2014

The Delage-Sumter Family in the Nineteenth Century Atlantic World

Mitchell Oxford
University of South Carolina - Columbia

THE DELAGE-SUMTER FAMILY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY ATLANTIC WORLD

By

Mitchell Oxford

Bachelor of Arts
The Florida State University, 2006

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

History

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2014

Accepted by:

Don Doyle, Director of Thesis

Matt Childs, Reader

Lacy Ford, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Acknowledgements

The author thanks Dr. Don Doyle for his guidance and direction throughout the writing and editing of this thesis. He also thanks Dr. Matt Childs for his helpful comments as this essay was drafted and edited. Both are deserving of considerable gratitude for their willingness to help see this project to its completion. He thanks Dr. Lawrence Glickman for his assistance throughout the early stages of researching and writing, and his considerate aid in the years that followed. Thanks to librarians at the South Caroliniana Library, especially Brian Cuthrell, Graham Duncan, and director Henry Fulmer, for their incredible assistance as the research for this thesis was conducted, and their continued help and friendship throughout. He owes a great amount of thanks to the many, many people who provided helpful criticism of evolving versions of this thesis, especially Dr. Carol Harrison, Dr. Tom Brown, Dr. John Jeffries, Dr. Allan Potofsky, Virginia Pillsbury, Jonathan Boyette, Evan Kutzler, Tim Hyder, Andrew Kettler, Neal Pohlemus, Mark Van Driel, and Chaz Yingling. Particular thanks are due to Mr. Thomas Tisdale for his help throughout this project, and his enthusiasm for the continuation of a project that he has worked on for so long. Finally, if the author has gained any particular insight from this project, it is the invaluable importance of wisely building and participating in an edifying network of professional contacts, friends, and family. My deepest thanks go to all of those who, without having read a word of this thesis, were indispensable to my completion of it.

Abstract

Thomas Sumter Jr. (1768-1840) and Natalie Delage's (1782-1841) marriage in 1802 joined prominent families from the United States and France. Although both families enjoyed an elite status in their societies, they had sharply divergent political ideologies and commitments in a revolutionary era shaped by ideological conflict. The South Carolinian Sumter family was as steadfastly republican as the French de Lage family was royalist. Despite holding to these seemingly dichotomous ideologies, this emergent Atlantic family pursued vigorous strategies in the effort to uphold their status, and ensure the financial and social stability of future generations. In their efforts, the family employed connections in surviving Old Regime states, and the emerging post-revolutionary states in Europe and the Americas. This essay examines these strategies by following the de Lage and Sumter families as the contingencies of the Age of Atlantic Revolutions allowed for their unlikely union. It then traces their uneasy and uneven attempts to forge a common transatlantic family strategy over the course of the following forty years. Focusing on these families' often aggressive relocations, and their careful deliberation over marriage choices, this essay seeks to understand how a family attempted to interpret and respond to the uncertainties of the revolutionary and post-revolutionary Atlantic. Despite the Delage-Sumter family's tenuous ideological and cultural disharmony, they were able to forge coherent transatlantic strategies for several decades. They did so for as long as they did by focusing on what they shared: the

importance of the family's continued economic security and social status, within an ordered and hierarchical political system. In exploring their story, this essay participates in the turn to micro-history by historians of the Atlantic World, for micro-history's utility in articulating the details of macro-historical phenomena, and for probing prevailing historical meta-narratives.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

AN ATLANTIC FAMILY IN THE AGE OF REVOLUTIONS, 1775-1804

So quickly did Thomas Sumter Jr. (1768-1840) and Natalie Delage[1] (1782-1841) fall in love, that not long after their ship arrived in Nantes in December 1801, Aaron Burr was worried about how Delage's mother, "a furious Royalist," would receive the couple. Delage was an émigrée from a French aristocratic family who had fled the French Revolution in 1793. She was sent by her parents to the United States. There, she lived in Burr's household in New York City from 1794 to 1801. At the end of 1801, Delage had left Burr and the United States to return to France and reunite with her family, who had returned earlier in the year from their exile in Spain. Thomas Sumter Jr. was en route to Paris to join the United States diplomatic delegation as the secretary to Robert Livingston, the newly appointed American minister to France. Sumter, the son of Thomas Sumter, a Revolutionary War General and Congressman from South Carolina, obtained this position thanks to his family's political connections. These connections included Burr, who had recommended Sumter for the position. Delage and Sumter met at port in New York City, and were inseparable from that point forward. Burr's concern about how Sumter might be received by Natalie's family in France was well founded. The Marquise de Lage (1764-1842), Delage's ardently royalist and Catholic mother, found her daughter's relationship with the republican and Episcopalian Sumter repugnant. But, as Burr noted, "[Natalie's] heart was in the United States." The de Lage family begrudgingly approved the union, and the couple was married in a Catholic ceremony in Paris on 20 March, 1802.[2]

[1] A note on spelling: I have employed the Anglicized spelling, Delage, which Natalie Delage took when she moved to New York City in 1793. When I refer to the family in France, I retain the original French, de Lage. Likewise, I use de Lage for other members of the de Lage family, such as the Marquise de Lage de Volude, and Stephanie de Lage, Natalie Delage's mother and sister respectively.

[2] The romance between Delage and Sumter is discussed in Aaron Burr's correspondence with General Horatio Gates in Aaron Burr 30 March 1802 in Matthew L. Davis, editor, *Memoirs of Aaron Burr,*

This study traces the formation and strategies of the Delage-Sumter[3] family with particular attention to their migration and marriage strategies within the Atlantic World.[4] Chapter One covers the period from 1750 to 1802. It addresses the Sumter family's arrival in British North America, Thomas Sumter Sr.'s establishment in South Carolina, his career in the Revolutionary War, and the Sumter family's role in the politics of the early United States. It then addresses the de Lage family in the *ancien regime* and Revolutionary France, Natalie Delage's life in the United States, and the heated negotiations over the Delage-Sumter marriage in the winter of 1802. Chapter Two follows the Delage-Sumter family from 1802 to 1842. During this period the family frequently worked together to consolidate their financial and social status in France and the United States despite their often considerable differences of opinion over politics and polity. Even as the de Lage and Sumter families attempted to work together, considerable

---

Complete (New York, 1836); the Delage-Sumter romance is also discussed at length in Thomas Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills: Natalie Delage Sumter* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 29-36; and in Countess H. Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle: La Marquise de Lage de Volude 1764-1831* (Paris: Perin et cie, 1907), 192-198; Burr's observation was recorded in a letter to his daughter, Theodosia Burr Alston, in Davis, *Memoirs*,19 March, 1802.

[3]Here and throughout the essay, I use Delage-Sumter to denote the extended family in the United States and France whose common connection was the marriage between Delage and Sumter in 1802. See the Appendix A for a genealogical chart, Appendices B and C for timelines of the de Lage and Sumter families respectively.

[4]Though its earliest antecedents are older, contemporary Atlantic History coalesced in the late 1960s. Drawing from both the new social history as from contemporaneous political movements, Atlantic scholars sought to move past traditional narratives of the European expansion and colonization, which they criticized as overly simplistic, teleological, and nationalistic. In sketch, the new Atlantic paradigm is as follows: Early Modern European exploration borne of imperial competition led to demographic, economic, and cultural exchanges within the Atlantic basin as consequence of encounters between Europeans, Africans, and Amerindians. These links fostered new societies, ideologies, cultural forms, identities, and eventually polities, within a relatively coherent and discrete Atlantic World. These exchanges were not, of course, on an even footing. Much of the coherence of the Atlantic World is owed to the development of the African slave economy and racial slavery, the rise of new world commodities (especially sugar, rice, and cotton), and of a wide range of ideologies, from proslavery thought based on racial categorization to radical political egalitarianism emerging from the Enlightenment. Distinctly Atlantic civilizations emerged from this cacophony, as did the interconnected revolutions of the late eighteenth and nineteenth century For a discussion of some of the methodological and ideological challenges of Atlantic History, See Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2005); see also Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, eds, *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

disagreements emerged between the aristocratic and traditionalist Marquise de Lage, her much more liberal and republican daughter Natalie, and Natalie and Thomas Sumter Jr's children. Despite these differences, however, for several decades the Delage-Sumter family navigated the revolutionary and post-revolutionary Atlantic World. They found a common cause in the endeavor to retain their family's property and social status in the United States and France, and in building a stable political order that rested on a hierarchical social order. The Delage-Sumter family's efforts to execute informed strategies concerning migration and marriage took place as they interpreted the changing political and economic circumstances of the post-revolutionary Atlantic. Duly, this study will seek to interpret the family's movements within the context of changing geopolitical as well as familial balances of power.[5]

The historian is ill-equipped to discern the nuances of romance, bound as the discipline is to the limitations of sources, and thwarted by the ordinary opacity of the human heart. Accordingly, this study seeks to understand the romance between Sumter and Delage (as well as the bonds of affection within the family) by examining the outward expression of their affection, as well as the circumstances in which the family acted on familial and romantic impulses. The decisions made by members of the Delage-Sumter family reveal overlapping priorities that included the impulses of romance and of familial duty, and commitment to religious and political ideologies. These overlapping commitments are common, but the Delage-Sumter family acted upon them during an extraordinary period. The Delage-Sumter marriage in 1802 was the genesis of a distinctly

[5] A note on sources: Much of the correspondence that I use for this largely epistolary history is in French; I have provided courtesy translations for this essay. The French language originals can be found in the Papers of the Sumter and Delage Family at the South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina in Columbia, South Carolina. (Hereafter cited as the Sumter-Delage Papers.)

transatlantic family.[6] It joined elite families in France and the United States during the chaos of the Age of Atlantic Revolutions[7] from the contingency of Natalie and Thomas' romance. Although their marriage was bitterly opposed by Natalie's mother and grandmother in France, the de Lage matriarchs eventually, if reluctantly, acquiesced to the union. Their acquiescence was due to Natalie and Thomas's tenacity, the Sumter

[6]This thesis owes a particular debt to Sarah M. S. Pearsall's, *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), which places family and epistolary history within an Atlantic framework. Additionally, it owes its origin and historiographical framing to the considerable literature on families and the importance of "generation" in the study of the Revolutionary Atlantic, and the post-Revolutionary world, much of which has been published by French scholars in the past twenty years. See especially André Burguière, *Le mariage et l'amour en France de la Renaissance à la Révolution* (Paris: Le Sueil, 2011); Philippe Daumas, *Familles en révolution: Vie et relations familiales en Île-de-France, changements et continuités (1775–1825)* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2003); Christopher H. Johnson et al. eds. *Transregional and Transnational Families in Europe and Beyond: Experiences since the Middle Ages* (New York: Berghan, 2011); Ralph E. Giesey, "Rules of Inheritance and Strategies of Mobility in Prerevolutionary France," *American Historical Review* 82.2 (April 1977); Vincent Gourdon, *Histoire des grands-parents* (Paris: Tempus, 2001); Agnès Martial, ed. *La valeur des liens: Hommes, femmes et transactions familiales* (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2009); Irène Théry and Christian Biet, eds., *La famille, la loi, l'État: De la Révolution au Code civil* (Paris, 1989); David Troyansky "Looking for Grandparents in the French Revolution" *Annales de demographie historique* (1991) 127-131; David Troyansky, "Generational Discourse in the French Revolution" in *The French Revolution in Culture and Society*, ed. David Troyansky, Alfred Cismaru, and Norwood Andrews Jr. (New York: Praeger, 1991), 23–31; Anne Verjus, *Le bon mari: Une histoire politique des hommes et des femmes à l'époque révolutionnaire* (Paris: Fayard, 2010); Michel Vovelle, "L'enfance et la famille dans la Révolution française," in Marie-Françoise Levy, *L'enfant, la famille et la Révolution française* (Paris: Orban, 1989).

[7] For a look at the approach to the Age of Atlantic Revolutions that was dominant in the mid-twentieth century, see Jacques Godechot, *France and the Atlantic Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, 1770-1799*, trans. Herbert R. Rowan (New York: The Free Press, 1965); R. R. Palmer, *the Age of Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959-64). Godechot and Palmer emphasized the democratic, liberal and emphatically Western character of the Atlantic Revolutions, an approach that almost completely ignored the Haitian Revolution and the role of non-Europeans in shaping the politics, societies, and cultures of the Atlantic World; for a recent critique of this, as well as a discussion of recent studies that seek to integrate the Atlantic Revolutions with fidelity to the importance of Haiti, see Laurent Dubois, "An Atlantic Revolution" *French Historical Studies* 32 (2009); interestingly, this Atlantic World history largely comes out of the American and British academies, see Cecile Vidal, "The Reluctance of French Historians to Address Atlantic History," *Southern Quarterly* 43 (2006) 153-189 for her sharp analysis on the political and cultural reasons behind this reticence in the French academy; See the analysis of the peculiarities of the development of nationalism in the Americas as opposed to Europe in Don Doyle and Marco Antonio Pamplona, eds. *Nationalism in the New World* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006); For the historiographical issues with the "Age of Revolutions" in the Atlantic World, see Wim Klooster, ed., *Revolutions in the Atlantic A Comparative History* (New York: New York University Press, 2009); as well as David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, eds., *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); See also Trevor Bernard and Allan Potofsky, "The Political Economy of the French Atlantic World and the Caribbean Before 1800," *French History* 25 (2011).

family's elite status in the United States, and the de Lage family's unstable position in Napoleonic France in 1802.

For the duration of Thomas, Natalie and Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage's lives, the de Lage and Sumter branches of the family employed coherent transatlantic strategies in the effort to preserve the family's economic and social well-being on both sides of the Atlantic. Blurring the lines between old and new patterns of wealth and class, the Delage-Sumter family relied on their political connections and landed wealth in both France and the United States. The de Lage family's claim to noble status reached back to the medieval period. By the eighteenth century, Natalie Delage's family was the lords of estates in the Saintonge and Gascoigne in southwestern France, and in Champagne in northwestern France. The family also owned houses in the important cities in these regions, Bordeaux and Saintes. By the height of the eighteenth-century Bourbon state, however, the de Lage family resided in Versailles and worked for the monarchy. Thanks to this long historical connection, the Marquise de Lage remained an ardent supporter of the senior line of the Bourbon royal family in and out of power throughout her life. During the Bourbon Restoration, the reigns of Louis XVIII (1815-1827) and Charles X (1827-1830) – both of whom she knew personally – de Lage enjoyed a renewed connection to political power. Conversely, the Sumter family's elite status in British North America and the incipient United States was a product of New World imperial expansion, eighteenth century war and revolution, and Thomas Sumter's military advancement and political connections. Thanks both to his 1767 marriage to Mary Jamison in South Carolina, and his military connections, Thomas Sumter emerged from

middling origins as one of the largest landowners in South Carolina's midlands, holding over 150,000 acres.

Thanks to his father's political connections, Thomas Sumter Jr. served as a United States diplomat in France, Great Britain, and Brazil (the latter from 1809-1821), before returning to his native Stateburg S.C. to manage the Sumter family's plantation. When Natalie Sumter and five of her children visited Natalie's mother in France from 1823 to 1827, the Sumters were in financial duress and in need of Natalie's father's inheritance. During Natalie and her children's trip to France, the Marquise de Lage successfully used her wealth and political connections to negotiate marriages to European aristocrats for her two eldest granddaughters (Fanny, in 1825, and Nat, in 1828). Although Natalie and Thomas were initially hesitant to arrange marriages for their daughters to European suitors, they nevertheless acknowledged the social and economic utility of doing so. These marriages revealed generational rifts within the family over appropriate marriage practice and family strategy. Nevertheless, the marriages had the double effect of satisfying the Marquise de Lage's wish for her granddaughters to marry into respected and economically stable aristocratic families, while permitting Natalie to inherit her portion of her father's estate in France despite her status as an émigrée to the United States. Thomas and Natalie Sumter's children were raised in a distinctly cosmopolitan family. However, theirs and subsequent generations did not have the same personal, economic, or ideological incentives to continue to strategize across the Atlantic. Because of this, the connection between the French and American branches of the family declined by the mid-nineteenth century, after the generation that had forged the family's initial transatlantic strategy had died.

By the mid nineteenth century, upheaval in both the United States and France severely curtailed the family's connections to political power. The family's coherence was already weakened following the deaths of the Thomas Sumter Jr. (1840), Natalie Sumter (1841), and her mother, the Marquise de Lage (1842). Familial affinity was not enough to stem the tide of estrangement between branches of the family as they faced separate challenges in France and the United States. The pyrrhic victory of the Bourbon Restoration was ended by the Revolution of 1848. Barely more than a decade later, the American Civil War (1861-1865) crippled the Sumter family's political fortunes in the United States. These two midcentury upheavals dealt a powerful double blow to the Delage-Sumter family's social and political status in France and the United States. The result was by mid-century the family no longer had the personal, economic, or political incentives to maintain strong relations across the Atlantic. And thus, the reasons why subsequent generations no longer acted in concert are clear. A transatlantic family strategy that drew on economic and political advantages was no longer possible, and the personal bonds of affection between the de Lage and Sumter families had naturally faded after its founding members died.

CHAPTER I

THE SUMTER AND DELAGE FAMILIES AND THOMAS AND NATALIE'S MARRIAGE (1750-1802)

The transatlantic scope and elite status of the Sumter and de Lage families came before the Age of Revolutions. By the onset of the Atlantic revolutions, both families were well-placed landed elites. Their path to elite status, however, was markedly different. The de Lage and Amblimont families in France claims to elite status antedated the sixteenth-century establishment of the Bourbon French state. Thomas Sumter's his military career for the British in the Seven Years War and for the South Carolina militia in the American Revolution, however, was the catalyst for the Sumter family's emergence as an important political family in the early American republic. The Sumter family came to the colony of Virginia from obscure British origins in the mid eighteenth century. William Sumter (1692?-1754) was born in Hinston, Cambridgeshire, in England. His family's origins are lost to history—though it is thought that Sumter's father was Welsh and that William became an orphan in his childhood. His father's name was only recorded as "Nicholas," and nothing further is known of him or of William Sumter's mother, Katherine Matthews. Though no record remains of when William, and his wife Elizabeth (née Iveston, born 1695), also of Hinston, arrived in Virginia. They must have migrated before the birth of their first child, Patience Sumter (1729-1814), who was born in Albemarle County in the Piedmont of Virginia. The Sumter family was of modest means. William Sumter worked as a miller in Virginia; parish records show that the family moved frequently within the region during the mid-eighteenth century.

Thomas Sumter (1734-1832), William and Elizabeth's second son, was born in either Albemarle or nearby Hannover County. It is unlikely that Thomas Sumter, or his five siblings, relied on any inheritance from their father's estate. Furthermore, coming from a middling family in the backcountry of Virginia, Thomas Sumter received a

rudimentary education. He learned to read and write, and, it is likely, was taught agricultural techniques common to a rural education. This education provided skills that prepared Sumter for a livelihood as a farmer or tradesman. William Sumter died in Louisa County Virginia in 1752. After his father's death, Thomas Sumter joined the Virginia Militia at age 18. His decision to enlist in military service was sound and a common track for second sons in societies that maintained primogeniture.[8] This decision proved to be a propitious one for the Sumter family's fortunes. Soon after, he participated in the French and Indian War. For the next century, the family's social and political fortunes would rise largely thanks to war and revolution.[9] Although the Sumter family's early history in the British American colonies does little to suggest the family's rise to prominence, the latter half of the eighteenth century demonstrates the opportunities available to talented and bold individuals in a period marked by imperial warfare. The French and Indian War (1754-1763), as the American theater of the Seven Years War was known, was the first major global war. Although every major European power was involved in some aspect of the conflict, the Seven Years War was principally an imperial contest between Britain and France. Though mainly fought in Europe, and Europe's Atlantic coast, the French and British empires also fought in North America, the Caribbean, Southeast Asia, and Africa.[10]

---

[8]Primogeniture and entail lasted in Virginia until 1785. See C. Ray Keim, "Primogeniture and Entail in Colonial Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly* 25.4 (1968), 550-551.

[9] For a discussion of the Sumter family in the early eighteenth century in Virginia, see Robert D. Bass, *Gamecock: The Life and Campaigns of Thomas Sumter* (New York: Holt, 1961), 1-20. Bass' work remains the best and most complete biography of Thomas Sumter.

[10] For recent scholarship in the Seven Years War as a global imperial struggle, see Daniel Baugh, *The Global Seven Years War, 1754-1763* (New York: Pearson Press, 2011) and Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754–1766* (New York: Faber and Faber, 2000). For scholarship on the war as it concerned colonial North America see William H. Fowler, *Empires at War: The Seven Years' War and the Struggle for North America* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 2005).

The North American theater of the war was not as strategically important as the European and Atlantic naval arenas. It was largely fought by colonials and their native allies on both sides. This included Sumter's Virginia Militia, in which George Washington served as major. The British victory in 1763 led to several important outcomes. First, the French lost Quebec, their easternmost province in North America. Although Quebec was sparsely populated, it was a bulwark to British domination of the Atlantic seaboard of North America, and was an important region for its fur trade. Their victory, however, was a mixed blessing for the British. The expense of the war helped set in motion a tax-revolt-turned-revolution in thirteen of the British North American colonies. When the American Revolution began in earnest in 1775, it was the first in a series of colonial revolts across the Atlantic World; revolts that were aided and exacerbated by rival European and American powers.

The American Revolution is viewed as the opening salvo of the "Age of Atlantic Revolutions" that continued into the early nineteenth century. This Age of Revolutions—comprising the American, French, Haitian, and Iberian-Atlantic revolutions—were deeply connected politically and ideologically. Both the Sumter and de Lage families were drawn into the American Revolution. During American Revolution (1775-1783) the American colonists were aided by not only France and Spain, but by many other foreign nationals. Foreign aid for the American cause was driven by differing motivations; some certainly were moved by a belief in the American cause, and its use of the Enlightenment ideals articulated in the Declaration of Independence. However, those who aided the American colonial cause were also motivated by the opportunity to strike against the British Empire. French intervention in the American Revolution under Louis XVI

followed the American victory at Saratoga in the winter of 1778. The great-grandson of Louis the XIV harbored no affection for republican politics; his aid was motivated by the *real politik* of imperial strategy. Louis seized the opportunity to strike the British Empire that had defeated France just two decades before.[11]

The years between the Seven Years War and the American Revolution were a period of transition for Thomas Sumter. Thanks to his connection with Henry Timberlake, with whom Sumter had participated in an expedition to the Cherokee "Overhill Country" during the French and Indian War, Thomas accompanied a group of Cherokee chiefs to London in the spring of 1762. He and Timberlake left America in May and returned in August of 1762. The chiefs were received with interest by the London public. Their tour even included an audience with George III. However, the voyage threatened both Timberlake and Sumter with financial ruin. Timberlake likely died in a London debtor's prison. Upon returning to America by way of Charleston, Thomas was unable to pay his outstanding travel expenses. He was stranded in South Carolina in the winter of 1762, until he was sent to Virginia where he was imprisoned in 1763 as he was unable to pay his debts. Sumter, however, was more fortunate than Timberlake. His friend (a future Revolutionary general) Joseph Martin, loaned Thomas the money that allowed him to leave prison, after which, Sumter relocated to the High

[11]Some of the important works on the diplomacy and politics of the American Revolution, especially concerning France's involvement, include Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937); Edward S Corwin, *French Policy and the American Alliance of 1778* (New York: Archon Books; 1962); Jonathan R. Dull, *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985). For a recent intervention of the politics of the Age of Revolution, see David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, eds., *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); David Armitage's *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), and Manuela Albertone, and Antonino De Francesco, eds., *Rethinking the Atlantic World: Europe and America in the Age of Democratic Revolutions* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Hills region of central South Carolina. He married Mary Jamison in 1767, and due to successful business ventures he became a member of the established local elite by the time of the Revolution. Thanks both to his marriage to Jamison, and Sumter's use of his own connection to colonial officials, Sumter became one of the largest landowners in South Carolina. By 1775 Sumter owned over 150,000 acres of land, in several districts of the midlands and upstate South Carolina. Sumter's position as an important landowner was central to his decision to participate in the American Revolution, and his early appointment to the South Carolina militia.[12]

This rapid rise in social and economic standing was a product of Sumter's work and good sense, as well as the connections that he had made during the war. When the Revolution came, Sumter rapidly advanced from Lieutenant Colonel to Brigadier General in the South Carolina militia. He acquired a reputation for fierceness for his involvement in the war. Thus, Sumter's participation in two late eighteenth century wars propelled him and his family into heights of the social and economic hierarchy that would have been much more difficult otherwise. His role in the Revolution, however, meant that Sumter was part of the founding mythos of the early American Republic—which was undoubtedly more valuable than vulgar economic status. By the end of Revolutionary War Thomas was a war hero in addition to being a *nouveau riche* planter. He parlayed his status and reputation into a political career, serving in the United States House of Representatives from 1789 to 1793, again from 1795-1801, and in the United States Senate from 1801 to 1810. Sumter's role in the revolution as a general in the South

[12] Henry Timberlake's account of the expedition to London survives in his prison memoirs. Samuel Williams, editor, *Memoirs, 1756-1765* (Marietta, Georgia: Continental Book Co., 1948); Bass discusses this briefly in Bass, *Gamecock*, 65-70.

Carolina militia has been well documented—his heroics cemented his position within the South Carolina elite.

Unlike the Sumters' obscure origins, Natalie Delage came from nobility, with a well-established genealogy. Her maternal line, the d'Amblimont family, was originally from the region of Champagne in Eastern France (they were perhaps of Saxonian origins). Through the d'Amblimont line, Natalie Delage's family had a long connection to the French Atlantic. Throughout the *ancien regime*, Members of the D'Amblimont family served in the Admiralty, beginning with the first Marquis d'Amblimont's (1642-1700) tenure as the Governor-General of the French Antilles in the late seventeenth century. Following this tradition, Natalie's maternal grandfather, the Marquis Renart de Fuchsamberg d'Amblimont, was an admiral in the French Navy. During his career, he played a role in the French Navy's decisive actions in the war; his participation in the American Revolution was a continuation of his family's longstanding connection to the French Atlantic. Though most of his service took place in European waters, he was briefly stationed in New York City in 1782. The de Lage family's long history in the Atlantic was augmented by this meaningful connection with the emergent United States—a connection to which the family returned when revolution upset France's political and social order, and put the family at mortal risk.[13]

In addition to the d'Amblimonts' longstanding service in the French Royal Navy, the de Lage family had close connections to the France's royal family, the Bourbon dynasty. Natalie's father, the Marquis de Lage de Volude, was from a noble family in the

[13] The Marquis Fuchsamberg d'Amblimont's record with the French Navy is discussed in Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 2-24; perhaps the best English language work on the French Navy during the period is Jonathan R. Dull, *The Age of the Ship of the Line: the British and French Navies, 1650-1851* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009).

Saintonge in southwestern France. He married Beatrix-Stephanie-Renart d'Amblimont in 1782; their marriage certificate was signed by Louis XVI. After his marriage, the Marquis de Lage also took a commission in the Navy, though he was too late to join his father-in-law in the American Revolution. Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage was the *dame d'honneur* (lady in waiting) to Maria Teresa of Savoy-Carignan, the Princess Lambelle (1749-1792). Lambelle was a close confidant of Marie Antoinette, and the governess to the royal family. The Marquise de Lage's post was a boon to the family before the Revolution, but it was a dangerous association during it. Natalie's mother's personal connection to the monarchy is crucial in explaining her post-revolutionary politics. In addition to serving in Louis XVI court, she maintained lifelong relationships with the future Louis XVIII and Charles X. Her personal connection with these men meant that de Lage remained a Legitimist, a supporter of the senior line of the Bourbon monarchy, for the rest of her life.[14]

The dynamism of the years between the end of the American Revolution in 1783 and the beginning of the Terror in 1792, which led to Lage family's emigration from France the following year, demonstrates the disparate effects that the Age of Revolutions had on the de Lage and Sumter families. While the American Revolution elevated the Sumter family, the French Revolution not only diminished the de Lages, it threatened their lives and compelled them to leave France. A brief look at the two families in the years from 1783 to 1802 reveals their widely divergent trajectories. Thomas Sumter's service in the South Carolina Militia propelled him to Brigadier General during the

[14] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, xi-xvii.

American Revolution and to the upper echelon of South Carolina politics after the war.[15] Conversely, the French Revolution was an existential threat to the de Lage family, as their close ties to the monarchy left them particularly exposed to risk. Recognizing the danger that the revolution posed, even in its relatively moderate and liberal early stages, the de Lage family fled Paris in 1789. Initially, they removed themselves to the de Lage family's provincial seat in the Saintonge, southwestern France. While in the Saintonge, from 1789 to 1793, the family's situation deteriorated further.[16] The first years of the French Revolution, power was contested between moderate and radical elements within the revolution's supporters. From 1789 to 1792, the moderates sought to constrain the monarchy through constitutional reform. This effort failed due to a disastrous lack of interest by Louis, and lack of trust by the people. Louis XVI was no proponent of constitutional constraints, and attempted to escape France and rally his supporters in 1792. This led to Louis' arrest in August 1792.

The radical phase of the French Revolution began the following month, in September 1792.[17] This radicalism emerged from the power vacuum that followed Louis' arrest, and the paranoia stemming from the threat of foreign invasion. The beginning to the "Reign of Terror" saw mob violence and summary executions during the "September

[15] Bass, *Gamecock*, 25-150.
[16]Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 57-108.

[17] While much of the classic historiography of the French Revolution has sought to explain its causes internally, Jean Jaurés et al., *Histoire Socialiste 1789-1900* (Paris: J. Rouff Presse, 1901) argued that to understand the causal forces that underlay the Revolution historians must look beyond metropolitan France. Jaures' insight –has proved useful as historians have cast and recast the meta-historical narrative of the Revolution, and successively reevaluated the Age of Revolutions and the Atlantic World. Historians of other national academies have acknowledged that the French Revolution had causes and consequences that transcended national boundaries. Particularly influential to this reexamination of Haiti was Yves Benot, *La Révolution Français et la Fin des Colonies* (Paris: la Découverte, 1988).

Days" of September 1792. Among the victims of revolutionary violence was the Marquise de Lage's benefactor and friend, the Princess Lambelle. Following his arrest, Louis XVI's deposition, trial, and execution on 21 January, 1793 marked the definitive end of the *ancien regime*.[18] The execution of the monarch also ignited the most violent expression of counterrevolutionary violence to come from the French Revolution—the War in the Vendée (1793-1796). Although counterrevolutionary sentiment existed across France, it was particularly strong in the Vendée, a coastal territory in southwestern France between Nantes and La Rochelle—a region that was perilously close to the de Lage's position in the Saintonge. Inspired by their devotion to the Catholic Church and the monarchy, the Vendéen counterrevolutionaries opposed the French Republic's anticlerical policies and were inflamed by the Republic's regicide. Despite their proximity and their favor of the royalist cause, the de Lage family did not participate directly in the counterrevolution. However, the family was close to several of the important leading royalist figures. The atrocities committed by both sides finally compelled the de Lage family to flee France in 1793.[19]

The War in the Vendée was particularly savage. This was due to the French Republic's need to legitimate itself through establishing a national consensus, coupled with the broad popular support that the anti-republican revolt had in the region. Support of for the Royalist cause in the Vendée was thanks to the region's divergence from

[18]Georges Bertin, *Madame de Lamballe* Trans. Arabella Ward, (New York: Godfrey A. S. Weiners, 1901).

[19] The recent historiography on the War in the Vendée centers on Reynald Secher's *A French Genocide: The Vendée*, trans. George Holoch (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003) originally published in 1986. perhaps the best recent handling of the War in the Vendée and of the anti-republican counterrevolution is Jean-Clément Martin, *Contre-Révolution, Révolution et Nation en France, 1789-1799* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, Points d'Histoire, 1998); for a discussion of the Revolution's militaristic spirit, see Frank Attar, *Aux armes citoyens ! Naissance et fonctions du bellicisme révolutionnaire* (Paris: l'Universe Historique, 2010).

eighteenth-century trends across France towards de-Catholicization, and towards the noble class being increasingly removed from local populations. The Vendée's strongly conservative political culture thus favored collaboration between noble and common folk under the Royalist cause. The Royalist leadership in the war was the local nobility. Among the most prominent of these were the Rochejaqueleins, who were close friends of the de Lage family. Thus, the Vendéen conflict took on a personal dimension for the de Lage family. It set the Marquise de Lage against republicanism for the rest of her life. During 1792 and early 1793, the de Lage family moved with trepidation between the family's countryside estates and the region's chief cities of Bordeaux and Saintes, where the family also held property.

The September Massacres, the executions of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, and the War in the Vendée convinced the de Lage family to leave France.[20] In their decision to emigrate, the de Lage family participated in a mass emigration from the chaos of the French Revolution. The political instability and violence led as many as 160,000 people to leave France from 1789 to 1799. These émigrés were chiefly moderate republicans and royalists who felt threatened by the revolution's radicalism. The tumult of the Revolution demanded improvisation, and only those who had financial means, personal connections, or wherewithal, were able to leave. Unsurprisingly, the majority of those who left did so to adjacent territories. Though most émigrés left for Britain, Spain,

[20] Jacques Godechot, *La Contre-révolution, doctrine et action 1789-1804* (Paris: Publications Universitaire Française, 1961);Jean-Clément Martin, *Contre-Révolution, Révolution et Nation en France, 1789-1799* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, collection Points, 1998); Margery Wiener, *The French Exiles, 1789-1815* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1966); Kirsty Carpenter and Philip Mansel, *The French Émigrés in Europe and the Struggle Against Revolution, 1789-1814* (New York: MacMillan Press, 1999).For a discussion on the communities that these French immigrants created in the French Atlantic, see Darrell R. Meadows, "Engineering Exile/Social Networks and the French Atlantic Community, 1789-1809." *French Historical Studies* 23 (2000) 67-102; and his "The Planters of St-Domingue, 1750-1804, Migration and Exile in the French Revolutionary Atlantic" (PhD diss., Carnegie Mellon University, 2004).

The Netherlands, Switzerland, and various German states, between 10,000 and 25,000 émigrés left for the United States.[21] Like other royalist émigrés, the de Lage family had a clear preference to immigrate to states that supported the overthrown Bourbon dynasty. Increasing revolutionary radicalism and violence, however, meant that French counterrevolutionaries were harbored across Europe as European powers formed the First Coalition against the French Republic. The de Lage family, however, had a unique network of connections. This was thanks to their history of service to the Bourbon dynasty, not least of which was the d'Amblimonts' naval service in the French Atlantic Empire. The family escaped the worsening violence of 1793 by employing these connections, inadvertently establishing an Atlantic family in the process.

However, the violence of the Terror should not obscure the fact that the family's immigration from France was done with a great deal of planning and rational decision making.[22] When the situation turned grave for the family in 1793, the family escaped France. They did not, however, leave as a group. Instead, the family chose to split up and weather what they hoped was a temporary storm. When the family committed to immigration in 1793, they did so incrementally. Their strategy centered on Spain, due to Spain's proximity to the family in southwestern France. Furthermore, Spain's Bourbon monarchy ensured the family political connections. On account of her age, the family's matriarch, the Marquise Fuchsamberg d'Amblimont, remained in the southwestern of

[21]See Jean Vidalenc, *Les Emigrés Français, 1789–1825* (Caen: Publications de l'Université de Caen, 1963); Margery Wiener, *The French Exiles, 1789-1815* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1966). See also, Thomas Sosnowski, "Revolutionary Émigrés and Exiles in the United States: Problems of Economic Survival in a New Republican Society," (*French History and Civilization*, H-France.net, 2005).

[22] A collection of letters written by the Marquise de Lage during her exile in Spain was published as Léon Audebert La Morinerie, ed., *Souvenirs d'émigration de Madame la Marquise de Lage de Volude* (Paris: A Hérresey, 1869); For a recent perspective on the Marquise de Lage's exile in Spain, see Rosena Davidson, "Time and Exile: The Case of Mme la Marquise de Lage de Volude" *Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies / Lumen : travaux choisis de la Société canadienne d'étude du dix-huitième siècle* 18 (1999), 69-82.

France at the family's properties in Bordeaux and the Saintonge.[23] For the rest of the family, Spain took on crucial importance in the de Lage family's strategy. Spain's Bourbon monarch, Charles IV, was a relative of the French royal family. The de Lages' close connection to the Bourbons played a key role in their immigration to Spain. It also meant that the de Lage family had reliable connections in the Spanish court.[24]

While Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage, sought refuge in Spain, the Marquis d'Amblimont and his son-in-law, the Marquis de Lage resigned their positions in the French Navy after the collapse of the monarchy in 1792. They received commissions in the Spanish Navy that same year. The Marquis d'Amblimont served as rear admiral—the same rank that he had held in France. While the Marquis d'Amblimont took an active, martial, role in the European warfare of the 1790s, Natalie's father, the Marquis de Lage accepted a land grant in Puerto Rico from the Spanish government. In his service to the Spanish Navy, d'Amblimont served in the First Coalition against The French Republic from 1793 to 1795. The coalition—comprising Great Britain, Spain, and numerous German states—disintegrated in 1795. Spain made peace with the French Republic the following year and entered into an alliance against Great Britain.[25] Because of this change in alliance, when he died in the battle of Cape St. Vincent in 1797, he did so fighting against the British for a French-led alliance.[26]

---

[23] For their discussions of the de Lage family in the first decade of the 1800s, under Napoleon's empire see Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 247-257; Davidson, "Time and Exile," 79-82.

[24] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 110-130; William Doyle. *Oxford History of the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 197-220 for his account of the First Coalition's efforts against the French Republic.

[25] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 120-124.

[26] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 120-124; John D. Bergamini, *The Spanish Bourbons: The History of a Tenacious Dynasty*(New York: Putnam, 1974); Jean Tulard, *La Contre-Révolution: origines, histoire, postérité* (Paris: Perrin, 1990).

While the Marquis de Lage established himself in Puerto Rico in 1793 (where he died in 1799 from unknown circumstances) the Marquise de Lage sent their eldest daughter, Natalie, to the United States in September 1793. As the Marquise de Lage attempted to immigrate to Spain, Natalie, still in Bordeaux, was unable to acquire a passport to join them. So the family improvised. Natalie was sent with a family friend, Madame Senat, who was leaving from Bordeaux to the United States in the spring of 1793. Senat had five children, and the Marquise de Lage correctly assumed that Natalie would be able to more easily escape France with Senat by blending in with her large family.[27] Natalie and Senat arrived in the winter of 1793. Although Senat only makes a fragmentary mark on the historical record, she undoubtedly played a large role in Natalie's life in New York. Like the Marquise de Lage, it is likely that Senat was an educator in France. On her arrival in New York, Senat established a school for émigré children in order to provide for herself, her children, and Natalie. Though Senat proved to be an able guardian for Natalie, it is clear that the de Lage family did not wish to remain separated long-term. Indeed, Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage, attempted to join her daughter in the United States only months after Natalie arrived in New York City. Traveling under an assumed name and a false passport in March of 1794, the Marquise de Lage attempted to take the *Fluyvasant*, a Swedish ship, bound for the United States.[28] The ship was intercepted by a British warship and returned to Spain. During this ordeal she was nearly arrested and returned to France by the British Navy. However, she was eventually returned to safety in Spain. De Lage, who was ambivalent from the outset about her planned adventure to the United States, later wrote in her memoirs that she

[27] Morinerie, *Souvenirs*, 180-181.
[28] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle* 108-110; Morenerie, *Souvenirs* 30-40.

"would not have left for America at all, if not to save her [own] life, and, would [have wanted] return immediately to Europe."[29] After this encounter, she did not again attempt to leave Europe. Whatever thoughts the de Lage family might have entertained of a reunion in the new world ended in 1794.

In New York City, Natalie and Senat were taken in by Aaron Burr in early 1794. Whether this came about through connections in the United States that were established by Natalie's grandfather, the Marquis d'Amblimont, by Burr's own connections to New York's French community, or mere good fortune is unknown. However, there is cause for some speculation. While serving in the French Royal Navy during the American Revolution, the Marquis d'Amblimont was stationed in New York City. After the war, d'Amblimont was a founding member of the French branch of the Society of the Cincinnati—a hereditary organization for officers of the Revolution and their descendants—which gave the family a substantive connection to the United States. Aaron Burr, a colonel in the Revolutionary War and a republican politician, was a member of the order as well.[30] Regardless of how Burr was made aware of de Lage and Senat, he moved quickly to bring them into his household. Burr's first mention of Natalie and Senat in his voluminous records comes from 4 August 1794, only months after the immigration. They were enthusiastically integrated into Burr's household, and lived with Burr until 1801.

The de Lages' decision to send Natalie to the United States is surprising at first. Their migration from France was precipitated by the fall of the monarchy and the

[29] Morinerie, *Souvenirs* 199; Kirsty Carpenter and Philip Mansel, *The French Émigrés in Europe and the Struggle Against Revolution, 1789-1814* (New York: MacMillan Press, 1999).

[30] William Doyle, *Aristocracy and Its Enemies in the Age of Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) especially chapter 4: "Aristocracy Avoided: America and the Cincinnati," 86-137.

radicalism of Republican France. Even though Natalie was unable to gain passage to Spain in the winter of 1793, why then, did her family choose to send her to the young American Republic? Some likely reasons emerge. It is possible that Natalie's immigration became part of an improvised strategy for the family to temporarily escape Europe altogether, as war had erupted across the continent. The family had a connection to the Caribbean through Natalie's maternal line, which gave the family an Atlantic scope. Finally, the United States was an *en vogue* destination for émigrés in the 1790s. Although most émigrés to the United States were liberal and moderate republicans, some monarchists also emigrated. In all, some 10,000 to 25,000 French émigrés came to the United States, mostly to the port cities of Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Charleston.[31] Apart from all of these reasons, above all, Natalie was unable to join her mother in 1793. The family made an improvised choice to send her to the United States when the opportunity was presented to them to remove her from France.[32]

For both personal and geopolitical reasons the United States must have seemed to be a reasonable location in 1793. However, it was to be a temporary solution to what was hoped to be a temporary political crisis. Even this separation was supposed to be short.

---

[31] Patrice Higonnet, *Sister Republics: The Origins of French and American Republicanism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

[32] American historians have long acknowledged the impact émigrés of the French Revolution had on the politics of the United States—even as they occasionally conflate them with refugees from the Haitian Revolution. However, most of this work confines itself to the short-term political impact of these migrants, and largely focuses on the politically and culturally active men who formed vibrant – and short-lived – communities in American cities in the 1790s. Natalie Delage was of course not alone in her migration. Many others, perhaps 160,000 in all, left France for the Americas and elsewhere in Europe. French migration from the Revolution would have serious political ramifications for the countries that they to which they immigrated, as well as their native France. Natalie Delage's example should encourage historians to investigate further the impact of the women and children émigrés, as well as the role of conservatives who were certainly less vocal, but perhaps no less vital. See Frances Sargent Childs, *French Refugee Life in the United States, 1790-1800: An American Chapter of the French Revolution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940);Jocelyne Moreau-Zanelli, *Gallipolis: Histoire d'un mirage américain au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Harmattan, 2000); Darrell R. Meadows, "Engineering Exile/Social Networks,"; Allan Potofsky, "The 'Non-Aligned Status' of French Émigrés and Refugees in Philadelphia, 1793–1798," *Transatlantica* 2 (2006).

Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage, initially sought refuge with the Countess de Montijo in Madrid, a wealthy supporter of Spain's Bourbon monarch. Montijo was also the cousin of the Duke d'Havre—a friend of the d'Amblimont family. The Montijo family remained important players in European politics of the nineteenth century. Her daughter, Eugénie de Montijo, married Napoleon III of France. Montijo was a gracious host and benefactor to the Marquise de Lage for the duration of her immigration in Spain, which lasted from 1793 until 1801.[33] The incremental migration that the de Lages' employed was finally completed at the end of 1794. Although Natalie was sent to the United States, and the Marquise de Lage escaped to Madrid, Natalie's younger sisters, Stephanie and Calixte, remained in France in 1793. They remained in Bordeaux in the care of their grandmother, the Marquise d'Amblimont until the two were able to join their mother in Madrid in the fall of 1794.[34]

By improvised design or happy accident, Natalie Delage spent her adolescence under the attentive care of Aaron Burr. Burr was a recent widower in 1794. He had one child, Theodosia (1783-1813), to whom Burr was a particularly observant parent. Burr was an ardent advocate of women's education, and he took great care to provide for Theodosia's intellectual development. Furthermore, as an avid Francophile, Burr encouraged Theodosia to learn French. When he was initially made aware of Natalie and Senat's presence in New York in 1793, he saw the advantages of bringing them into his home. Natalie and Theodosia were only one year apart in age, and Burr saw the benefits of having an aristocratic French companion for his daughter. Burr served as a surrogate father to Natalie, providing for her education and well-being. Theodosia and Natalie

[33] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 111-180.
[34] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 100-108.

became lifelong friends, and Senat played a pivotal role in Theodosia and Natalie's education. Furthermore, it was through Burr's patronage that Senat established her school for the children of New York's French émigré community. Some intimations in his correspondence indicate that a romantic relationship existed between Burr and Senat as well—though Burr's language is opaque, he was playful and familiar—often referring to Senat as *ma bonne amie.*[35] Furthermore, Burr took personal interest in Natalie's education and her progress in English.[36] Theodosia was Natalie's constant companion in New York and they remained close until Theodosia's death in 1819.[37]

Though unlikely at the start, Natalie's immigration to New York was the most lasting of the de Lage family's moves in 1793. Although Natalie remained in contact with her mother, grandmother, and sisters in Europe, the letters are no longer extant. It is unknown if Natalie was in contact with her father in Puerto Rico, and his career there is absent from the historical record. Whatever role he might have played in reuniting the family, either within the Spanish Empire or the United States, ended with his death in 1799. His death, and the Marquise de Lage's inability to surmount the British blockade, halted any attempts the de Lage family made to reunite in the Americas. The first coalition against the French Republic collapsed in 1795, and Spain was forced into a

[35] See Burr's letters to his daughter on 21 March, 1801 and 26 May, 1801. Davis, *Memoirs.*

[36] See Burr's letter to Natalie 15 August, 1801. Burr praises her progress in English, and encourages her to read Edward Gibbon; promising that they will discuss it when he returns from Washington, in the Sumter-Delage Papers, 4:1.

[37]Burr's relationship, particularly the forthright role he took in providing for her education has been studied closely by his biographers, including Isenberg, and especially Omask, *Aaron Burr*. Additionally, Theodosia Burr Alston is the subject of Richard N. Coté, *Theodosia Burr Alston: Portrait of a Prodigy* (New York: Corinthian, 2002).See also, Childs, *French Refugee Life*, and Greer, *The Incidence of Emigration during the French Revolution*; Allan Potofsky, "'Non-Aligned Status.'".

peace agreement with France in 1796.[38] Although this was a humiliation for supporters of the Bourbons in both France and Spain, it also should have signaled to the de Lage family the weakness of a family strategy that centered on a quick return to modes of politics modeled on the *ancien regime*. As the violence in France subsided, the political order that emerged was neither republican chaos nor return to the old regime, but rather the emergence of the First Empire under Napoleon I. France's new political order, it seemed, was too strong for the family to hope that it would be soon swept aside. However, the violence that had driven the family to escape France had passed. Furthermore, the character of French politics changed dramatically with the emergence of Napoleon, First Consul under the Consulat, and as Emperor in 1804.

The rise of Napoleon meant that although France was no longer ordered by the pillars of the old regime—the monarchy, Catholicism, and a legally privileged aristocracy—it had emerged as an autocracy, not a democracy.[39] Although the Marquise de Lage thought of Napoleon as a usurper, his liberalized policy towards émigrés meant that most émigrés were allowed to return safely to France, including noblewomen.[40] By 1800, the amelioration of the political and economic climate had allowed several prominent émigrés to return to France—including the Marquis de Lafayette, and Louis-Philippe. The following year the Marquise de Lage and her daughter Stephanie left Madrid for Paris (Calixte, the de Lage's youngest daughter, died in 1800). There, the Marquise de Lage was rejoined by her mother, the Marquise d'Amblimont. The two

[38] John A. Lynn, *The Bayonets of the Republic: Motivation and Tactics of the Army of Revolutionary France, 1791-1794* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996); Lynn Hunt, Classic *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

[39] Martyn Lyons, *Napoleon Bonaparte and the Legacy of the French Revolution* (Oxford: Palgrave, 1994); Keith Baker, ed. *The Political Culture of the Old Regime* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987); William Doyle, *Old Regime France.*

[40] See Weiner, *French Exiles*, 180-200.

widowed matriarchs set themselves to reestablishing the family in post-revolutionary France. The death of the Marquis de Lage meant that the surviving members of the family were in France, apart from Natalie in New York. On her return to Paris in 1801, the Marquise de Lage called her daughter to return to France from the United States.

In New York, Burr financed Natalie's return in the fall of 1801. He purchased her way on a ship embarking for Nantes, with his friend Robert Livingston (1743-1813).[41] Livingston was a fellow Republican politician from New York, and the recently-elected President Thomas Jefferson's nominee to be Minister to France. Livingston was en route to Paris with his personal Secretary Thomas Sumter Jr. to take this post. Burr was acquainted with Sumter through his father's military service during the Revolution, and had written Thomas Jefferson on Sumter's behalf in regards to the post in France. Burr's attempts to strengthen his personal and political ties with the south were clear. His recommendation of Sumter came after his daughter's fiancé, South Carolinian Joseph Alton, declined the position. Burr was unhappy that Natalie was returning to France, but expected that she would attempt to return to the United States. He undoubtedly saw the possibilities inherent in a match between Sumter and Natalie. Thomas and Natalie met at port, and were inseparable throughout the journey. By the time they had arrived in France, in December, they had decided to marry. When news of the romance arrived to Burr, in a letter from his friend Horatio Gates, Burr approved of the couple.[42] Natalie's relationship with the South Carolinian Sumter was a political opportunity for Burr, a fact Burr made explicit in his letter congratulating the couple. He remarked to Natalie that

[41] George Dangerfield, *Chancellor Robert R. Livingston: 1746-1813* (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1960); Peter J., Kastor and François Weil, eds., *Empires of the Imagination: Transatlantic Histories of the Louisiana Purchase* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009).

[42] Aaron Burr to Theodosia Burr Alson, 8 March, 1801, in which he asks "would Mr. Alston be willing to go as secretary to Chancellor Livingston? I beg your immediate response." Davis, *Memoirs*, 413.

"Nothing could be more grateful to me than your proposed connexion with Mr. Sumter… These circumstances never fail to generate attachments, and I am truly happy in being more closely allied to him."[43] Burr and Natalie's sentiments and motives were obvious. What chord was struck within Thomas Sumter Jr., however, is largely outside of the historian's view, as Sumter left scant personal records. The only son of Thomas Sumter Sr., he was twenty years Natalie's senior, and a life-long bachelor.[44]

Natalie's age and social status play a crucial role in explaining why she was inclined to remain in the United States. Her attachment to the United States perhaps explains her romance with Sumter, which began only after she began her return to France. Although no record of Natalie's reaction to being called to return to France has survived, it must have been bittersweet. The surviving account of the journey to France indicates that Thomas and Natalie were inseparable before the ship had even left harbor in New York.[45] They presented their intention to marry to Natalie's family soon after they arrived in Paris in January 1802. Their impetuousness may reflect an intrinsically amorous nature. However, the manner in which they acted must be interpreted within the context of Natalie's background—a history that juxtaposed aristocratic privilege, revolutionary violence, Atlantic transmigration, and a childhood in exile in a vibrant port city under the care of a dynamic statesman of the new American republic.

Although Natalie was strong-willed by all accounts, the impetuousness of the relationship shows that Natalie was cognizant that marriage to a prominent American—

[43] Burr to Natalie Sumter, 5 July 1802 in Davis, *Memoirs.*

[44] See the discussion of the political calculations that surrounded his ministry to France, in Davidson, *Chancellor*, 290-315.

[45] For these accounts see the letter from Thomas Sumter Jr., as recorded in Davidson *Chancellor*, 330; the letter from Horatio Gates to Aaron Burr on 30 May, 1801, Davis, *Memoirs.*

one with political ties to her paternal surrogate—provided her an opportunity to return to the United States. If those were her motives, then Sumter was a good marriage choice for Natalie. However, Natalie's intention to marry Sumter and return to the United States was angrily and bitterly opposed by her mother and grandmother.[46] The relationship had a jarring effect on Natalie's family, and for good reason. No sooner had the family reunited, after nearly a decade of separation, than their reunion was jeopardized by Natalie and Thomas's relationship. Not only did this challenge the family's resumption of life in France, but it also challenged the de Lage matriarchs' ideals. Natalie intended to marry a man whose republicanism and Episcopalian religion was not immediately or easily reconciled to the de Lage family's worldview which was shaped in France's old regime.

Adding to de Lage and d'Amblimont's shock was the suddenness of Natalie and Thomas's announcement was the rapidity with which the couple went forward with their intended marriage. Arriving in Nantes on 31 December 1801 and in Paris in January 1802, the couple spent the winter months pushing Natalie's family on the question of marriage. Robert Livingston, the American Minister to France, played a key role in persuading Natalie's mother and grandmother that Sumter was a suitable marriage partner.[47] In order to overcome the seemingly intractable opposition of Natalie's family, and to have his secretary resume his work, Livingston plied his diplomatic skill.[48] In order to allay the fears that Natalie's family had about the viability of the American republic, Livingston emphasized the Sumter family's reputation, standing in South

[46]Stephanie de Lage to the Marquise de Lage, 26 June, 1800, Delage-Sumter Papers, 12:1;Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 191,

[47] Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills*, 43-48.

[48]Letter from Robert Livingston to the Marquise de Lage, in March 1802. Delage-Sumter Papers, 13.1;

Carolina's social hierarchy and the Sumters' economic security rooted in land and slaves. Initially, Natalie's mother and grandmother wanted a marriage contract for Natalie and Thomas, as was customary in France. Livingston was able to diffuse this contentious issue by arguing that Sumter's honor would be as impugned in the United States for having a marriage contract as it would be in France for not having a contract. Livingston's intercession was pivotal in explaining and smoothing over the differences between American and French marriage practices, and in selling the de Lage matriarchs on the Sumter's status as American quasi-aristocracy. His intervention made the Sumter's politics more palatable to the de Lage family. His presentation demonstrated that the Sumter's republicanism coexisted within a hierarchical and conservative social system. However, despite its centrality to this social and economic system, slavery was never discussed.

Not only did Livingston encourage Natalie's family to accept the marriage, but some of the de Lage family's closest confidants did as well. Natalie's grandmother's confidant, the Abbé de Montisquiou played a similar role as Livingston. His counsel was perhaps decisive in convincing the de Lage matriarchs to allow Natalie and Thomas's marriage to go forward. Whereas Livingston was an able and incisive advocate for the Sumter family, Montisquiou focused on the emotional import of Natalie's life in America, and urged her family's understanding and acquiescence. In his letter of 2 March, 1802 to Natalie's grandmother, the Marquise d'Amblimont, Montisquiou offered his thoughts about Natalie. He focused his insight on how Natalie's life in the United States had profoundly influenced her outlook. Aware of the deep shock that the relationship was to d'Amblimont and de Lage, he began with a note of understanding. "I

know how long you have been tormented…but what pains you suffered were for principles and morals that are foreign to others." However, he continued, "[y]our granddaughter is young and charming, spiritual, well-born, full of good works, and possessing reason beyond her age. But, it is the spirit, the reason, and even the morals of another country, of the country in which she lived. And nothing of it resembles ours." Natalie's decision was not easy, Montisquiou explained. Rather, "she has felt deeply her separation from the family. I have never seen so much grief, and so many tears." However, he continued, there were good reasons why Natalie wanted to return to the United States. "Her gentleness and good nature could serve the good will of everyone, but I doubt that she would find what she needs here…for all of the charms of life for us, she finds foreign." Montisquiou had intervened in the increasingly acrimonious family situation as the discussions between Natalie and Thomas, and Natalie's family developed in January and February of 1802. He carried on extensive conversations with both Natalie, and Natalie's grandmother.

In his letter Montisquiou related to the Marquise d'Amblimont that his conversations with Natalie revealed a stark divide between the generations, and of old and new worldviews on family, love, and duty: "What she calls love is a penalty for us; it is a fancy, a convenience. It is the same good that she could experience within the family, with all of its tenderness. And, those feelings at the bottom of her heart must be absorbed, or else she would be sacrificing religion, family, and homeland. *But I saw that she wasn't listening to me*" [emphasis mine]. Montisquiou was certain that Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage's protestations would not be heard. Despite Natalie's "good nature and reason," Montisquiou pointed out, "she was raised in a country where each follows the

religion that they want, where children are used to seeking a family, and forgets their own, and in a country where no one knows either their homeland or their ancestors." To Montisquiou, Natalie's years in the *Nouveau-Monde* had not only estranged her from her life in France, but they had instilled in her new values that challenged the importance of her family's values, rooted in the politics and religiosity of the old regime. In short, he echoed Burr's assessment of Natalie that "her heart is in the United States." While Burr clearly was doubtlessly buoyed by this, from Montisquiou's vantage Natalie's embrace of American values was a thing to be endured. American republicanism was damningly related to French revolutionary republicanism, which de Lage held responsible for the destruction of the Old Regime in France and for the political instability, violence, and war that followed.

Having explained Natalie's point-of-view as he understood it, Montisquiou then turned to the extraordinary circumstances that had driven the family apart. He sought to give the Marquise d'Amblimont some comfort: "what would I say to you madam? It is a sacrifice that you have been condemned to undergo during the Revolution. It was necessary to choose between separation, and the loss of a child." Nevertheless, because of these circumstances "I feel, as do you, the upright thing to be done, is what our ancestors would have rejected." Montisquiou adroitly acknowledged that the politics of the *ancien regime* had been eclipsed. Now, Montisquiou attempted to convince the de Lage family that although it was "a sad destiny" for the family, to endure permanent separation, however "there [were] certain advantages" to Natalie's marriage to Thomas Sumter Jr.: "Mr. Sumter is an estimable man, of high account in his country, for his connections and his fortune. Carolina, where he lives, is a colony of superior order…compared to all the

others, its inhabitants are thought of as a race apart, and who have nothing in common with the origin, and the vagabondage, of the other American States." He concluded, noting that "it's long been said that the feelings of a mother are more tender than their children," imploring the Marquise d'Amblimont she "be an example [for her daughter, the Marquise de Lage], so that "that which tears your heart not become a disastrous legacy." Both Livingston and Montisquiou's contribution to the family's negotiations emphasized the cultural and political difference between the United States and France. However, both also made the case for a common ground, found in the both families' landed wealth, and position at the top of a hierarchical social structure.

The Abbé de Montisquiou's powerful letter clearly played as key a role in the marriage as that of Livingston. The following day, 3 March, 1802, the Marquise d'Amblimont wrote on behalf of the family to welcome Thomas Sumter Jr., and to give her blessing to the marriage.[49] In her biography of the Marquise de Lage, the Countess H. Reinach-Foussemagne aptly stated that "[i]t was not only Madame d'Amblimont who gave way… it was the entire old regime."[50] D'Amblimont's letter to Thomas Sumter Jr. was courteous, but it was also frank. She began by acknowledging that her granddaughter had already made her choice, and that "Natalie is today more yours than mine." However, the Marquise admitted, "you must have seen that I find it repugnant to give my confidence in [Natalie's] happiness to a foreigner; nor assent to rending an eternal separation." Echoing the counsel given to her by Montisquiou, she deftly blended two ways of choosing a marriage partner. "I see," she wrote, "that it would be you that I

[49] Letter from the Abbé de Montisquiou to the Countess d'Amblimont see Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 193-195; the letter from the Countess d'Amblimont to Thomas Sumter Jr. on 3 March, 1802 appears in the Delage-Sumter Papers, 13.1.

[50] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 196.

would have chosen, if she would have left to me the choice." And so, d'Amblimont concluded, "I put her happiness in your hands, and yours in hers. Afterwards, there is nothing left for me to do than to give you my full and entire consent; my most tender blessing for the mutual happiness of you both." Having given her blessing to Thomas Sumter Jr., the Marquise d'Amblimont then wrote to her granddaughter, Natalie, that same day. Although conciliatory, d'Amblimont's letter showed that the pain of loss for herself and Natalie's mother was still raw: "ah, my child!" she exclaimed, "If you had but a quarter of the tenderness that I have for you, you would hesitate before you did this misfortune of my life, and that of your poor mother."

Again echoing Montisquiou's views, d'Amblimont told Natalie that, "the results may have been the same…In recognizing that your happiness is attached to that eternal separation, your heart must be telling you that ours must be sacrificed." Finally, the Marquise acquiesced: "and there it is—the last of my reproaches against you. My heart, and my religion command me to pardon the evil that you've done me… I give you my consent and I extend my blessing fully." She encouraged Natalie to "believe me…your poor mother's heart, completely broken though it is, will always be open to her Natalie—to her child, who she loves painfully and tenderly." But more than giving her assent, the d'Amblimont offered some kind words to her granddaughter on her husband-to-be. She wrote Natalie that "Mr. Sumter seems to me to be the most worthy, sensible, and the most loyal of all men. I was less stunned that you had sacrificed everything to your desire to be with him." Led by The Marquise d'Amblimont, the de Lage family begrudgingly assented to Natalie's choice of husband. The marriage itself reveals the negotiations and compromises made by both the de Lage family and Thomas Sumter Jr. Natalie affirmed

her commitment to the Catholic faith, and the couple was married in the Church. Thomas Sumter Jr. however, remained Protestant. (Thomas and Natalie maintained this peaceable confessional division throughout their lives.) The de Lage family succeeded in having Thomas and Natalie married in the Catholic Church, however, there was no marriage contract. Natalie de Lage and Thomas Sumter Jr. were married on 20 March, 1802 in a Catholic ceremony in Paris. And with that, the *ancien regime* stood aside.[51]

In 1802, the aristocratic and deeply royalist de Lage family's matriarchs permitted their eldest daughter to marry a republican, a Protestant, and a foreigner. After the Marquise de Lage had spent the previous decade expending her energy maintaining the family during the Revolution, it is astounding that she would acquiesce to her daughter's wishes, despite the apparent sincerity of Natalie's emotion, and Sumter's well positioned family in South Carolina.[52] That the de Lage matriarchs allowed Natalie to leave France without any expectation that she would return suggests that the Marquise de Lage and her mother the Marquise d'Amblimont were constrained by their family's political and economic situation, and were willing to engage in a proactive strategy to ensure the family's survival. This "repugnant" outcome was only conceivable because the de Lage family's confidence in their position in France was shaken in the wake of the revolution and its aftermath. These uncertainties were addressed by Livingston and Montisquiou. The appeals of these judicious and savvy advisors made the scion of an elite American family acceptable to a French aristocratic family that remained devotedly royalist throughout the French Revolution and throughout the nineteenth century.

[51] The letter from the Countess d'Amblimont to Natalie Delage appears in Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 197-198.

[52] W. R. Ward, *Christianity Under the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

The struggle over the Delage-Sumter marriage also revealed differing views within the family on questions of politics in the emerging post-revolutionary world of participatory government. The Marquise de Lage's politics were conventional for an aristocrat of the old regime. She was motivated by loyalty to monarchy and the Roman Catholic Church; the semi-sacerdotal absolute kingship that the Bourbon monarchs had embraced throughout the early modern development of the French state. As their strategy in exile demonstrated, the de Lage family employed a conservative cosmopolitanism. Though the family was French, the Marquise de Lage's loyalty was not to the French nation—and certainly not to a government that emphasized individual equality, and sought to remove the privileges of both the church and the aristocracy. Such principles seemed self-evidently dangerous to the de Lage family. Many observers agreed with such sentiments in both France and the United States.[53] The Marquise de Lage's opposition to emergent republican politics was informed by her formative experiences during the French Revolution, and undergirded her unwavering personal devotion to the Bourbons and to the principles of the *ancien regime*. Montisquoiu and Livingston's insights into the affinities between the Sumter and de Lage families was likewise evidence of some possible harmony between the South Carolinian Sumters' American republicanism and the de Lage's values.

[53] Edward Berenson, et al. eds., *The French Republic: History, Values, Debates* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2011); Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969); Drew McCoy, *The Elusive Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980); for two historiographical assessments, see Daniel T. Rogers, "Republicanism: the Career of a Concept," 79 (June, 1992), 11–38; Ed White, "The Ends of Republicanism," *Journal of the Early Republic* 30 (Summer 2010), 179–199; See Carol Harrison's recent *Romantic Catholics: France's Post-Revolutionary Generation in Search of a Modern Faith* (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2014), which points to the uneven ways that French Catholics sought to understand their role in 19th century French society and politics without jettisoning their faith. Natalie Sumter's relationship to the Church was metted out in the United States, but her religiousity bears certain similarities to those articulated by Harrison.

Natalie undoubtedly shared her mother's cosmopolitanism and Catholic faith. However, her politics were not that of an aristocrat of the French old regime. Instead, shaped by her years in the United States, Natalie's views were an amalgam of her aristocratic background, her own formative experience in the French Revolution, and her years in New York. This was a fact that both Aaron Burr and the Abbé de Montisquiou observed, and her mother came to accept, in the winter of 1802. Natalie, however, was never as interested or engaged in politics in the same way as her mother. Instead, her personal religious devotion, and her family life became her chief concerns. Natalie remained a devoted Roman Catholic, and she helped to nurture the Catholic Church in South Carolina. She also passed her Catholicism to her children. However, her religion was more inward-focused and did not have the same political implications as her mother's old regime Catholicism. Natalie's decision to marry an American, from a prominent political family best speaks to her politics. It at least proved Aaron Burr's assertion correct that "[her] heart [was] in the United States." The negotiations over the marriage, however, showed that both Natalie and Thomas Sumter's politics were pliable. Thomas Sumter Jr., too was cosmopolitan, but his politics were shaped by the American Revolution, and the project of building an American nation-state.

Sumter gave up little of importance in the marriage negotiations. He acceded to a Catholic ceremony, but was not required to convert. He avoided a marriage contract, and Natalie was returning to the United States to Thomas' native South Carolina. Thomas and Natalie's children, on the other hand, were raised Catholic, and given a Catholic secondary education. Although this was not a point of contest for Thomas Sumter Jr., it was his sole major concession in 1802. Natalie's acculturation within French aristocratic

society had been cut short by her migration to the United States. Instead of coming of age within aristocratic French society, she spent her formative years under the tutelage of the republican, liberal, and eccentric Aaron Burr. (Burr believed in the intellectual equality of women, and was accused of sexual libertinage.) While Natalie never disassociated herself with her aristocratic heritage, this heritage was readily integrated within her embrace of American culture and politics. The negotiation of Natalie and Thomas's marriage was not the first test of the de Lage's or Sumter's family cohesion. It was, though, the first in a series of challenges facing this newly-created Atlantic family, as they reassessed their position within the post-Revolutionary Atlantic World.[54]

[54] Martyn Lyons, Post-Revolutionary Europe, 1815–56 (Oxford: Palgrave, 2006).

CHAPTER II

THE DELAGE-SUMTER FAMILY, 1802-1842

Thomas and Natalie Sumter's marriage created a transnational family network across the Atlantic World. The struggle over the marriage revealed the profound and unresolved ideological fissures that shaped the family's contentions as they maintained their transatlantic relationship in the early nineteenth century. Nowhere were these disagreements more pronounced than over Natalie's daughter's marriages in the 1820s. As with Natalie and Thomas Sumter Jr.'s marriage, economic and social considerations played a decisive role. In the years that immediately followed the Delage-Sumter marriage, the de Lage family in Napoleonic France continued to endure material challenges. Conversely, the Sumter family prospered in South Carolina along with the fortunes of the United States. The family's trajectories, however, shifted in the 1810s. Thanks to the changing political and economic currents in France and the United States, and the Sumter's own financial mismanagement in the 1810s, by 1823 the two family's positions had reversed. The Bourbon restoration in France in 1815 and the Sumters worsening financial situation in the United States fundamentally changed the balance of power between the American and French branches of the family.

In 1802, economic and political uncertainty in France forced the Marquise de Lage into the untenable position of consenting to her daughter's marriage to an American, and a son of a prominent family of the American republic. The changed circumstances within the family—and the Atlantic World writ large—meant that Natalie and Thomas Sumter Jr. were forced to make similar concessions for their daughters' marriages as the Marquise de Lage had made in Natalie and Thomas's marriage. In the 1820s, Natalie and Thomas Sumter's two eldest daughters, Nat (b. 1803) and Fanny (b. 1805), married European aristocrats, thanks to financial assistance and the political

connections of Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage. The period from 1802 to 1823 that led to Natalie and her children's visit to France is poorly documented. However, enough remains to understand the dramatic change in family fortune in both France and the United States. This reversal of interfamily balance of power underlay the Marquise de Lage's insistence that Natalie visit France, and that Natalie's daughters marry suitable European aristocrats, and not their American equivalents. Unlike her failed effort to thwart Natalie's marriage in 1802, this time the Marquise de Lage was able to impose her will on the marriage of her daughters.

Natalie and Thomas Sumter had seven children from 1803 to 1820. They lived in France (until 1803), the United States, (from 1803-09) and Brazil (from 1809-1821), where Thomas Sumter served as a United States diplomat. Two years after Thomas and Natalie Sumter and their children's return from Brazil to South Carolina, Natalie and five of her children prepared for an extended visit to France, which they took from 1823-27. Thomas Sumter Jr. remained in South Carolina to attend to the family's land, human property and finances. By the end of the 1810s the Sumter's financial situation was in poor shape. The Sumters were in debt, after nearly two decades of the Sumter's absenteeism; with the elder Sumter serving in Washington, and Thomas Sumter Jr.'s extended diplomatic ventures in Europe and Brazil. In remaining in the United States it seems that Thomas yielded control of his daughter's marriages to Natalie's judgment during his family's visit to France. Even if Thomas had initially demurred at the prospect of his daughters' marriages in Europe, his family's finances, and his mother-in-law's firm control of the family assured his acquiesce. Although he is mostly absent from the record, the fact that Thomas permitted his wife and children to leave for France on his mother-in-

law's insistence indicates an initial level of compliance. Natalie and her children's voyage to France was likely funded by Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage. De Lage's generosity, however, was matched by her keen desire to shape her family's future, by making sure that her grandchildren married suitable European aristocrats with landed wealth.[55]

Although Natalie did not want her children's marriages to be determined by her mother, she had little choice. The Sumter family's debts in South Carolina had hemmed-in Thomas and Natalie's ability to find suitably advantageous marriage partners for her daughters in the United States. The Marquise de Lage understood her ability to direct the family's decisions. In addition to her ability to find husbands for her granddaughters, she also knew that for Natalie, an immigrant, to inherit her portion of her father's estate, Natalie would need her assistance.Because of France's post-revolutionary inheritance law first enacted by the French First Republic that forbade foreigners and expatriates to inherit French estates. Still in effect under Louis XVIII, the law reflected French concerns over the drain of capital out of France by émigrés such as Natalie. Some thirty years after the demographic disruption caused by the revolution, Louis' government reformed France's inheritance policy. The 1825 Inheritance Law liberalized France's inheritance policy for the émigrés who had fled the French Revolution. Even after 1825 Natalie could still only gain her portion of the inheritance through a transfer from a French citizen. This transfer was arranged with the marriage of her daughter Nat to Gabriel de Fontenay in 1828. Because the underlying economic and political situation

[55]See Appendix A for the Sumter family's genealogy and Appendices B and C for the extended families' timelines.

was so starkly in the Marquise de Lage's favor, she played a determining role in her granddaughter's marriages in the 1820s.

However, the de Lages' and Sumters' reversals of fortune developed over the course of the first decades of the nineteenth century. In 1802, the de Lages' position in France had not yet reached its low point. In Napoleonic France, the de Lage family's connection to political power was greatly reduced. During this period, de Lage[56] and her mother, the Marquise d'Amblimont, struggled to remain economically solvent. They survived thanks to the 5,000 francs de Lage was awarded from the Spanish government for her father, the Marquis d'Amblimont's service in the Spanish Navy in the 1790s, and an additional 8,000 francs from the government of the Count of Savoy for her years of service to the Princess Lambelle in pre-Revolutionary France. This was a substantial sum, but neither payment was substitute for an income. Under the empire the de Lage's were unable to establish sustained income.[57] The Marquise de Lage returned to France in 1802. During the next decade, she moved between Paris, her late husband's land in the Saintonge, and with friends in the southeastern region of Provence. De Lage held a precarious place within Napoleonic France's political order. She remained a forthright advocate of the supremacy of the Bourbon monarchy—even refusing to lodge Napoleon in her family's chateau in the Saintonge in 1807.

[56] Hereafter, the Marquise de Lage will be referred to as de Lage, as after the death of her husband in 1797 the Marquise de Lage is the only prominent person in this study with the surname de Lage.

[57] Although the Marquise de Lage refers to these sums in *livres*, the French government transitioned from *livres* to francs in 1795. However, it remained common to refer to large sums in *livres* for some time afterward.

Stephanie de Lage, Natalie Sumter's surviving sibling, married Louis-Francois the Count d'Isle de Beauchesne in 1809, in Saintes.[58] Stephanie and her husband left France for the Portuguese island of Madeira, where d'Isle had property, not long afterward.[59] The Marquise de Lage, now in her late 30s, began to take on the sole matriarchal position within the extended family. Her husband's parents had both died in the 1790s, and her mother, the Marquise d'Amblimont was in poor health. She died in 1812.[60] Less than a decade after the de Lage family resumed life in France its coherence was profoundly threatened. After the death of de Lage's mother, the Marquise d'Amblimont, she was forced to sell her family's chateau in the Saintonge to remain solvent.[61] This was the nadir of the family's economic and social life in France's First Empire.

In contrast, the Sumter family prospered during the first decade of the nineteenth century. The Sumter family enjoyed prestige and political connections within the Republican Party. Thomas Sumter Sr., Natalie's father-in-law, served as United States Senator from South Carolina from 1801-10. After Thomas Sumter Jr. served in Robert Livingston's diplomatic delegation in France (during which time Jefferson's government negotiated the Louisiana Purchase), he briefly worked in the American consulate in London in 1802-03. While in Europe, the Sumter's first child, Natalie Anne Sumter (1803-1855) was born in Paris.[62] However, Thomas and Natalie Sumter's time in Europe was brief; by 1803 they returned to the United States. After arriving in South Carolina in

[58]The marriage announcement for Stephanie de Lage and the Count d'Isle is found in the Delage-Sumter papers, 15.1; the marriage is also discussed in Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 250-260.

[59]See Davidson, "Time and Exile," 69.

[60] The death of the Countess d'Amblimont in Saintes is discussed by Davidson, "Time and Exile," 78-81 and Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 284-285.

[61] Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 199-303.

[62]To avoid confusion, references in this essay to Natalie Anne Sumter will use her nickname Nat.

1803, Thomas and Natalie Sumter relocated to the Sumter family's land in the midlands of South Carolina [present day Sumter County]. As the elder Sumter was in Washington, it fell on Thomas Sumter Jr. to help manage the family property, mostly in undeveloped real estate, and of farmland in South Carolina's midlands, in which the Sumters raised cotton. From 1803-1809 Thomas, Natalie, and their children lived at Stateburg, South Carolina.

This was undoubtedly a period of difficult transition for the family, but was so especially for Natalie. In 1803, when she arrived in the village of Stateburg, South Carolina, she was twenty-one, and fresh from living in New York City, Paris, and London. As Natalie's marriage to Sumter was negotiated in 1802, the de Lage family had been assured of the Sumter family's social position as prosperous members of South Carolina's social and political elite. Though this portrayal was not inaccurate, the de Lage's experience in France underscored that socioeconomic status was no guarantor of safety and stability in tumultuous times. Natalie's life in South Carolina was a distinct departure from her previous experiences, in some of the Atlantic World's most important cities.[63] Natalie was now married, having children, and living in a country plantation in a rural district of the midlands of South Carolina. Travel, communication with friends and family, and connections to the Catholic Church were all more difficult for Natalie in South Carolina than the places she had lived previously. Despite the difficulty, Natalie was able to keep in contact with her family in France, and her friends in the United States—especially Aaron and Theodosia Burr. This was especially the case as Theodosia

[63] Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills,* 45-55.

too married a South Carolina planter. She and her husband Joseph Alston lived in Georgetown, South Carolina, a port city north of Charleston.[64]

Thomas Sumter Jr. had not abandoned a career in public service. Napoleon's dominance of the Iberian Peninsula, which had impacted the de Lage family in Spain in the 1790s, forced the Portuguese royal family into exile to Brazil in 1807. The following year, James Madison's government offered Sumter a position in the US delegation to the Portuguese court in exile in Rio de Janeiro. Thomas accepted the post, and he, Natalie, and their children lived in Rio de Janeiro from 1809 to 1821.[65] Natalie and Thomas's children were spared the trauma of revolutionary violence that their parents experienced in the United States and France. However their lives were as peripatetic as their parents. When the family returned from Rio de Janeiro in 1821, none of the children had spent more than six years in the United States and Natalie had lived in South Carolina for only eight years. The two youngest children had lived their entire lives in Brazil.[66] When Thomas, Natalie, and their children returned to South Carolina in 1821, the family was in debt. Their finances strangled by Thomas Sumter Sr.'s mismanagement after he had retired from politics in 1810. The financial Panic of 1819, too, meant that the Bank of South Carolina had constricted of the state's money supply. This, alongside declining cotton yields due to soil exhaustion, meant that the Sumter family faced dire financial straits when they returned from Brazil, and were forced to look to France to ameliorate their situation.[67]

---

[64] Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills*, 55-78.

[65] Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills*, 79-90.

[66] Letter from Natalie Sumter to Mary Anderson September 10th 1823, Mary Virginia Saunders White, editor, *Fifteen Letters of Nathalie Sumter* (Columbia: Gitman's Book Shop, 1942).

White, *Fifteen Letters.*

[67] Murray Rothbard, *The Panic of 1819: Reactions and Policies* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962); Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: From Jefferson to Jackson* (New York:

Even as the Sumter family experienced social and economic difficulties in South Carolina during the 1810s, the political fortunes of Natalie's mother, the Marquise de Lage, had improved dramatically after Napoleon's fall from power in 1815. The subsequent restoration of the Bourbon monarchy returned to power the family that de Lage had served before the French Revolution, and had remained loyal to during the ordeal of the First Republic and Napoleon's rule. Starting in 1816 de Lage received a yearly pension of 1,200 dollars from Louis XVIII. By 1823 she lived on 3,000 dollars a year. This was thanks to de Lage's royal pension, and the revenues from her property in France and Italy that she reacquired after the Bourbons were restored.[68] The Marquise de Lage always insisted that the women in her family married men of respected social standing and property. However, the struggle over Natalie's marriage to Thomas Sumter Jr. made de Lage's preference for European aristocracy over Americans all the more ingrained. In 1802, these preferences had been circumvented by the de Lage family's precarious position in France and Natalie's vehement desire return to the United States by marrying Thomas Sumter Jr. The extraordinary circumstances of the age of Atlantic Revolutions that surrounded Sumter and Delage's marriage had forced an exception to de Lage's preferences. The circumstances that the two branches of the family found themselves in during the 1820s had been sharply reversed from those of 1802. These changed circumstances, not a change in de Lage's ideology or temperament, account for

---

W.W. Horton, 2010). See also Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 245-288.

[68] White, *Letters*, 90. These figures were reported by Natalie Sumter, in her letter to her friend Mary Anderson.

the striking difference in her control over her granddaughter's marriages as compared to her own daughter's marriage, during the Sumters' visit to France in the 1820s.[69]

The Sumter family's debts forced the family to look to Natalie's mother in France for aid, when Thomas and Natalie returned to South Carolina in 1821. In addition to their financial difficulties, the Sumters' relationship with the Burr family was no longer a source of strength. Aaron Burr, Natalie Sumter's earliest benefactor in the United States, was scandal-ridden, bankrupt, and no longer a factor in American politics. Burr's daughter Theodosia, Natalie's oldest friend, died at sea in 1812. Along with Thomas Sumter Sr.'s retirement in 1810, Natalie and Thomas Sumter Jr. were now deprived of their two chief patrons in American politics on their return to the United States. They must have felt an acute dearth of influential friends at a moment when it was most needed.[70] Though the family had ling discussed a visit to France, the Sumter's financial constraints changed the nature of such a visit, and imbued it with a new urgency. While Natalie was still in the United States, her portion of her father's estate in France was inaccessible. Because of the Sumters' financial duress and their diminished avenues for amelioration in the United States, and at her mother's request, Natalie and five of her children visited France. Her two oldest male sons stayed in the United States, but her three oldest daughters, Nat, Fanny, and Mary, joined her, as well as her two youngest children, Pauline and Sebastian. Thomas Sumter Jr., remained in South Carolina to see to the family's affairs in the United States. The subtext of their visit to France could not be clearer: both the Sumters' current financial problems and the family's long-term stability

[69] William W. Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War; the Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); Charles Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[70] The discussion of Sumter's financial situation is particularly rich in Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills*, 91-109.

could be addressed through advantageous marriages between Natalie's daughters to landed European aristocrats. Their marriages would be arranged by their grandmother, the Marquise de Lage.[71]

The details of the negotiations over Nat and Fanny's marriages in the 1820s survive through the few extant letters that Natalie wrote to her friend Mary Anderson in Stateburg S.C., and the numerous letters that the Marquise de Lage sent to Natalie during Natalie's visit in France.[72] Accordingly, little of Natalie's or Thomas Sumter Jr.'s opinions on family strategy remain from their trip to France. However, the extant letters do show that Natalie was reluctant to remain in France from the moment she arrived, and that she did not want her daughters' marriage partners decided by her mother. However, the letters also show that Natalie and her children were under the financial control of Natalie's mother. It seems likely that the Marquise de Lage paid the Sumters expenses for the voyage to France, for the indebted Thomas Sumter Jr. could not have paid for such an expensive trip. The visit lasted longer than Natalie intended or wished, as she explained in a letter from early in her voyage. Writing to Mary Anderson that "I don't think I will be able to return next April...I am afraid it would kill me, but however I will not determine anything until April comes…it is very likely that Mr. Sumter will not be able

[71]Although there are no contemporary accounts of what the family thought of their sudden privation, Mary Boykin Chesnut made the following fascinating observation in her diary, in January 16 1862: "When Mr. S could not pay his debts, he refused to live in luxury. Mr. Sumter and his children fared in accord to their present circumstances. But for madame—Born Natalie de Lage, thrown by a cruel fate on our rough shores—they provided, as her delicate tastes and habits required, separate pantry, separate cuisine. Miss S C had been so trained to admire the beautiful and accomplished lady, she could not see in this anything but what was right—no selfishness, no cold-heartedness. It was but her due. Her just rights."In Mary Boykin Chesnut, C. Vann Woodward, ed. *Mary Boykin Chesnut's Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).

[72] The wife of Dr. William Wallace Anderson of Stateburg, little is known of her outside the letters written from Natalie Sumter to her during Natalie's visit to France. These letters are preserved in White, *Fifteen Letters.*

to send the money to return." Regardless of who paid for the outward journey, the return was beyond what the Sumters' could afford to pay in 1823.[73]

That Natalie and her children could not afford to return to the United States underscores the changed economic circumstances within this transatlantic family by the 1820s. During the 1810s, when the Sumter family was in Brazil, Natalie and her mother were less and less frequently in communication.[74] As she wrote from Rio de Janeiro, on 31 August 1817, to Mary Anderson, "I'll go to France by myself I think, it will be time…I've not heard from my mother in some time."[75] However by 1823, Natalie's visit to France was driven by economic concerns far more than a desire to see her family and friends. Although Natalie's daughters' suitability for economically advantageous marriages in France quickly emerged as central to the visit, Natalie was initially quite hesitant to leverage her daughters' marriages to address the Sumters' financial concerns. Nevertheless, both Thomas Sumter Jr. and Natalie understood that their daughters were more attractive marriage partners in Europe than the United States. This was largely thanks to the Marquise de Lage's connections in France, but also because of the Sumter girls' exoticism in France, and that marriage into the Sumter family promised American citizenship to European suitors. Despite their eventual centrality to the family's strategy, Thomas and Natalie Sumter's two eldest daughters, Nat, and Fanny did not originally

[73] Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills*, 103.

[74] It seems likely that Natalie and her mother's relationship had been strained for some time prior to the visit. It only became more so during the 1820s. Natalie remained in contact with her mother throughout her life; however, their contact had waned during the 1810s. There is one extant letter between Natalie and de Lage among the substantial correspondence between Natalie and her other contacts. This letter, from 1820, discusses family gossip, some economic speculation, and little related to any impending trip to Europe. The personal and economic hardships that the Sumters' underwent in the 1810s undoubtedly added to the strain between Natalie and de Lage. The Sumters' return to France went forward, but only with the Marquise de Lage's financial assistance. This letter, from 28 January, 1820, appears in the Sumter-Delage Papers, 16:1

[75] White, *Letters*, 90.

accompany the rest of the family in Paris. They joined a year later, in 1824. Once Nat and Fanny did arrive, their grandmother immediately began to push for them to marry. In the 1802 contest between the Marquise de Lage's aristocratic values and Natalie's American liberal values, de Lage allowed her daughter to marry her choice of husband. The reversed circumstances that surrounded Natalie Sumter's visit to France, the Sumters' economic dependence on Natalie's mother, meant that de Lage imposed her will on the family. Fanny married in 1825, and Nat married in 1827; both married European aristocrats selected by their grandmother.

In Bourbon Restoration France de Lage's connections to high society and high politics was returned, as much of the political establishment from the old regime had returned to power.[76] Her steadfast support of the Bourbons in exile was rewarded. In addition to her royal pension, de Lage had relative ease of access to the royal family. During Natalie and her children's visit, Natalie's mother provided for her grandchildren's education, and gave Natalie a substantial allowance for her expenses. There was, however, a stipulation: she did not let Natalie use that money to return to the United States.[77] Furthermore, The Marquise de Lage's aid to the Sumter family during their visit highlighted the changed dynamics of their relationship. In exchange for providing Natalie with financial support, her mother took an active – even domineering – role in decisions

[76]See the letter from Natalie Sumter to Mary Anderson, 10 September, 1823 in White, *Fifteen Letters*; and the letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 4 June 1824, Sumter-Delage Papers, 17:1.

[77] Anne-Marie Fuger, *La Vie Élégante: ou la Formation de Tout-Paris* (Paris: Artheme Fayard, 1990). The Marquise de Lage even arranged an audience with Louis XVIII for her grandchildren, which took place in 1824, discussed in Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills*, 102. De Lage knew figures from Restoration's political and intellectual order, de Lage's correspondence includes references to the Duchess d'Aumont, the Duchess de Berry, and the Madame de Rochejaquelin, among others. For one notable example see her correspondence with Joseph-Marie Michaud, an early member of the AcademieFrancaise, and a member of the Assemblée Nationale both during and after the Bourbon Restoration. Michaud was a long-time supporter of the Royalist faction. See the letters from Joseph François Michaud to the Marquise de Lage 29 and 30 July, 1825, Sumter-Delage Papers, 17:1.

affecting Natalie and her children. Unlike 1802, de Lage was not interested in her granddaughters' personal preferences, nor was she content to let them leave France and marry Americans. The Sumters' tenuous financial position in South Carolina on the outset of Natalie's return to France undoubtedly confirmed to de Lage that American elites were no more stable than their European counterparts. Under Louis XVIII, France had returned to a political and social order that she perceived as more stable. Her daughter's position in the United States would forever be suspect, in de Lage's eyes, due to its republican government.

Natalie's letters to the United States made it clear that she chaffed under the new inter-family balance of power. The first of her letters from France, which she wrote to Mary Anderson on 10September 1823, provided Anderson some information on her arrival, and the Sumters' living situation and financial arrangements. "[M]y mother is very kind," Natalie began, "she gives me everything and more than I can wish.[O]f course I am at no expense in her house, and she gave me 500 dollars for any little thing I should want, and besides, [she] has given me all the dresses hats, caps, etc., etc. that I am in need of.[S]he has spent for me, Natalie, Brazilia and Sebastian one thousand dollars." Natalie's letter began on a boastful note; however, The Marquise de Lage's willingness to spoil her and her children revealed the ever present concern that troubled Natalie's visit to France. Her mother's lavish spending laid bare her control of her family's finances, and thus, their ability to act. As Natalie continued, she continued to reveal due cause for unease, explaining to Anderson that "when I beg [my mother] not to spend so much, she says that I am her daughter as well as my sister, [Stephanie, who was now in Madeira], and that she has put this money in reserve for me." De Lage also spent lavishly on her

grandchildren, as Natalie related: "[my mother] pays Brazilia's expenses in the convent, which are very high for this country. For her board alone is 200 Dollars and with the masters and other expenses it will come to 400." It is not difficult to understand Natalie's unease with these arrangements: the school expenses that de Lage paid for Brasilia alone was nearly equal to the three hundred dollars that a return fare to the United States cost. As she noted, "I could not take a governess and my health did not permit me to attend to [Brazilia]… my mother will spoil her very much… [as] she thought she had the same temper that my sister [Calixte de Lage, who had died in 1800] had."[78]

Although Natalie's mother was willing to spend considerable sums on her daughter and grandchildren while they were in France, she would not pay the three hundred dollars needed for Natalie's return to the United States—not until she had secured marriages for her eldest granddaughters. It is here that the limits of de Lage's generosity were brought into view, as well as the financial straits that gripped the Sumter family. A month after her first letter, Natalie again wrote to Anderson. Her letter of 31 October 1823 discussed Natalie and Thomas's initial reservations on having their daughters marry the European aristocrats. Natalie acknowledged that Nat and Fanny would draw the attention of rich suitors. She admitted to Anderson that "Nat… was very agreeable…and young men of talent and fortune would be happy to be the grandson of my mother, for she would have them placed in the army, or in the corps dipomatique."[79] Despite this, Natalie was disinclined to have Nat and Fanny married in Europe. This, she claimed, was because her husband would not approve. However, she later explained to Anderson that "when I went away, [Thomas] left me and [our daughter Nat] entirely

[78] Letter from Natalie Sumter to Mary Anderson, 10 September 1823 in White, *Letters*, 196.
[79] Letter from Natalie Sumter to Mary Anderson, 31 October 1823, in White, *Letters*, 97.

mistress [sic] about [the question of marriage], saying [that Nat] would be 21 before [the family's] return [from France] and able to judge for herself." Thomas, it seems, had largely recused himself from his daughters' marriages in favor of her daughters' employment of their own judgment.

Natalie asserted that her daughters ought to choose their own spouses as well. As she continued to her friend: "I assure you that [even] if I had the best offer in the world I would not encourage [marriage], for it is too great a responsibility."[80] Natalie was certainly thinking of her own marriage as she penned these words. As the Abbé de Montisquiou had observed in 1802, marriage was a matter of personal choice to Natalie. For her, directly choosing her daughters' spouses was too great a responsibility and not her prerogative. Moreover, Natalie displayed antipathy towards Paris, claiming that the city "[was] not what it was 50 years ago…you would find just as much pleasure in Charleston."[81] De Lage's attitude towards marital choice ran counter to her daughter. The role that she played in her granddaughters' marriages made it clear that marriage was matter that necessitated more than parental guidance and confidence in the wisdom of babes; it demanded the firm-minded control. De Lage attempted to impose that control on her granddaughters, as Natalie had abdicated from that responsibility.

Nat and Fanny both married European aristocrats, and their grandmother, the Marquise de Lage, played an integral role in selecting their matches. Throughout 1824-25 the Marquise de Lage immersed her granddaughters in the social life of Paris' aristocracy. Undoubtedly, de Lage and her three young, single American granddaughters were becoming well-known in the first years of their visit in Paris. As Natalie predicted,

[80]Quotation from a letter from Natalie Sumter to Mary Anderson, 10 September 1823 in White, *Letters*, 98.

[81]Letter from Natalie Sumter to Mary Anderson 31 October 1823 in White, *Letters*¸ 117.

their exoticism as French-Americans attracted the attention of eligible suitors. Fanny was the first to wed, to Giuseppe Agamemnon Sylvester Binda (1790-1864) in 1825, a year after Nat and Fanny arrived in France. Binda was born to a noble family from the city-state of Lucca, in Tuscany. He attained French citizenship after Lucca was incorporated into Napoleon's Empire in 1805, when Binda was fifteen. Like Natalie Sumter, Binda's adolescence was shaped by the French Revolution and the First French Empire. Binda used his socioeconomic and political status to make connections with people of influence. During his service as a diplomat in the short-lived Kingdom of Etruria (a Napoleonic Era puppet state), he established contacts throughout the French Empire, Great Britain and across the Atlantic—during which time, he first encountered the Sumter family in Rio de Janeiro. Despite this diplomatic career, Binda's chief preoccupation was selling art to wealthy patrons. He used his diplomatic position as a means to establish connections and cultivate clients for his art trade in cities across the Atlantic, a pattern he continued after he married into the Sumter family.[82]

When Binda learned of the Sumters' presence in Paris in the summer of 1824 he acted decisively. First, he first visited the Marquise de Lage on21 August, 1824, likely as an attempt to ingratiate himself to the family matriarch. A few days later, on 27 August 1824, he arrived unannounced at the Sumter family's residence in Paris.[83]From these initial meetings through the end of 1824, Binda recorded nineteen visits to de Lage and twenty-seven visits to Natalie and Fanny Sumter in his concise but consistently

[82] This history is explored in detail in Arnold Blumberg, "The Strange Career of Joseph Binda," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 67 (1966) 155-166. Binda first encountered the Sumter family in Rio de Janeiro during his service in Napoleon's Empire. Tisdale also gives an account of Binda's career and his relationship with the Sumter family in *A Lady of the High Hills,* 103-109.

[83] See Joseph Binda's journal in the Joseph Agamemnon Binda Papers, 1824-1889, The South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. (Hereafter the Binda Papers.)

maintained journal.[84] Fanny and Binda's courtship lasted through the winter of 1824-25, and they were married in Paris in the spring of 1825. Their marriage caused Natalie considerable anxiety. Her letter to Mary Anderson from 14 March 1825 discussed Fanny and Binda's marriage. Natalie highlighted her mother's focus on Binda's landed wealth as pivotal in securing the relationship. However, because Binda married into the Sumter family, he acquired American citizenship. Binda's livelihood was tied to his cosmopolitanism. Thus, the opportunity to gain American citizenship, as well as ties to the then still-prominent Sumter family was clearly important to him. Natalie informed her friend that "it was likely instead of leaving any of my girls [in Europe] I should be followed by another intended son who means to become an American." This was "a great cause of uneasiness" for Natalie, who was unsure of her husband's approval. What was even more disconcerting to Natalie was that after the marriage, it became evident that Binda intended to move to the United States, and that they would be reliant on the Sumters' already meager resources in South Carolina.

Natalie voiced her concerns to Anderson: "I do not know yet how to settle [Binda and Fanny]. What will [Thomas] do for his daughter? This want of money is really a great torment." Clearly Fanny's marriage to Binda was not the boon for the Sumter family's financial woes that Natalie or her mother had hoped it would be.[85]What's more, it seems that Natalie perceived of Binda's intentions more quickly than her mother.

---

[84] See Binda's journal in the Binda Papers; Blumberg, "Strange Career" discusses at some length Binda's career in the 1830s. Thanks to the Sumters' political influence Binda secured a position as American consul to Lugarno, Italy. However, his frequent truancy from this post in favor of his own interests in the art trade made him a constant irritant to the United States Department of State. Throughout his career for the United States in the 1830s, he often ignored letters from Washington. What's more, Binda spent as much time in London and Paris, furthering his art business, as he while he was supposed to be in Lugorno.

[85] Letter from Natalie Delage Sumter to Mary Anderson, 14 March 1825 in White, *Fifteen Letters*, 120-124.

Despite Binda's thinly veiled intention to relocate to the United States, Natalie's mother had different expectations for the couple. Even as Natalie bemoaned Binda's intent to relocate to America, her mother argued for Italy's superiority over South Carolina on both economic and social grounds. In a letter to Natalie, de Lage insisted that Fanny and Binda should settle in Europe, arguing that Binda's landed wealth, and the natural advantages of Italian life over the United States meant that the couple should live in Italy.[86]De Lage made a case to her daughter and granddaughter that Italian life was far superior to South Carolina. She argued that that the climate was more agreeable, and that "there were no negroes, or the drivers of negroes" in Italy.[87] De Lage's final barb was instructive: although slavery underlay the Sumters' wealth, and indeed, the whole political economy of South Carolina, apart from this sole reference, the institution was conspicuously absent from the family's discussions (as was de Lage's tenant-based landed wealth in France). Her negative assessment of slavery perhaps speaks to de Lage's assessment of the deleterious of slavery on aristocratic constitutions.

Perhaps because of her concerns about her mother's control of the family, after Binda and Fanny's wedding in March of 1825, Natalie and her newly-married daughter left France. They spent a year and a half on the Portuguese island of Madeira, where they stayed with Natalie's younger sister Stephanie and her husband, the Count d'Isle de Beauchesne. During Natalie and Fanny's journey, Binda remained in Europe pursuing his business interests in France and Italy. As he traveled, he maintained sporadic written contact with his wife in Madeira, and his grandmother-in-law in Paris. The record of Natalie and Fanny's visit to Madeira does not reveal their precise motivations for the

[86]Letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter 19 September 1827, The Sumter-Delage Papers, 19:1.

[87]Discussed at length in Blumberg, "Strange Career," 155-166.

visit. However, the letters that de Lage sent her daughter and granddaughter on their trip to Madeira do provide some clues. These letters, twelve in all, were written between 26 May and 20 October 1825. What is discernible is that Natalie and Fanny's trip to Madeira had strained the relationship between Natalie and her mother. The earliest of these letters, from 26 May 1825 fills in the gaps of Natalie Sumter and her daughter Fanny's trip to voyage. The excuse Natalie gave was that they fled to Madeira for Fanny's health, but the timing suggests they were escaping de Lage's wrath. Her letters to Natalie and Fanny began at the time that they left for Madeira in the late spring of 1825, returning over a year later, in the summer of 1826. In addition to revealing the acrimonious relationship between Natalie and her mother, the letters also provide insight on de Lage's religious devotion that undergirded her loyalty to the Bourbon monarchy, and, as ever de Lage's persistent attempts to find a suitable husband for Natalie's eldest daughter, Nat. De Lage's efforts culminated with Nat's marriage to Gabriel de Fontenay in 1828.

These matters were informed by de Lage's poor health, and her pessimism about the future of the Bourbon monarchy on whose largess which she had become economically dependent.[88] Louis XVIII died in September 1824 and his brother, Charles Philippe the Count d'Artois, ascended to the throne as Charles X. On 29 May 1825, Charles X reinstated the ornate coronation ceremony of the old regime: royal anointment and confession at the Cathedral at Reims. This practice had been abandoned by Louis, returning to this ceremony signified Charles' emphasis on strengthening the ties between

[88] These letters, and those that de Lage wrote to Natalie Sumter after the fall of the Bourbon dynasty have been described by the Marquise's biographer the Countess Reinach-Foussemagne, as filled with "enormous amounts of things that are often repeated—details on her health, the categories of gifts sent to Charleston, but not one important fact." Fortunately, the purposes of this study differ significantly from that of the Countess de Reinach-Foussemagne in 1905. Quotation from the Countess H. de Reinach-Foussemagne to Stephanie Brownfield, 16 June 1905, The Sumter-Delage Papers, 25:2.

the church and state. His ultra-royalist government was out of step with France's political culture in the 1820s; however, his attempt to vigorously reinstate the politics of the *ancien regime* deeply resonated with de Lage. She attended the ceremony in Rheims, and provided moving details of it in her letter to Natalie on 1 June 1825.She exclaimed that "for the first time in [her] life… [she] had seen a day so already perfumed with nerves…of which there was no remedy." This momentous event had clearly lifted the de Lage's spirits and broken the monotony of her present circumstances. After giving some details on her Natalie's children in her care in Paris, de Lage discussed the coronation ceremony and Natalie's travel to Madeira—she gave her daughter advice on where, and with whom she might visit en route.[89]

De Lage wrote to Natalie several days after the coronation in the full flush of exuberance.

> I won't give you a mere recitation of the sacred; the newspapers can give you all of the details. But no such relation can express the impressiveness of this ceremony. And that is what I will try to do: this alliance of Religion and Royalty, the maintenance of the King, this sort of calling branded on his forehead is a sublime thing. And yet, the moment when he was at the confessional, and the crown was placed upon his head, and while on his knees he received the royal coat, and humbled himself to receive the pardon of the King of Kings in view of all.[90]

The ceremony's marriage of religiosity and the power of the state deeply moved de Lage. Heretofore her letter had a rather common tenor; she discussed Brasilia and Sebastian's desire to return to Paris, and Brasilia's education and other such matters. Her tone changed as she concluded; she took care to wish her daughter well, giving her "the blessings of all [her] heart" and offered Natalie some kind words regarding Thomas

[89]Letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 25 May 1825. The Sumter-Delage Papers, 17:1.

[90]Quotations from the letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 1 June1825. The Sumter-Delage Papers, 17:1.

Sumter Jr., wishing Natalie that "[he] would make her quite happy." Finally, de Lage directed her wishes to her granddaughter Fanny: "please get better…it is good that you are in Madeira, because the air you have there is so favorable…I embrace you, my dear child and think only of your health."Throughout the summer of 1825 politics and high society remained at the forefront of their correspondence.[91]De Lage's focus on the wider political and social milieu was shaped by the dramatic stylistic changes employed by Charles X's government, which proved to be deeply unpopular to the French body politic that had little desire to return to the ethos of eighteenth century absolutism.

Natalie never provided a satisfying explanation for their trip; it seems to have been a shortsighted and obstinate response to the stresses that she was experiencing in France. By the summer of 1825, de Lage's patience with her daughter and was wearing thin. She worried that Natalie and Fanny's prolonged visit might strain Fanny's relationship with Binda. The de Lage and Sumter family's always-tenuous ability to strategize together was especially difficult during Natalie and Fanny's extended absence. De Lage wrote to Fannyon1 June 1825: "I would rather like your husband if he makes you happy, and of that I have no doubt."[92]Three days later de Lage wrote again to say she had received Fanny's letter from Madeira, and that she was glad to see that the voyage from France to Madeira had seemed to improve Fanny's health. Binda, meanwhile, while continuing his own travels across Western Europe complained that he had not heard from Fanny in ten months. Relating this to Natalie, de Lage retorted that "a wife should stay in her husband's home"—a less than subtle reminder of the circumstances of Natalie's own

[91] Sheryl Kroen, *Politics and Theater: the Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France, 1815-1830* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000);De Lage's biographer pays particular attention to her religious devotion during the Bourbon restoration, Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 304-351.

[92]Letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 1 June 1825, The Sumter-Delage Papers, 17:1.

marriage.[93] Natalie's relationship with her mother was frequently tense, and the Sumters' years in France exacerbated the rift between Natalie and her mother.[94]As de Lage attempted to keep close watch on Fanny and Binda's relationship, Natalie began to make plans to return to the United States.

While Natalie was on her extended visit to Madeira with Fanny, she had left her other children in her mother's care. In so doing Natalie had practically conceded to having her mother arrange Nat's marriage to a French suitor. During this year and a half, de Lage set out with determination to negotiate a suitable marriage for Nat, now twenty-four years old. De Lage immersed her granddaughter Nat in the aristocratic world that Natalie had been deprived of by her immigration from the French Revolution a generation prior. De Lage introduced Nat to friends in and around Paris, among whom were Caroline Ferdinande Louise, Duchess de Barry (1798-1870), the future Princess of the Two Sicily's, Marie Louise Victoire de Donnissan, the Marquise de La Rochejacquelein (1772-1857), of the Vendéen noble family that had led the anti-Republican fight in the 1790s, and the Count and Countess de Fontenay, from Autun, Champagne, close to the Marquise de Lage's family's land in northeast France. While the Binda marriage had some elements of spontaneous romance, Nat and Fontenay's union was an orchestrated affair that de Lage conducted from beginning to end. Furthermore, Natalie ceased her protestations against her mother's control of the process. Despite her position on the outset of her voyage to France, that "even if [she] had an offer for [Nat] I will throw cold water on it…God only knows what is best, and what matches are

[93]Letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 19 September 1827. The Sumter-Delage Papers, 17:1; Tisdale, *A Lady of the High Hills*, 103-107.

[94]Letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 4 June 1825.The Sumter Delage Papers, 17:1.

happy."[95] Years of her mother's admonitions that social and economic considerations were of paramount importance in marriage seem to have stultified Natalie's earlier stance, even though it likely caused some resentment between mother and daughter. By the end of 1826 de Lage was firmly in charge of her granddaughter's marriage negotiations. Because de Lage was so clearly in control of her family's marriage strategy, she relented from her previous refusal to help her daughter and grandchildren's return trip to the United States. De Lage financed her daughter's return to the United States in the summer of 1827. Natalie and her children (including Fanny and Binda) left in August 1827, except for Nat, who stayed in France as her grandmother continued to arrange her marriage to Gabriel de Fontenay with the Fontenay family.

The negotiations over Nat's marriage to Gabriel de Fontenay exposed the family's generational rift concerning attitudes toward marriage strategy. After Natalie and her children returned to Stateburg, de Lage accused Natalie and Thomas of obstructing their daughter Nat's marriage to Fontenay. In a letter from Paris in September 1827, de Lage claimed that the Sumters' slowness to approve of the marriage put the arrangement in jeopardy. De Lage complained that this stall had given the Fontenay family the chance to reflect on the situation. She wrote to Natalie that "[the Fontenay family has] judged, with some reason, that there was little reason to choose a wife who had no money… a girl of 25 years who was neither pretty, nor pleasant, and had none of the advantages to please him nor give him aid…" indeed, the Fontenay's informed de Lage, "Mr. [Fontenay] had no great love for [Nat]." De Lage cautioned her daughter that unless Natalie and her husband had the good sense to use de Lage's connections to the French monarchy, Natalie Sumter "ought to renounce the idea of marrying [Nat] in Europe," as she was "a

[95] White, *Letters*, 97.

girl with neither fortune, nor youth, nor beauty" and thus "could not hope to be married in the old world."[96] Her letter continued, as de Lage reminded Natalie of the Sumter's deplorable financial situation in South Carolina, which the Fontenay marriage would help to remedy.

Furthermore, de Lage reminded Natalie that her life in South Carolina, "amongst the negroes and the owners of negroes" might be suitable for Natalie and Thomas, however, the spontaneity of their romance should not serve as a model for their children. De Lage stressed instead— as she always had—that land, social status, and stability should be of paramount importance in establishing the family's marriage strategy. Both the Sumter's personal financial situation, and the relative instability of South Carolina's politics in the early 1820s, fed de Lage's prejudices. She scolded Natalie, in a letter from late 1827: "As you have plenty of daughters to marry," de Lage wrote, "it is necessary nonetheless to tell you the truth…at any point, the question of marriage and that which I want to speak of the guarantee of the land like that which Mr. Sumter profits from in Carolina. One does not marry for polity… but for the gifts to be afforded." De Lage concluded by reminding Natalie that the de Lage family's connections—not Nat's own dubious beauty or charm—had secured Nat's marriage. De Lage employed her political connections to Charles X's government to have Gabriel de Fontenay placed in the French diplomatic corps. Doubtless, both de Lage and Natalie saw the parallels to Aaron Burr's role in Thomas Sumter Jr.'s placement in Paris in 1801.

Following this intemperate exchange between de Lage and Natalie, Fanny Binda wrote from Stateburg to rebuke her grandmother. Binda expressed anger over what she

[96]Letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 11 October 1827. Delage-Sumter Papers, 19:1.

perceived as attacks on her sister Nat. "I believe that the devil had burned up three or four of the lines of this letter" she began, "our good angel [Nat], she is noble, she is sensible, she is all that one could desire. I have reason to say that it was the devil who wrote these lines." Stephanie then took aim at her grandmother's financial preoccupations, tepidly adding that her grandmother can "have her married for herself, for you, or for me, but if this is a marriage for profit, never…believe me my dear grandmother, I cannot write all that I wish [on this matter]."[97] Despite Fanny's aggressive defense of her sister, and her criticism of her grandmother's effort to arrange Nat's marriage, the marriage was already set in stone. The Sumters' debts in South Carolina, and their need for Natalie's inheritance in France, made the Fontenay marriage a fait accompli. Although de Lage was concerned that Natalie and Thomas were dragging their feet in acceding to Nat's marriage, the matter was soon resolved. After de Lage's impatient prodding, the Sumters gave their assent to the marriage.

Fanny Binda's rebuke of her grandmother, however, showed that Natalie and Thomas Sumter's children shared their parents' romantic and relatively liberal views on marital choice. Despite such inclinations, however, the Sumter daughters had no choice but to accept their grandmother's guidance.[98] Despite de Lage's aggressive tone in her correspondence with her daughter in 1828, none of what she argued throughout her granddaughters' marriage arrangements in the 1820s represented a change in philosophy for the family's matriarch from her stance during the negotiations over Natalie and Thomas' marriage in 1802. Rather, the different outcomes of her daughter's and granddaughters' marriages demonstrates the changed political and economic conditions

[97]Letter from Stephanie Binda to the Marquise de Lage, 21 December 1827,The Sumter-Delage Papers, 19:1.

[98] Ibid.

within the Atlantic World generally, and their impact on the Sumter and de Lage families. Economics, and the effort to situate the family in a place of political and social stability, were the determining factors in both 1802 and the 1820s. As Natalie had acknowledged at the outset of her trip to France, the Sumter's inability to provide a substantial dowry was little obstacle to finding a suitor for Nat in France. In place of a dowry, the family offered political connections. De Lage used her influence with the French government to attract a young man "of birth, talents, and fortune." Fontenay's courtship also proved Natalie's cousin's prediction true that "a young man of fortune… would be happy to be the grandson of [de Lage], and she would have them placed in the army or the corps diplomatique."[99]After Nat and Fontenay were married, in October 1828, Nat secured her mother's portion of her grandfather, the Marquis de Lage's estate. Natalie was finally able to recover her inheritance, but was only able to do so thanks to her mother's efforts on the family's behalf. Thanks to de Lage's connections to the government of Charles X, Gabriel de Fontenay received a post in Florence; the couple soon left for Italy. The Fontenays remained there for over a decade.[100] Indeed, both Nat and Fanny's marriages were cemented thanks to the Delage-Sumter family's connection to the American and the French diplomatic corps.[101] Natalie's two eldest daughters had married European aristocrats. Nat's marriage to Gabriel de Fontenay allowed Natalie to inherit part of her father's estate. Additionally, the Sumters were only able to repatriate Natalie's father's estate thanks to the France's 1825 Inheritance Law, and her daughter Nat's marriage. The

[99] Letter from Natalie Sumter to Mary Anderson 10 September 1823 in White, *Letters*, 97-98.

[100] The details of these marriage arrangements are found in the letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie Sumter, 11 October 1827. The Sumter-Delage Papers, 19:1.

[101] This inheritance was finally passed from the Fontenay's to Thomas Sumter Jr. by notarized action in 1828. See the Par-Devant Notaire [Notarized Letter] to Mr. Thomas Sumter, 1828 in the Sumter-Delage Papers, 19:1.

newly-liberalized inheritance law allowed Natalie's family inheritance to become the decisive factor in the inter-family negotiations over Nat's marriage to Fontenay.

Thus, by 1828, a year after Natalie and all of her children apart from Nat had returned to the United States, by many standards the extended voyage was a success. Despite Natalie and Thomas's apprehension about having their daughters marry in Europe, the Sumter family's finances had changed the balance of power within this transatlantic family. The Sumters' debt in South Carolina meant that they were less likely to arrange suitable marriages for their daughters in the United States than in France. This alone speaks to the profound and uneven effects that the Age of Revolution and early nineteenth century had on the Atlantic families that continued to employ transatlantic and transnational strategies into the nineteenth century. The French Revolution brought Natalie to the United States, and the post-revolutionary political instability that faced the de Lage family in France was decisive in their acquiescence to her marriage to Thomas Sumter Jr.

By the 1820s, however, it was the Sumter family in South Carolina who were politically and economically vulnerable. The Sumters had fallen into debt thanks to mismanagement and absentee lordship in the early decades of the 1800s. South Carolina's grim economic situation in the 1820s forced the Sumters to look to France, and Natalie's mother, for help. Natalie's daughters were married during the "Indian summer" of the France's Bourbon monarchy. For the Marquise de Lage, the Bourbon Restoration was a return to the proper social and political order. Her confidence in the stability of monarchy undergirded her firm-handed approach to her granddaughters' marriages, and her impatience with the liberal individualism of her family in the United

States.[102] During her involvement in Natalie and Thomas Sumter Jr.'s marriage in 1802, and her grandchildren's marriages in the 1820s, de Lage stressed the importance of land, reputation, and financial solvency in making a marriage partnership. As consequence, class, religion, and political stability trumped nationality in de Lage's calculus. Although she had a clear preference for European aristocracy, this was due to her conviction in the inherent stability of inherited wealth and hierarchical government and society.

When the senior branch of the Bourbon monarchy was still in place, de Lage orchestrated her granddaughter's marriage to Gabriel Fontenay. A marriage into a family of the Fontenay's status was unlikely to be arranged in the United States. However, the marriage also facilitated the Sumters' employment of France's inheritance law, and transfer Natalie Sumter's father's estate to the United States. After Charles X was overthrown in July of 1830, de Lage took a self-imposed exile to Baden, in the German Confederation. There, she remained a vociferous proponent of the legitimist Bourbons in exile. When Gabriel de Fontenay chose to accept a diplomatic position offered to him by the government of Louis-Philippe, she lashed out at them both for supporting "a usurper and an imposter."[103]However, during her years in exile, de Lage softened her tone. Her correspondence with Natalie and her grandchildren, now scattered across the United States, France, and Italy, was mollifying and affectionate. Despite these reconciliatory gestures, after the Marquise de Lage, Natalie, and Thomas Sumter Jr. died, only Natalie and Thomas's youngest daughter, Pauline remained in meaningful contact with her

[102] See the introduction to Kronen, *Politics and Theater*,for a discussion of the place of the Bourbon restoration in French historiography; see Lynn Hunt's discussion of the teleology of French historiography in "The French Revolution in Global Context;" in Armitage and Subrahmanyam, *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context*; for de Lage's exile in Baden, see Reinach-Foussemagne, *Une Fidèle*, 352-388.

[103]Letter from the Marquise de Lage to Natalie de Fontenay, 2 January 1835. The Sumter-Delage Papers 3:3.

French relatives through the mid-nineteenth century. The political order of the post-Revolutionary Atlantic emerged from the strategies of networks like the Delage-Sumter family. However, the de Lage and Sumter families did not survive as an integrated Atlantic family when the circumstances in which they came together were eclipsed by emerging political and social changes in the mid-nineteenth century.

For two generations, the family's character was marked by dynamic Atlantic-wide strategies over migration and marriage. However, these strategies did not retain an Atlantic scope after the generation that initiated them died. Nor did the strategies employed by this generation amount to a shared transnational, Atlantic, politics, nor a common Atlantic identity. Just over a decade after Natalie Sumter returned from France in 1827, these key figures that had fought to preserve family unity across the Atlantic died. Thomas Sumter Jr., in 1840 at age seventy two and Natalie a year later, died at age fifty nine both in Stateburg South Carolina. The Marquise de Lage died in Baden in 1842 at the age of seventy eight. Their deaths meant an end to the personal links that held together this fragile Atlantic family. Nat and Gabriel Fontenay died soon after; Nat in 1853, at age fifty, and Gabriel in 1856. The end of Bourbon rule in France in 1848 definitively ended the de Lage family's influence at the highest levels of French government. However, members of the Fontenay family continued to furnish successive French governments with diplomats into the twentieth century.[104] The struggles over the Delage-Sumter family marriages in 1802 and the 1820s were shaped by generational divides, and animated by ideological and political commitments that shaped the Age of Atlantic Revolutions. Although the French and American branches of the family

[104] Gabriel de Fontenay served as a diplomat for Louis-Philippe, and his grandson, Viscount Joseph de Fontenay (1864-1946) served as an ambassador to Mexico for the Third Republic of France.

remained in contact into the twentieth century, their communication was increasingly sparse. The identities and priorities of subsequent generations were no longer shaped by the events of the revolutionary Atlantic, and the families no longer shared strong personal ties. Thus, the vitality, coherence, and utility of these connections also faded. This was the natural consequence of a family that was no longer economically connected, nor pressed to action by shared political or ideological concerns.

The Atlantic Revolutions of the late eighteenth century transformed the politics of the Atlantic World. Although these two families were similarly elite in their own societies, they owed their elite status to different and at times incongruent political orders. And their political allegiances caused them to view the Age of Revolutions quite differently. De Lage's old regime ideals were reinforced by her experience in the French Revolution, which confirmed to her the destabilizing effects of republicanism, she maintained her pro-monarchical pro-Bourbon stance her entire life. It is not surprising that an aristocrat with personal ties to the Bourbon monarchy rejected republicanism and or the emerging concept of the nation-state. De Lage's loyalty to the Bourbons, the monarchy, and the Catholic Church did not entail loyalty to the French nation, or even to the cadet branch of the House of Bourbon. Instructively, although the Sumter family shared the de Lage family's Atlantic cosmopolitanism, the Sumters' rise to prominence was thanks to the Age of Atlantic Revolutions, whereas the same revolutionary era deeply diminished the de Lage family's social status and connections political power. Indeed, the Sumter family gained its elite status in a large part thanks to Thomas Sumter Sr.'s role in the American Revolution, and they owed their transatlantic scope to the family's connections with the American and the French states. Indeed, Natalie and

Thomas Sumter Jr. met because of Sumter's diplomatic post, and the family in France continued to serve in the diplomatic corps into the twentieth century.

The Sumter family gained its elite status from the American Revolution, and emerged as a leading family in South Carolina politics in the early decades of the American republic. Conversely, the French Revolution upended the political order on which the de Lage family depended, while threatening their lives. Despite this starkly dichotomous relation to revolution, the Sumter and de Lage families were able to forge a transatlantic strategy based on what values they held in common: the importance of land, reputation, political stability, and social order. What's more, the Sumters' cosmopolitanism meant that Thomas and Natalie's family forged a distinctly Atlantic identity in the midst of rising nationalist movements across the Atlantic World. Their children were raised in Brazil, South Carolina, and France; they spoke Portuguese, English and French with varying degrees of fluency. Their continued cosmopolitanism showed that the Sumter family was willing to embrace transatlantic family strategies despite its profound connection the United States. Unquestionably, the Marquise de Lage's fidelity to the *ancien regime*, and her daughter, Natalie Sumter's wholehearted embrace of the United States' culture and society made for a tense relationship. However, these ideological differences could be subordinated to their shared interest in assuring that they maintained their elite status and proud reputation. The extraordinary circumstances in which the Sumter and de Lage families found themselves required both families to improvise as they charted a course though an uncertain and often dangerous era. Lacking perfect clarity of their circumstances, and possessing of a likewise occluded vision for the future, the members of the de Lage and Sumter families often acted boldly

in the face of their challenges. Their actions make evident that theirs were an ordinary set of overlapping motives and interests—individual, familial, political, religious—set against an extraordinary backdrop.

Bibliography

Manuela Albertone, and Antonino De Francesco, eds. *Rethinking the Atlantic World: Europe and America in the Age of Democratic Revolutions* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Fred Anderson. *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754–1766* (New York: Faber and Faber, 2000).

David Armitage. *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, eds. *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context*(London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Keith Baker,ed. *The Political Culture of the Old Regime* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987).

Bernard Bailyn. *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

Bernard Bailyn. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969).

Robert D. Bass. *Gamecock: The Life and Campaigns of Thomas Sumter* (New York Holt, 1961).

Daniel Baugh. *The Global Seven Years War, 1754-1763* (New York: Pearson Press, 2011).

Samuel Flagg Bemis. *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937).

Yves Benot. *La Révolution Français et la Fin des Colonies* (Paris: la Découverte, 1988).

Edward Berenson, et al. eds. *The French Republic: History, Values, Debates* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2011).

John D. Bergamini. *The Spanish Bourbons: The History of a Tenacious Dynasty* (New York: Putnam, 1974).

Trevor Bernard. *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire: Thomas Thistlewood and His Slaves in the Anglo-Jamaican World*(Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

Trevor Bernard and Allan Potofsky. "The Political Economy of the French Atlantic World and the Caribbean Before 1800." *French History*, 25.1 (2011).

Georges Bertin. *Madame de Lamballe*, Arabella Ward trans. (New York: Godfrey A. S. Weiners, 1901).

Arnold Blumberg."The Strange Career of Joseph Binda."*The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 67. 3 (1966) 155-166.

André Burguière. *Le mariage et l'amour en France de la Renaissance à la Révolution* (Paris: Le Sueil, 2011).

Kirsty Carpenter and Philip Mansel. *The French Émigrés in Europe and the Struggle Against Revolution, 1789-1814* (New York: MacMillan Press, 1999).

Alix de Rohan Chabot. *Madame de la Tour du Pin: Le talent du Bonheur* (Paris: Perin, 1997).

Mary Boykin Chesnut, C. Vann Woodward, ed. *Mary Boykin Chesnut's Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).

Edward S Corwin. *French Policy and the American Alliance of 1778* (New York: Archon Books, 1962).

Frances Sargent Childs. *French Refugee Life in the United States, 1790-1800: An American Chapter of the French Revolution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940).

Richard N. Coté. *Theodosia Burr Alston: Portrait of a Prodigy*(New York: Corinthian, 2002).

Philippe Daumas. *Familles en révolution: Vie et relations familiales en Île-de-France, changements et continuités (1775–1825)* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2003).

Rosena Davidson. "Time and Exile: The Case of Mme la Marquise de Lage de Volude" *Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies / Lumen: travaux choisis de la Société canadienne étude du dix-huitième siècle* 18(1999) 69-82.

George Dangerfield. *Chancellor Robert R. Livingston: 1746-1813* (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1960).

Don Doyle and Marco Antonio Pamplona. *Nationalism in the New World* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2006).

William Doyle. *Oxford History of the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

_____. *Aristocracy and Its Enemies in the Age of Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Laurent Dubois."An Atlantic Revolution." *French Historical Studies* 32.4 (2009).

Jonathan R. Dull. *The Age of the Ship of the Line: the British and French Navies, 1650 1851*(Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009).

_____. *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

Walter Edgar. *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998).

Robert Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman. *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Slavery*(New York: Little, Brown, and Company, 1974).

H. Reinach-Foussemagne. *Une Fidèle: La Marquise de Lage de Volude 1764-1831* (Paris: Perin et cie, 1907).

William H. Fowler. *Empires at War: The Seven Years' War and the Struggle for North America*(Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 2005).

William W. Freehling. *Prelude to Civil War; the Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

Anne-Marie Fuger. *La Vie Élégante: ou la Formation de Tout-Paris* (Paris: Artheme Fayard, 1990).

Eugene D. Genovese. *Roll, Jordan, Roll: the World the Slaves Made*(New York: Vintage Books, 1976).

Ralph E. Giesey. "Rules of Inheritance and Strategies of Mobility in Prerevolutionary France," *American Historical Review* 82.2 (April 1977).

Jacques Godechot. *La Contre-révolution, doctrine et action 1789-1804* (Paris: Publications Universitaire Française, 1961).

_____.*France and the Atlantic Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, 1770-1799* Herbert R. Rowan, trans. (New York: The Free Press, 1965).

Vincent Gourdon. *Histoire des grands-parents* (Paris: Tempus, 2001).

Susan-Mary Grant. *North Over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2000).

Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, eds. *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Carol Harrison. *Romantic Catholics: France's Post-Revolutionary Generation in Search of a Modern Faith* (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2014).

Patrice Higonnet. *Sister Republics: The Origins of French and American Republicanism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

Lynn Hunt. *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

Nancy Issenberg, *Fallen Founder: The Life of Aaron Burr* (New York: Viking, 2007).

Jean Jaurés et al. *Histoire Socialiste 1789-1900* (Paris : J. Rouff Presse, 1901).

Christopher H. Johnson et al. eds. *Transregional and Transnational Families in Europe and Beyond: Experiences Since the Middle Ages* (New York: Berghan, 2011).

Walter Johnson. "The Pedestal and the Veil: Rethinking the Capitalism/Slavery Question. "*Journal of the Early Republic* 24 (2004).

Peter J. Kastor and François Weil, eds. *Empires of the Imagination: Transatlantic Histories of the Louisiana Purchase* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009).

Roger G. Kennedy. *Burr, Hamilton, and Jefferson: A Study in Character* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

C. Ray Keim. "Primogeniture and Entail in Colonial Virginia." *William and Mary Quarterly* 25.4 (1968) 550-551.

Wim Klooster, ed. *Revolutions in the Atlantic, A Comparative History* (New York: New York University Press, 2009).

Sheryl Kroen. *Politics and Theater: the Crisis of Legitimacy in Restoration France, 1815-1830*(Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

Simone Lassig. "Toward a Biographical Turn? Biography in Modern Historiography—Modern Historiography in Biography," *GHI Bulletin* 35 (2004) 145-155.

Jacqueline Letzter. *L'Épopée Américaine de la Famille Stier d'Anvers* : *Entre Deux Mondes* (Brussels: Editions Racine, 2011).

Marie-Françoise Levy. *L'enfant, la famille et la Révolution française* (Paris: Orban, 1989).

John A. Lynn. *The Bayonets of the Republic: Motivation and Tactics of the Army of Revolutionary France, 1791-1794* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996).

Martyn Lyons. *Napoleon Bonaparte and the Legacy of the French Revolution* (Oxford: Palgrave, 1994).

Agnès Martial, ed. *La valeur des liens: Hommes, femmes et transactions familiales* (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2009).

Jean-Clément Martin. *Contre-Révolution, Révolution et Nation en France, 1789-1799* (Paris: éditions du Seuil, collection Points, 1998).

Silvia Marzagalli. "The French Atlantic" *Itinerario* 13.2 (1999) 70–83.

Drew McCoy. *The Elusive Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

Katharine McKinna. *A Life of Propriety Anne Murray Powell and Her Family, 1755-1848*(Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994).

Darrell R. Meadows. "Engineering Exile/Social Networks and the French Atlantic Community, 1789-1809."*French Historical Studies* 23.1 (2000) 67-102.

_____."The Planters of St-Domingue, 1750-1804. Migration and Exile in the French Revolutionary Atlantic," PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2004.

Nora Milanich. "Whither Family History: A Road Map from Latin America." *American Historical Review* 112.3 (April: 2007) 439-458.

Léon Audebert La Morinerie, ed. *Souvenirs d'émigration de Madame la Marquise de Lage de Volude* (Paris: A Hérresey, 1869).

Jocelyne Moreau-Zanelli. *Gallipolis: Histoire d'un mirage américain au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Harmattan, 2000).

Milton Omask. *Aaron Burr* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1979).

R.R. Palmer. *The Age of Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959-64).

Sarah M. S. Pearsall. *Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

David M. Potter. *The South and the Sectional Conflict* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968).

Allan Potofsky. "New Perspectives on the Atlantic."*History of European Ideas* 34 (2008) 383-387.

_____. “Paris-on-the-Atlantic: from the Old Regime to the Revolution.”*French History* 25.1(2011) 89-107.

_____.“The ‘Non-Aligned Status’ of French Émigrés and Refugees in Philadelphia, 1793–1798,” *Transatlantica* 2 (2006) n. pag.

Lara Putnam. “To Study the Fragments/Whole: Microhistory and the Atlantic World.” *Journal of Social History* 39 (2006)615– 630.

Daniel T. Rogers. “Republicanism: the Career of a Concept.” 79.1(June, 1992) 11–38.

Murray Rothbard. *The Panic of 1819: Reactions and Policies* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962).

Thomas J. Schaeper. *France and America in the Revolutionary Era: The Life of Jacques Donatien Leray de Chaumong, 1725-1803* (Providence: Berghahn Books, 1995).

Rebecca J. Scott.“Small-Scale Dynamics of Large-Scale Processes.”*American Historical Review* 105 (2000).

Rebecca J. Scott and Jean M. Hébrard. *Freedom Papers: An Atlantic Odyssey in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012).

Reynald Secher. *A French Genocide: The Vendée,* trans. George Holoch. (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003).

Charles Sellers. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

James Sweet. *Domingos Alvares, African Healing, and the Intellectual History of the Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

Irène Théry and Christian Biet, eds. *La famille, la loi, l’État: De la Révolution au Code civil* (Paris, 1989).

David Troyansky. “Looking for Grandparents in the French Revolution” *Annales de demographie historique* (1991) 127-131.

David Troyansky, Alfred Cismaru, and Norwood Andrews Jr., eds. *The French Revolution in Culture and Society* (New York: Praeger, 1991).

Jean Tulard. *La Contre-Révolution; origines, histoire, postérité* (Paris: Perrin, 1990).

Anne Verjus. *Le bon mari: Une histoire politique des hommes et des femmes à l’époque révolutionnaire* (Paris: Fayard, 2010).

Cecile Vidal. “The Reluctance of French Historians to Address Atlantic History.” *Southern Quarterly* 43.3 (2006) 153-189.

Jean Vidalenc. *Les Emigrés Français, 1789–1825* (Caen: Publications de l'Université de Caen, 1963).

W. R. Ward. *Christianity Under the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Margery Wiener. *The French Exiles, 1789-1815* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1966).

Ed White. "The Ends of Republicanism."*Journal of the Early Republic* 30.2 (2010) 179–199.

Mary Virginia Saunders White, ed. *Fifteen Letters of Nathalie Sumter* (Columbia: Gitman's Book Shop, 1942).

Sean Wilenz. *The Rise of American Democracy: From Jefferson to Jackson* (New York: W.W. Horton, 2010).

Samuel Williams, ed. *Memoirs of Henry Timberlake, 1756-1765* (Marietta, Georgia: Continental Book Co., 1948).

Bertrand Van Ruymbeke and Randy J. Sparks, eds. *Memory and Identity: the Huguenots in France and the Atlantic Diaspora* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003).

APPENDIX A:

THE DE LAGE AND SUMTER FAMILY GENAELOGY

Persons in Bold Appear in this Essay

[Brackets indicate name primarily used in the text]

The Marquis Renart Fouchsamberg d'Amblimont [The Marquis d'Amblimont],1736-1797

m. The Marquise Renart Fouchsamberg d'Amblimont [The Marquise d'Amblimont],d. 1812

Beatrix-Stephanie-Renart de Fuchsamberg d'Amblimont [The Marquise de Lage],1764-1842

***

Thomas Sumter, 1734-1832

m. Mary Jameson

Thomas Sumter Jr, 1768-1840

***

Beatrix-Stephanie-Renart de Fuchsamberg d'Amblimont [the Marquise de Lage], 1764-1842

m.**The Marquis Joseph-Paul-Jean de Lage de Volude [the Marquis de Lage]**, d. 1799

Stephanie de Lage[Stephanie] 1787-1855
Calixte de Lage 1789-1800
Nathalie de Lage de Volude [**Natalie (Delage) Sumter]** 1782-1841

***

Natalie Delage Sumter 1782-1841

m. **Thomas Sumter Jr.** 1768-1840

Natalie Annette Sumter [Nat], 1803-1853

m. **Vicomte Gabriel de Fontenay**

Stephanie Beatrice Sumter [Fanny] 1805-1864

m. **Giuseppe Agamemnon Sylvester Binda**, 1805-1864

Marie Thomasa Sumter, 1806-1828
Paul Thomas Delage Sumter, 1809-1874
Pauline Brazilimo Beatrix Sumter, [Bresilia], 1813-1889
Francis Louis Brazilimo Sumter, 1815-1866
Sebastian D'Amblimont Sumter, 1820-1909

APPENDIX B:

THE DE LAGE AND D'AMBLIMONT FAMILY TIMELINES

The Marquis Renart Fuchsamburg d'Amblimont

Born in Rochefort, France	**1736**
Serves in the French Navy, rising to the position of rear admiral	**1751-1792**
Marries Marie Anne de Chaumont-Quitry	**1754**
Briefly harbors in New York City during the American Revolution	**1782**
Serves in the Spanish Navy as rear admiral	**1792-1797**
Dies in the Battle of Cape Vincent	**1797**

The Marquise de Chaumont Quitry d'Amblimont

Born	ca. **1740**
Lives in Versailles during the reign of Louis XV	ca. **1755-1774**
Her daughter, Beatrice, is born in Paris	**1764**
Leaves Paris for the family's land in the Saintonge and Bordeaux	**1792**
Remains in the Southwest of France during the French Revolution	**1792-1801**
Rejoins her family in Paris on their return from Spain	**1801**
Dies in Saintes	**1811**

Beatrice d'Amblimont, the Marquise de Lage

Born in Paris	**1764**
Serves at Court in Versailles under Louis XVI	**ca. 1781-1792**
Marries Paul-Joseph de Lage de Volude	**1782**
De Lage and family live southwestern France during the Terror	**1792**
She and her younger two daughters immigrate to Spain	**1793**
Lives in Madrid with the Countess de Montijo	**1793-1801**
Returns to Paris	**1801-ca. 1804**
Leaves Paris for the family's property in the southwest of France	**1804-1815**
Returns in Paris during the restoration of the Bourbon Monarchy	**1815-1830**
Daughter Natalie visits from the United States	**1823-1827**
Arranges for her granddaughter Fanny's marriage to Giuseppe Binda	**1824**

Is present for the coronation of Charles X in Rouen	**1825**
Arranges for her granddaughter Nat's marriage to Gabriel de Fontenay	**1828**
Lives in exile in Baden after the after the Revolution of 1830	**1830-1842**

Paul-Joseph, the Marquis de Lage

Born, likely in the Saintonge	**ca. 1760**
Marries Beatrice d'Amblimont	**1782**
Serves in the French Royal Navy	**1782-1792**
Resigns the French Navy and enters the Spanish Navy	**1792**
Holds a land-grant to Spanish-held Puerto Rico	**1793-1799**
Dies in Puerto Rico	**1799**

Natalie Delage

Born Natalie de Lage, in Paris	**1782**
Leaves Paris for southwest France with her family	**1792**
Attempts to join her family in Spain	**spring 1793**
Immigrates to the United States with Madame Senat and her family	**1793**
Natalie and Senat are taken in by Aaron Burr; begins using Delage	**1794-1801**
Leaves to rejoin her family in Paris	**1801**
Meets Thomas Sumter Jr. in port in New York City	**1801**
Marries Thomas Sumter Jr. in Paris	**1802**
The Sumters live in Paris and London, Nat born in Paris 1803	**1802-1803**
The Sumters return to Thomas' home in Stateburg S.C.	**1803-1809**
The Sumters live in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil, seven children born by 1820	**1809-1821**
The Sumters return to S.C., prepare for family's voyage to France	**1821**
Natalie, Mary, Brasilia, and Sebastian leave for France	**1823**
Nat and Fanny join the Sumter family; Thomas remains in S.C.	**1824**
Fanny marries Giuseppe Binda	**1825**
Natalie and Fanny go to Madeira; they with Natalie's sister Stephanie	**1825-1826**

Natalie and her children, except for Nat, but including Giuseppe Binda return to the United States	**1827**
Nat marries Gabriel de Fontenay	**1828**
Natalie dies in Stateburg S.C.	**1841**

APPENDIX C:

THE SUMTER FAMILY TIMELINE

Thomas Sumter

Born in Hannover County VA	**1732**
Thomas Sumter joins the VA Militia	**1752**
Thomas Sumter Serves in the French and Indian War	**1754-1763**
Thomas Sumter visits England	**1762**
Relocates to South Carolina	**1764**
Participates in the Revolutionary War in the South Carolina Militia	**1776-1783**
Serves as a United States Representative	**1789-1793, 1795-1801**
Serves in the US Senate	**1801-1810**
Retires to Stateburg SC	**1810**
Dies	**1832**

Thomas Sumter Jr.

Born in Stateburg South Carolina	**1768**
Appointed Secretary to Minister to France Robert Livingston	**1801**
Marries Natalie Delage	**1802**
Serves US Consulate in London	**1803**
Thomas and Natalie Return to Stateburg, S.C.	**1803-1809**
Serves as South Carolina Lt. Governor	**1804-1806**
Serves as Minister to Brazil	**1809-1821**
Returns to Stateburg South Carolina	**1821**
Dies in Stateburg	**1841**