

Historiographical Note

For the historiographical debate regarding the relationship of the family and patriarchal politics, see Julie Hardwick, *The Practice of Patriarchy: Gender and the Politics of Household Authority in Early Modern France* (University Park, Pa., 1998). On the persistence of political societies as family writ large, see Caroline Ford, “Private Lives and Public Order in Restoration France: The Seduction of Emily Loveday,” *American Historical Review* 99, no. 1 (February 1994): 21–43; Suzanne Desan, “Reconstituting the Social after the Terror: Family, Property and the Law in Popular Politics,” *Past and Present*, no. 164 (August 1999): 81–121. On debates about the timing of the emergence of liberal affect, see Sarah Maza, “Only Connect: Family Values in the Age of Sentiment: Introduction,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 30, no. 3 (Spring 1997): 207–12; Judith Surkis, *Sexing the Citizen: Morality and Masculinity in France, 1870–1920* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2006). In the United States, governmental power may have continued to reside in the figure of the father, namely George Washington, but he was a father whose power was strictly limited by popular sovereignty and thus shorn of tyrannical or coercive overtones. See François Furstenberg, *In the Name of the Father: Washington’s Legacy, Slavery and the Making of a Nation* (New York, 2006), 10, 45, 93. On the Federalist defense of an older politico-familial order, see Rosemarie Zagarri, *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia, 2007), 106. Major studies of the eighteenth-century British state include John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688–1783* (New York, 1989); Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth, eds., *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford, 1999); Joanna Innes, *Inferior Politics: Social Problems and Social Policies in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford, 2009); Christopher Tomlins, *Freedom Bound: Law, Labor, and Civic Identity in Colonizing English America, 1580–1865* (Cambridge, 2010). For a similar argument with regard to the relationship between husbands and wives, see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville, Va., 2002). On the counterrevolution in the United States, see Zagarri, *Revolutionary Backlash*; Sarah Knott, “Sensibility and the American War for Independence,” *American Historical Review* 109, no. 1 (February 2004): 19–40, esp. 35; Terry Bouton, *Taming Democracy: “The People,” the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution* (New York, 2007); Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2009); Sarah M. S. Pearsall, *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 2008). The increasing use of familial metaphors is borne out in law cases in Lower Canada. See for example Petition of Christian Shavers, Jan. 11, 1796, Court of Quarter Sessions (QS), Bibliothèque et Archives Nationales du Québec, Montreal (BANQM). It is difficult to ascertain whether discourse or social practice takes precedence in determining the contours of cultural values. Elites shaped the discourse of mastery through the public court system, and the term *mastery* was often employed in political debates over the superiority of the British versus the French in Quebec in this period. What is clear is that many ordinary people self-consciously adopted the language of family and loyalty to the state as a means to distinguish themselves from American republicans. Whether they had assimilated these values from British government elites is difficult to determine with any accuracy.