generated a shift amongst returned emigrants. After seeing contemporary documents, it remains unclear whether this debate took place during the emigration, or whether it was a political creation of the Empire and later the Restoration. This absence might relate to the difficulty for returned emigrants to admit they received financial help from their main military and economic opponent. Those who rallied to the Empire as well as the ones who returned to France after 1814 mostly ignored the topic—or intentionally forgot it. Others pretended they had rejected British charity and pitied the émigrés who were forced to "beg the enemy of their fatherland" to survive.[73] Georgette Ducrest, the author of this comment, was most certainly less than five years old when her parents' left London. Born in emigration in November 1789, she admits that her first memories date from after 1794 at which time she seemingly had left the British Isles. She could not have possibly remembered the *émigré schilling*, not to mention the experience of shame related to receiving charity. She then dwelled on this apocryphal judgement by giving a historical justification to those who accepted the British help. "*George III acquittait, au nom de la nation et de la royauté, la dette de Jacques II* [George III repaid James II debt, in the name of the Nation and Royalty]": the asylum given

to the French displaced by the Revolution was a reciprocal and fair repayment for the protection offered by the French monarchy to the Jacobites after the Glorious Revolution. With this sweeping statement, Ducrest transformed history. Wilfully ignorant of British politics, she regarded James' Jacobites and George's Hanoverians as one entity for they were British. Similarly mistaking territory with nation, Bouillé denounced British charities as a governmental plot, intended "to compensate the individuals for the evil deeds targeting the complete body of the nation", a probable reference to the beginning of the war with France.[74] Arnault called in freedom as many left for the continent: he described a boat full with French passengers who "*allaient chercher sur le continent une hospitalité moins couteuse que l'hospitalité anglaise* [went to the continent in search of a hospitality less costly than the English one]".[75] Once again, Walsh provides a dissonant voice in 1845 by affirming that memoir writers had invented a collective lie. He personally praised England for being charitable towards those he felt the French Revolution had persecuted, dispossessed and proscribed.[76] Like other rhetorical devices used by migrants, lies about receiving British charity could certainly be grounded on political agendas and the returned emigrants quest for national respectability. But, the pride of aristocratic men and women who went from riches to rags and back to riches should not be underestimated. Admitting to having received financial help would put an end to the emigrant myth of natural aristocratic social dominance by demoting the establishment, especially since the benefactor was France's main financial, military and imperial competitor in the nineteenth-century. It would also be an acknowledgment of the French aristocracy's subordination to their post-revolution main competitor.

Emigration was often represented as a component of the Anti-Revolution in self-narratives. As such, the cohabitation between emigrant and British populations was peaceful in 1792–1793, but threatened by the accumulation of defeats by the First Coalition against the Republican armies. In 1795, Pitt's government, Puisaye, and the Comte d'Artois launched a naval expedition to conquer Brittany and join the internal counter-revolution of royalist Chouans in Vendée against the Republican armies.[77] Present in almost all self-narratives, narrations around Quiberon eclipsed all other stories of emigrant-British military collaborations pre- and post-1795. Seven of the writers examined in this corpus participated in the attempts to invade France's

western shores. Most of the civilian writers declare they lost a family member or a close relation in the Republican repression following the setback of the counter-revolutionary armies. Memoir writers give two interpretations of Quiberon, placing the blame on the émigré regiments or the British government. Rohan-Chabot and Madame de Boigne condemned the patrician émigrés for their inability to overcome their aristocratic prejudices and accept an alliance with the popular element of the Vendée insurrection.[78] Others blamed the British government for conducting a "Machiavellian plot" and setting aflame a civil war in France, when, following the fall of the *Terreur*, the country had been somewhat pacified.[79] In an ultimate *ancien régime* fantasy, the constitutional monarchy was pitted against an aristocratic regime: Pitt's alleged manipulative behaviour, as an allegory of governmental actions, was contrasted with military officer Lord Moira's noble and commanding conduct. In a fit of rage, Bouillé wrote:

> *Le gouvernement anglais, heureux d'avoir en sa main une occasion aussi favorable pour satisfaire sa haine aussi bien que son intérêt contre la France, se prêtait avec autant de largesse que d'empressement à entretenir et à féconder ces germes de divisions intestines.*[80]

> [The British government, happy to have in hand such a favourable occasion to satisfy its hatred as well as in anti-French interests, maintained and fertilised with much generosity and eagerness these sprouts of internal struggle.]

Following this extract, the writer drew a comparison between the noble émigrés in Quiberon and the legend of El Cid, the Spanish national hero. Exiled by his fellow countrymen, El Cid returned home to inflict a series of major defeats on the Almoravid dynasty. Marcillac and Montgaillard made similar accusations in their self-narratives, with the latter using a particularly Anglophobic tone to condemn the "intrigues" of England's agents.[81] This notion of a civil war also appeared in Walsh. He did not clearly condemn the British government; he simply emphasised the sadness of soldiers on the move, "gone to fight against Frenchmen", against "fellow countrymen".[82] In this national-centric understanding of the Revolution and Counter-Revolution, Great Britain was dispossessed of its quality as a host to become an interested and uninvited third party in a French fight. It was reinstated in its place as France's natural and deceitful enemy.

Quiberon symbolizes the irreconcilable rupture between the French aristocracy, the constitutional monarchists and the British hosts. In many self-narratives, it heralded, and directly preceded, the emigrant departure from Britain, exasperated by the repeated failures of the French counter-revolutionary leaders and/or the perceived duplicity of the British government. Narrations of the journey from London to Dover are often short, and authors, or perhaps editors, often highlighted this rupture with formal chapter breaks. Some writers resented the growing British fascination with the French Revolution and Directoire. This was felt as a political abandonment by Bouillé, who was infuriated by the tactlessness of the British public honouring Tallien upon his arrival, "*un homme dont le nom seul rappelle l'époque la plus funeste et la plus honteuse des Annales de cette guerre et de celles de l'Angleterre* [a man whose name is a reminder of the most macabre and shameful age in the annals of this war and those of England]".[83] Those who decided to stay or reached London after Quiberon, like Madame de Staël or the duc d'Orléans, continued to praise Great Britain in their writings, sparking contempt amongst Legitimist hardliners who considered them corrupted and bribed.[84] Military defeats, ideological failures, bankruptcy and the length of the exile were factors increasing the marginalisation of the emigrant population in Great Britain. However, most bitter arguments used to justify the process of national identification seem to have been built retrospectively. Psychoanalysis demonstrates that the traumatism of exile and failed relocation reactivates age-old prejudices and phantasms about the alien, in this case Britain as the natural enemy.[85] In some way, Great Britain was imagined as the allegory of all that was not France. Retrospectively, the alleged attitude of the host country excused the failure of the emigration project and the impossibility to construct a cohesive national project representative of counter-revolutionary hopes. The style and arguments used by the defeated Frenchmen differed from previously known travel literature: descriptions of Britain and British attitudes towards the French were not based on the past journey; they were not even an evaluation of the British attitudes to the migrants. Descriptions of emigrant-host relationships were envisaged as a subversive didactic reinterpretation of the writers' past in fundamentally moral terms. In self-narratives, emigration was transformed into an elaborate mythico-history in which all personal responsibilities were eliminated.

Leaving a Patrie, Returning in a Nation?

An émigré collective figure reflexively emerges out of this discourse on Britain as a host, as that which the British were not. In their quest for respectability in Imperial and Restoration France, the malaise of returned French emigrants was retrospectively translated into an obsession with their homeland. Experiences of the host country related to an inner suffering, linked to the separation from home. Emigrants' self-narratives could be compared to modern versions of the *Odysseus*, an analogy emigrants themselves have contemplated.[86] France was transformed in a mythical original location. Exaggerated assessments, misrepresentations as well as narrative omissions on the British reception of French emigrants contributed to create a stark contrast between France as a horizon of expectation and a foreign island that could not live up to the emigrants' hopes. In the mythico-history of emigration, descriptions of Great Britain, its mores and inhabitants served as narrative ploys to better revere the home country. On its own, the analysis of stereotyped discourses on the British community and that of the evolving relations between emigrants and hosts minimizes the influential role of post-revolutionary ideologies on identity discourse. The relation between the French emigrant community and its host as described in self-narratives cannot be defined without studying that of returned emigrants' vision of France and reinsertion in their home country. In self-narratives, home is alternatively referred to as nation or *patrie*. Here is not the place for a general exegesis of the two concepts and their derivatives: patriotism and nationalism. However, the definition of nation and *patrie* by returned emigrants must be replaced within their original context. By 1789, both *patrie* and nation had taken a central and lasting place in French political culture. Historian David Bell believes *patrie* relates to the emotional attachment to a territory and political loyalty, and nation refers to "a group of people sharing certain important binding qualities".[87] For Eric Hobsbawm, the French Revolution led to the assimilation of nation with the State and sovereign people.[88] This democratic definition of nation is later replaced during the Empire by the deterritorialised notion of a *Grande Nation*. To what extent were the emigrants' uses of the two notions enmeshed in reactionary and oppositional cultural and political practices? Were the uses of nation and *patrie* in emigrant self-narratives remnants of *ancien régime* and aristocratic definitions, defined

by Jay Smith as a reactionary "hierarchic patriotism", or had they been renewed during and by the emigration?[89] On the contrary, had they absorbed the revolutionary and imperial meanings?

Any attempt to define a collective emigrant definition of *patrie* and nation would reveal a labyrinthine construction, with *ancien regime*, anti-enlightened and enlightened foundations, borrowing from multiple and often clashing political and social references. Both words even seem interchangeable in many cases. However, political trends have certainly dictated the quantitative and semantic use of the terms *patrie* and nation. Their uses are intricately related to the necessity for a writer, an editor or a publisher to obey certain social, political and literary trends. Personal politics played an important role in writing the mythico-history of emigration. The use and rejection of certain concepts were a consequential part of the construction of the diverse legends around emigration. The word nation was more widely used than *patrie* when the author of a self-narrative had returned to France before the Restoration and the works were published soon after this return. Since the Maupeou crisis, *patrie*, *patriotisme* and *patriote* all belonged to the revolutionary lexical field. In the early years of the Revolution, the so-called *Patriotes* were sitting amongst the Jacobins in the French Assembly, against the aristocratic *Noirs* and the constitutionalist *Monarchiens*.[90] The quantitative prominence of nation was strongly linked to the elites of the *ancien régime* reintegrated after 1804 in the Napoleonic system. One exception to this quantitative rule is the Comte de Montgaillard. He used *patrie* at least thirty-nine times and referred to nation only twelve times in his *Mémoires Secrets*. Montgaillard had been a Republican agent in the early years of the Republic and had only spent six weeks in Britain from August 1792. He returned to emigration in the late months of 1794, and was refused shelter in London as an ex-collaborator of Robespierre. The self-narratives published under the reigns of Louis XVIII and Charles X reversed this quantitative balance, as many authors preferred the term *patrie* to nation, reminiscent of Napoléon's *Grande Nation*. Following the 1830 Revolution, trends reversed again, and the use of nation occupied the predominant place in self-narratives, perhaps linked to the Orléans regime attempt to create, in its early years, a communal history based on national cohesion. Yet, the definition of *patrie* and nation differ grandly between each text and authors made little attempt to define extremely volatile concepts.

When memoir writers refer to *patrie*, it was usually understood as the territorial reality of France as opposed to foreign countries. The geographical scope of one's *patrie* might be limited to the local and regional environment where emigrants were born and their family originated. This traditional acceptation of *patrie* was complemented by a traditional definition of nation, as the social body formed by a population. For instance, in Tilly's *Mémoires* or in Dumas's *Souvenirs*, the British public were very often identified as the British nation.[91] The familiarity and filial love located in the *patrie* was contrasted in Marcillac with the "*humiliation, dédains, jalousies, privations de toute espèce* [humiliation, spite, jealousies and privations of all sorts]" experienced by emigrants in foreign countries.[92] In 1825, Marcillac associated the localised *patrie* with personal wealth and family, as well as the notion of "*bonheur de la vie* [happiness of life]".[93] Following enlightened and voltairian traditions, it was also the place where one could be happy.[94] *Malheureux* [unhappy] was the adjective used by many to describe the separation from the *patrie:* the 1819 edition of Villeneuve ended with the narration of how the soldier met in London with the exiled royal family, moaning over the lost fatherland.[95] Bouillé assimilated his nostalgia to the "*maladie du pays* [home sickness]".[96] The *patrie* was often transformed into an allegorical figure, embodying the emigrant family and their mindsets. The constitutionalist abbé Lambert related *patrie* to an allegorical beloved mother in the early years of the Restoration.[97] For Montgaillard, the *patrie* expressed emotional feelings, being either *heureuse* or *malheureuse*.[98] In many Restoration memoirs, the *patrie* was the victim of an illness in pre-revolutionary times and beyond. Lambert's maternal *Patrie* was beset by a "maladie grave [grave illness]".[99] Fabry remembered howling over the "*maux* [evils/sorrows]" oppressing his *patrie*.[100] Contades also referred to the "*maux*" that tore apart his unhappy *Patrie*.[101] The notion of a *patrie* in need of cure and regeneration traditionally belonged to the Enlightenment and the Revolution, with emigrants and aristocrats being assimilated to a national cancer. However, the association between *patrie* and illness in Restoration self-narratives was likely to be related to the recent publications of de Maistre and Bonald. In Andigné for instance, the *patrie* and its traditional and historical institutions had been blown away by the "*esprit révolutionnaire* [revolutionary spirit]" and all hopes left to only Providence, a word borrowed from counter-revolutionary writings.[102] In the 1820s, political divergences

between a Legitimist *patrie* and a constitutionalist one emerged, especially so as Charles X and his *Ultra-Montain* government reinterpreted the *Charte* in a manner colliding with liberal values. Legitimist writers like Villeneuve and Bouillé related *patrie* with a Roman-Catholic God and the Bourbons; this reactionary meaning of *patrie* was defined by a vertical relationship between the monarchy, aristocrats, the church and the French subjects. Patriotism was therefore assimilated to the attachment to a territorial entity whose legitimate and historical rulers (God, the King, the aristocracy) possessed authority over the country' inhabitants. On the contrary, constitutionalists and former Bonapartists who rallied to Louis-Philippe related their filial love of the *patrie* to a contract with the King, who remained the *primus inter pares*.[103] Dumas declared being altogether attached to his *patrie* and, independently, faithful to the king. Meanwhile, a deterritorialised and transnational definition of *patrie* appeared. To Élisabeth Vigée-Lebrun, *patrie* was the place where one felt one belonged; the first edition of her *Souvenirs* included a letter dated 1801 in which she declared having found amongst all her hosts (including Great Britain) a new *patrie*.[104] *Patrie* was similarly dissociated from a territory in Walsh's definition. It was a moral homeland, a place where one would share with his neighbours opinions, customs, feelings and common principles.[105] In this instance, Catholicism was the basis of this *patrie,* and Walsh infers his closeness with Irish Catholics.

In both Vigée-Lebrun and Walsh's acceptations, *patrie* shares with nation the importance of imagination in its definition, as a community in which one's belonging transcends territorial realities. From the earliest self-narrations of emigration to the latest ones, the meaning of nation spread from the natural association of people living in the same territory, in the more conservative texts, to the product of a political will, *id est* the people represented in Parliament, in Constitutionalist ones. In Legitimist leaning narrations, the nation resembled the *ancien régime* aristocratic ideals as an ensemble of people governed by its natural elites. Madame de Lage de Volude linked it to "honour, sacrifice and the King".[106] In Gauthier de Brécy, the rightful nation was faithful and proud to love its kings.[107] Andigné considered himself as belonging to the "*partie la plus saine de la nation* [the healthiest part of the nation]", marking a shift in the revolutionary principle stating that the nation was indivisible.[108] The relation between the sovereign and its subjects was considered as natural in tenants of aristocratic values, in opposition to the idea of a social

contract proposed by their opponents. In this acceptation, the nation was separated from the government of the State. This was a clear ideological opposition to the revolutionary collating of State, Nation and People. This might explain why the expression 'British Nation' always refers to public opinion in Bouillé's narrative, and never to the British government or Parliament.[109] In Constitutionalist leaning texts, the definition of nation by returned emigrants borrowed from the revolutionary and Imperial vocabulary. On the contrary, the Orléanist Lambert insisted that nation corresponded to the "*peuple assemblé*", the people assembled as a political force. In Genlis, nation corresponds to both the "*peuple armé*" and "*coalisé*", armed and united to defend the territorial *patrie*. After a brief sojourn in England in 1793 and a successful career in Imperial France, Mathieu Dumas felt entitled to combine revolutionary symbols and Napoleonic vocabulary.[110] Montgaillard also referred to the *Grande Nation*.[111] A direct association of nation and shared habits was present in the earliest memoirs, and intensified in the 1830s. Like many of his fellow soldiers having worked under British pay against the Revolutionary armies, d'Andigné aimed to distance himself from Great Britain. He contrasted French loyalty, seen as a characteristic national feature, to the British devious and belligerent nature.[112] Human characteristics and feelings, such as shame and hatred, often qualified the term in self-narratives. It possessed its own taste, "*genie* [genius]" and "*esprit* [spirit]". If the nation was gifted with feelings, one could have "*le sentiment de la nation* [the feeling of belonging to the nation]".[113] The definition of a French nation was at the core of self-narratives. The description of Great Britain was secondary and anecdotes about the host aimed to reinforce the superiority of the author's political project.

***

"*L'honneur est tout, il n'y a que lui dans le monde* [Honour is everything, there is nothing else in the world]" affirmed the emigrant Comte de Tilly.[114] In many of the self-narratives studied, the eighteenth-century noble concept of honour, and its correlative "imperative of concealment", still battled against the democratic concept of virtue, as the "imperative of truth-telling".[115] In fact, a great threat to historical truth lies behind the anecdotal evidence given in self-narratives. Replaced within their original ideological frames of reference, retrospective narrations of emigration reveal the complex dynamics of identity construction

at stake in writing about the self and its place in history. The examination of prejudices, repetitions, and chronological topoi, as well as the significance of semantic definitions of *patrie* and nation, reveals that stories about emigration are not what they declare to be. Writing about emigration and the host country equates to taking a position in nineteenth century politics. Importantly, this short chapter revealed the existence of renewed prejudices, new semantics and a novel tendency towards nineteenth-century nationalism within a group that is often perceived as stuck in an unrenewed and perpetuated *ancien regime* world. A similar study could be done on British nineteenth century memories of the French emigrant presence, to comprehend how the emigrant figure was retrospectively used to outline political and social ideologies. The rhetorical devices used by British memoir writers and authors of fictions would probably be similar to those used by French writers. By studying the link between memoir and political ideology, this chapter on the recollection of emigration and the host country in the first half of the nineteenth century has replaced stories of emigration in a French national context. The next chapters will attempt to explain the significance of foreign encounters in constructing identities at the time of the French Revolution. It is time to introduce the notion that the British government and public opinion have played a key role in the creation and development of emigrant and host identities.

Notes

1. Joseph-Alexis Walsh, *Souvenirs de Cinquante Ans* (Paris: Au Bureau de la mode, 1845), p. 45.
2. Richard Hayes, 'Biographical Dictionary of Irishmen in France: Part XXI', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 36 (1947): 343–349.
3. Walsh, p. 13.
4. Ibid., p. 24.
5. Ibid., p. 389.
6. Philippe Darriulat, "L'Affaire Pritchard, un paroxysme de l'Anglophobie française?" in Sylvie Aprile and Fabrice Bensimon, eds, *La France et l'Angleterre au XIXe siècle: échanges, représentations, comparaisons* (Paris: Créaphis, 2006), pp. 226 and 228.
7. Karine Rance, 'Mémoires de Nobles français émigrés en Allemagne pendant la Révolution française: vision retrospective d'une experience", *Genèses,* 30 (1998): 5–29. See also, Natalie Petiteau, *Écrire la Mémoire: les Mémorialistes de la Révolution et de l'Empire* (Paris: Les Indes Savantes, 2012).

8. Ronen Steinberg, 'Trauma before trauma. Imagining the effects of the Terror in post-revolutionary France', in *Experiencing the French Révolution*, ed. David Andress, (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2013), pp. 177–201 (p. 179). Patrice Higonnet, 'Terror, Trauma and the 'Young Marx' explanation of Jacobin politics', *Past and Present*, 191 (2006): 121–164.

9. François Jacob and Henri Rossi, *Mémorialistes de l'Exil: Émigrer, Écrire, Survivre* (Paris: Harmattan, 2003), p. 9.

10. Maurice Halbwachs, *Les Cadres Sociaux de la Mémoire* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1994); Pierre Bourdieu, 'L'illusion biographique', in *Raisons pratiques* (Paris: Seuil, 1994); Philippe Lejeune, *Le Pacte Autobiographique* (Paris: Seuil, 1975).

11. *Mémoires de la Marquise de la Tour du Pin: Journal d'une femme de Cinquante ans*, ed. Christian de Liederke Beaufort (Paris: Mercure de France, 2006), p. 10.

12. Antoine-Vincent Arnault, *Souvenirs d'un Séxagénaire* (Paris: Dufey, 1833), p. vi.

13. A similar suggestion was made in: Philip Dwyer, 'Public Remembering, Private Reminiscing: French Military Memoirs and the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars', *FHS*, 33 (2010): 231–258.

14. *Souvenirs et Fragments pour servir aux Mémoires de ma vie et de mon temps, par le Marquis de Bouillé*, ed. P.L de Kermaingant (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1906–1911), p. 2.

15. *Mémoires de la Comtesse de Boigne, née d'Osmond. Récit d'une tante*, ed. Jean-Claude Berchet, 2 vols (Paris: Mercure de France, 1999), I, p. 10.

16. CARAN, Paris, *Fonds Rohan-Chabot*, 729MI/54, *Mémoires de Charles-Rosalie de Rohan-Chabot*. For a list of the self-narratives used in this book, see Appendix 1 and 2, 'Memoir writers' and 'Retrospective self-narratives and editorial choice'.

17. Karine Rance, 'Identité Narrative et Ipséité', in *Identité, Appartenance et Revendication Identitaire*, ed. Marc Belissa (Paris: Nolin, 2005), pp. 385–393. See also Paul Ricoeur, *Soi-même comme un autre* (Paris: Seuil, 1996).

18. When it was possible, I chose the newest edition of a self-narrative—and in particular those published in the collection 'Le Temps retrouvé', by the *Mercure de France* which editorial choices are both critical and scientifically argued. In the absence of a modern re-edition, I prioritised volumes published during the lifetime of the author, as it is expected that they would have had a certain control on their publication.

19. Liisa H. Malkki, *Purity and Exile* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 57.

20. Félicité de Genlis, *Mémoires inédits sur le Dix-Huitième siècle et la Révolution française depuis 1756 jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris: Ladvocat, 1825).

21. Georgette Ducrest, 'Avant propos', in *Mémoires de Mme de Genlis sur la Cour, la Ville et les Salons de Paris*, ed. Georgette Ducrest (Paris: Gustave Barba, 1855).

22. Volumes 9 and 10 are a collection of texts written by Genlis.

23. *Mémoires sur l'Impératrice Joséphine par Georgette Ducrest*, ed. by Christophe Pincemaille (Paris: Mercure de France, 2004), pp. 27–28.

24. *Genlis*, ed. Ducrest (Paris, 1855).

25. *Mémoires de Madame de Genlis*, ed. Didier Masseau (Paris, 2004), p. 396.

26. *Ducrest*, ed. Pincemaille p. 51. Another edition of Genlis: *Mémoires de Madame de Genlis,* ed. Jean-François Barrière (Paris, 1857). Barrière was an Historian of the French Revolution and, like Madame de Genlis a moderate royalist. He had been forced to retire from his administrative career after 1848. The one mainly used in this book is that of Didier Masseau, specialist of eighteenth-century literature. He extracted 6 volumes from Ladvocat's edition and created chapters to facilitate the modern reader's experience of the text (pp. 37–38).

27. Malkki, p. 55.

28. Daniel Roche, *Les circulations dans l'Europe Moderne* (Paris: Fayard, 2011), p. 19.

29. Marc Belissa and Bernard Cottret (eds), *Cosmopolitiques, Patriotismes. Europe et Amériques, 1773–1802* (Rennes: Les Perséides, 2005).

30. Edmund Dziembowski, *Un Nouveau Patriotisme Français, 1750–1770: la France face à la Puissance Anglaise à l'Époque de la Guerre de Sept Ans* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1998), pp. 59–110.

31. Arnault, p. 398.

32. *La Tour du Pin*, ed. Liedercke, p. 213; *Mémoires de Théodore de Lameth*, ed. Eugène Welvert (Paris: Fontemoing, 1913), p. 220.

33. Walsh, pp. 125–126.

34. *Mémoires du Comte Alexandre de Tilly*, ed. Christian Melchior-Bonnet (Paris: Mercure de France, 1986), p. 269; Elisabeth Vigée-Lebrun, *Souvenirs* (Paris: Fournier, 1835–1837), III, p. 201.

35. Vigée-Lebrun, III, p. 227.

36. Angela Wright, *Britain, France and the Gothic, 1764–1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 69.

37. Walsh, pp. 63–64.

38. Isaac Cruickshank, *French happiness; British Misery* (London: S.W. Forbes, 3 January 1793).

39. *Tilly*, ed. by Melchior-Bonnet, pp. 270–272.

40. *Lameth*, ed. by Welvert, p. 229.

41. Ibid., p. 228.

42. Ibid., pp. 228–230.

43. *Bouillé*, ed. by Kermaingant, II, p. 104.

44. Arnault, p. 394.

45. Paul Langford, *Englishness Identified: Manners and Characters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 228–229.
46. CARAN, *Fonds Jarnac-Lasteyrie*, 729MI/57.
47. *Boigne*, ed. by Berchet, I, pp. 127–133.
48. Michel Winock, *Madame de Staël* (Paris: Pluriel, 2012), pp. 84–85.
49. Arnault, p. 398.
50. UK, British Museum, James Gillray, *Politeness* (London: Hannah Humphrey, 1779).
51. Arnault, p. 394.
52. Thomas Rowlandson, *A Frenchman plundered* (London: R. Newton, W. Holland, after 1792).
53. Harriette Wilson, *Memoirs of herself and others* (London: T. Douglas, 1825), p. 399.
54. Robin Eagles, *Francophilia in English Society, 1748–1815* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2000), p. 17: 'French was employed as a collective term for anyone of foreign nationhood'.
55. Raymonde Monnier, 'Tableaux croisés chez Mercier et Rutlidge: le people de Paris et le plebeien anglais', in *Annales Historiques de la Révolution française*, 339 (2005): 1–16.
56. Vigée-Lebrun, III, p. 128.
57. Louis Simond, *Voyage d'un Français en Angleterre dans les années 1810–1811*(Paris: Treutel & Wurtz, 1816), p. 169; Auguste Defauconpret, *Quinze Jours à Londres à la fin de 1815* (Paris: Emery, 1817), pp. 134–135.
58. *Boigne*, ed. Berchet (1999), I, pp. 141, 151.
59. Ibid., p. 142.
60. Tetty Havinga and Anita Bocker, 'Country of asylum by chance or by choice? Asylum seekers in Belgium, Netherlands and the UK', in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 25 (1999): 43–61.
61. Charles-Edme Gauthier de Brécy, *Mémoires véridiques et Ingénues de la vie privée, morale et politique d'un homme de bien* (Paris: Imprimerie Giraudet, 1834).
62. *Mémoires de mon Émigration par l'Abbé de Fabry*, ed. Ernest d'Hauterive (Paris: Champion, 1933).
63. *Genlis*, ed. Masseau, p. 99.
64. *Lameth*, ed. Welvert, p. 22.
65. Rance, 'Mémoires de nobles émigrés'.
66. Gauthier de Brécy, p. 278.
67. Arnault, p. 374.
68. Pierre-Jean Grosley, 'Londres' (Lausanne, 1774), in ed. Jacques Gury, *Le Voyage Outre-Manche—Anthologie de voyageurs français* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1999), pp. 67–70; Norman Scarfe, *Innocent Espionnage: The La Rochefoucauld Brothers' Tour of England in 1785* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1995), p. 207.

69. *La Tour du Pin*, ed. Liedercke, p. 316.
70. *Mémoires du Général d'Andigné*, ed. E. Biré (Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1900), p. 101.
71. *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, III, p. 103.
72. According to Walsh, p. 50.
73. *Ducrest*, ed. Pincemaille, p. 37.
74. *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, II, p. 104.
75. Arnault, p. 399.
76. Walsh, p. 50.
77. Roger Dupuy, Les Chouans (Paris: Hachette, 1997); Jean-Clément Martin, *La Guerre Civile, entre histoire et mémoire* (Nantes: Ouest Editions, 1995).
78. *Boigne*, ed. Berchet, I, pp. 144–148.
79. *Andigné*, ed. Biré, pp. 105–113; *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, II, p. 442.
80. *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, II, p. 399.
81. Louis de Marcillac, *Souvenirs de l'Emigration à l'Usage de l'époque actuelle* (Paris: Baudouin Frères, 1825), pp. 91–92. Jean-Gabriel Rocques de Montgaillard, *Mémoires Secrets de J.M.G de Montgaillard, Pendant les années de son Émigration: Contenant de Nouvelles Informations sur le Caractère des Princes Français et sur les Intrigues de Agents de l'Angleterre* (1804).
82. Walsh, p. 70.
83. *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, II, pp. 443, 459.
84. *Germaine de Stael, Dix Années d'exil*, ed. Madame Necker de Saussure (Paris: Garnier, 1906); Louis-Philippe, *Mémoires de Louis-Philippe, duc d'Orléans* (Paris, 1973). *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, II, p. 438.
85. Ségolène Payan, 'Du déplacement au sentiment d'exil', *Recherches en Psychanalyse*, 9 (2010): pp. 171–182 (p. 173).
86. Payan, pp. 177–178.
87. David Bell, *The Cult of the nation in France: Inventing nationalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2001), p. 21.
88. Eric Hobsbawm, *Nation and Nationalism since 1780: programme, myth, reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 23.
89. Jay M. Smith, *Nobility reimagined. The patriotic Nation in Eighteenth-Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).
90. Andigné, pp. 162–164.
91. *Tilly*, ed. Melchior-Bonnet, pp. 233–234; *Souvenirs du Général Comte Mathieu Dumas,* ed. Christian Dumas (Paris: Librairie de Charles Gosselin, 1839), pp. 576–577.
92. Marcillac, pp. 32–33.
93. Marcillac, p. 22.

94. Michel Vovelle, 'Entre cosmopolitisme et xénophobie: patrie, nation, république universelle dans les ideologies de la Révolution française', in *Nations and Nationalisms: France, Britain, Ireland and the Eighteenth Century Context*, eds. Michael O'Dea and Kevin Whelan (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1995), p. 13.

95. Louis-Gabriel de Villeneuve, *Mémoires sur l'Expédition de Quiberon: Précédé de l'Emigration de 1791, et sur les Trois Campagnes de 1792, 1793, 1794* (Paris: Le Normant, 1819), p. 196.

96. *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, II, p. 459.

97. *Mémoires de famille de l'Abbé Lambert, Dernier Confesseur du Duc de Penthièvre, Aumonier de la Duchesse d'Orléans, sur la Révolution et l'Emigration, 1791–1799*, ed. Gaston de Beauséjour (Paris: A Picard et fils, 1894), p. 159.

98. Montgaillard, pp. 40, 164.

99. *Lambert*, ed. Beauséjour, p. 159.

100. *Fabry*, ed. d'Hauterive, p. 75.

101. *Souvenirs du comte de Contades, Pair de France: Coblence et Quiberon*, ed. Gérard de Contades (Paris: E. Dentu, 1885), p. 75.

102. *Andigné*, ed. Biré, p. 82.

103. Grégoire Franconie, 'Louis-Philippe et la sacralité royale après 1830', in eds. Hélène Becquet and Bettina Frederking, *La Dignité de Roi: regards sur la Royauté en France au premier XIXe siècle* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2009), pp. 97–114.

104. Vigée-Lebrun, pp. 119–120.

105. Walsh, p. 47 ('La religion, c'est la première, la plus grande des patries').

106. *Souvenirs d'Emigration de Madame la Marquise de Lage de Volude*, ed. Baron de la Morinerie (Evreux: A. Hérissey, 1869).

107. Gauthier de Brécy, pp. 241–242.

108. *Andigné*, ed. Biré, p. 177—chapter on the Chouans, as a 'nation à part' as opposed to the *patriotes*.

109. *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant, II, pp. 420, 425, 472.

110. Dumas, T. III. p. 562.

111. Montgaillard, p. 1.

112. *Andigné*, ed. Biré, p. 337.

113. *Bouillé*, ed. Kermaingant.

114. *Tilly*, ed. Melchior-Bonnet, pp. 156–157.

115. William Reddy, *The Invisible Code. Honor and sentiment in Post-revolutionary France, 1814–1848* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 7.