

Peter N. Stearns

Social Structures, Political Elites and Ideology in Revolutionary Paris, 1792-94: A Critical Evaluation of Albert Soboul's "Les sans-culottes parisiens en l'an II"

Author(s): Richard Mowery Andrews

Source: *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Autumn, 1985), pp. 71-112

Published by: Peter N. Stearns

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3787919>

Accessed: 26/01/2010 18:33

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=pns>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Peter N. Stearns is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Social History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

**SOCIAL STRUCTURES, POLITICAL ELITES AND IDEOLOGY IN
REVOLUTIONARY PARIS, 1792-94: A CRITICAL EVALUATION
OF ALBERT SOBOUL'S *LES SANS-CULOTTES PARISIENS*
EN LAN II**

Since 1958, the late Albert Soboul's massive thesis has reigned as the authoritative history of Revolutionary Paris in 1793-94 and of the "sans-culotterie." It has been the object of polemics, but not of one systematic critique based on primary sources.¹ Soboul's conclusions are received academic knowledge, conveyed as truths in myriads of textbooks and general histories of the Revolution. I am presently completing a thematic history entitled "Power, Disorder and Order in Revolutionary Paris, 1792-96," whose methods and conclusions stand in contradiction to most of those of *Les sans-culottes parisiens*. Here, I cannot do full critical justice to Soboul's pioneering work. The problems are not those of slivers of positive knowledge. They are those of comprehending the great metropolis during the most creative and mysterious epoch of the Great Revolution. I am obliged to leave certain major problems unexplored in this essay: the antagonisms between the metropolis and the agrarian provinces; anti-clericalism; general policing of the City; the incidence of Terror and Counter-Terror.

Power within the Paris sections of 1792-94 — its social composition, dynamics, and ideology — is the general subject of this essay. I shall endeavor to demonstrate that between the social composition of the "sans-culotte" leadership and the general ideology of the "sans-culotte" movement there was a coherence far more extensive than Soboul, and succeeding historians, perceived.

The scale and ambition of *Les sans-culottes parisiens* have been commandingly seductive. The scale was all of Paris and its relations with the Revolutionary State in 1793-94. Soboul's ambition was comprehensive "history from below," a materialist description of the Parisian "sans-culotterie" as an autonomous popular movement and the compelling force behind the Revolutionary government in 1793. He wished to accomplish for Paris what Georges Lefebvre achieved for rural France of the Revolutionary era in the *Paysans du Nord*. In preface to the 1959 edition of that work, he and Armando Saitta described Lefebvre's "perspective from below" as "the only valid plane for historiographic research and reconstruction."² Soboul stated his purpose in the introduction to *Les sans-culottes parisiens*:

One group of Old Regime and Revolutionary France does not appear [in histories of the period] in its genuine place; this is the group that was known by contemporaries as the 'sans-culottes.' (p. 5)

Most historians, with differences of emphasis that can doubtless be explained by their temperaments, social origins and the times in which they lived, have tended to underestimate or depreciate the original and specific character of the popular revolution. (p. 10)

Within the framework of Paris and the chronological limits which we have set, it is our concern to demonstrate that the popular movement possessed its own autonomy and identity. (p. 18)

From the inception of the narrative and in the articulation of the sources, one senses that Soboul's categories for interpreting Revolutionary Paris were pre-determined by his desire to recreate a "popular movement," synonymous with the "sans-culotterie,"

that was socially and politically distinct from the Jacobins and the Montagnard State, distinct from the “bourgeois Revolution.” Were Soboul’s interpretive categories valid empirically?

Masses and Elites in Sectionary Paris

The “framework of Paris” was rigidly circumscribed in *Les sans-culottes parisiens*. The metropolis was not a protagonist of Soboul’s history. It was merely a place. There was no exploration of relations between “quartiers” and sections, between socio-economic geographies and local politics. We were given the impression that there were no significant differences, social or political, between the section Amis-de-la-Patrie and the section Lepeletier, that is, between the northern half of the rue Saint-Denis, simultaneously industrial, artisanal, mercantile and proletarian, and the “quartier” of the Bourse, of ministries of state, “rentiers,” financiers, barristers and luxury purveyors; no significant differences between the section Révolutionnaire and the section Sans-Culottes, that is, between the crafted, distinguished and affluent “quartier” of the Pont-Neuf and the peripheral, sprawling and very poor Faubourgs Saint-Victor and Saint-Marcel. Paris, the great and determining City, was a presence shadowy and inert in *Les sans-culottes parisiens*.

Soboul’s history of the sections from June, 1793 to mid-July, 1794 described them horizontally, *en masse*, through essentially public actions or repressive actions (selected incarcerations). Since the language of revolution was homogeneous throughout Paris by the Year II, for Soboul militancy itself was presumably homogeneous through the City. All protagonists lived within a rhetorical category and only there: Jacobin, “sans-culotte,” “extreme patriot,” “absentionist” or “indifferent” (“insouciant,”) “moderate.” Thousands of Parisians marched across these pages. Who were they? Soboul described them only by nomenclatures of trade or occupation (with sparse and uncertain notations of income), by formal offices or roles in 1793-94, and by their language and the language of their enemies in 1793-95. No section and its personnel were examined in depth, nor were Terror and Counter-Terror. No protagonists were studied in the duration of their social and civic careers. We were presented with a huge, ghostly procession of figurations, within which marched an ostensible “popular movement.”

A popular movement connotes sustained mass action. The most serious distortions of metropolitan politics in *Les sans-culottes parisiens* concern the “popular masses” as citizens or political actors. From June, 1790 to October, 1793, general assemblies of the forty-eight sections were the matrix of local politics and democracy. Until December, 1793 they elected all sectionary officials and decided most sectionary actions. Participation in these assemblies was the measure of popular involvement in the politics of the Parisian Revolution. In chapter 5 and appendix 4, Soboul revealed that attendance in general assemblies, and even popular societies, was sporadic and fractional in 1792-94. Only rarely did ten percent of those eligible to vote attend, even at times of major crises and political decisions. This fractional presence remained characteristic during the Year II, when penurious citizens were paid an indemnity of two “livres” per session for their attendance.³ No *de facto* increase in participation followed the *de jure* passage from censitary to democratic suffrage in August, 1792. The proportion of socially modest and laboring voters increased slightly within the small percentage of those in regular attendance. Soboul conceded in part II that sectionary politics were “revolutionary democracy,” not “popular democracy,” in 1793-94: the sovereign assemblies were an arena of “active minorities,” with the “sans-culotte” minority as agents of the absent “popular masses.” But in the narrative of sectionary politics, Soboul wrote a contradictory history — one of continual, trans-Parisian, and decisive “popular

movements," "popular thrusts," "popular ferments," and "popular paroxysms." "Popular:" the incantatory word occurs in almost every third sentence of the book, and in every conceivable grammatical form. Despite the sweeping velocity of Soboul's rhetoric, the "popular masses" of Paris were absent as citizens from the concrete, quotidian political life of the sections.⁴

Soboul defined the "popular masses" of Paris almost exclusively as subsistential wage earners and consumers, without analyzing them. "Plebeians" is our alternative definition. It encompasses all those without real, commercial or manufacturing property (except tools), who lacked marketable skills or literacy, who lived by wage, piece-rate or remuneration in goods, by institutional charity, begging, prostitution, street hawking (messengers, hucksters) and hustles (story-telling, making music, performing stunts), by directing appropriation of subsistence (scavenging, fraud, theft), and by all combinations of the above. The definition is capacious, as was the popular reality. Ingenious motility in combining several modes of existence, not persistent labor, characterized most plebeians in eighteenth century Paris. They were savant in arts and values of survival that were not those of a tamed wage-earning laboring class. "Proletarians," "pre-proletarians," and "laboring poor" are brittle reductionist terms when applied to this vital mass, whose members passed in and out of varieties of labor – often at long intervals and over extensive migratory spaces – just as they oscillated between festive surfeits and grim penuries of consumption.⁵

The plebeians of Paris existed in five general political modes in 1792-94, each of them defined or manipulated by the "sans-culotterie" and the Jacobins. (1) They were a talismanic, legitimating constituency invoked as sovereign by those acting on its behalf (militants and officials of the "sans-culotterie," Jacobins of the Convention) and a penumbral, hovering threat to order for adversaries of "sans-culottes" and Jacobins – a threat incarnated during the prison massacres of September, 1792 and the grocery riots of February, 1793. (2) Their pressures were selectively channeled into politics by the "sans-culotte" leadership. When mobilized by that leadership, they participated dramatically but ritualistically in politics, especially during "journées" and decisive confrontations between factions within general assemblies. During the "regeneration" battles of the spring and summer of 1793 by which "sans-culottes" won official sectionary power, plebeians appeared forcefully in the general assemblies – not as atomistic individual voters, but as groups of workers mobilized by their "sans-culotte" employers for temporary muscle when ballots were to be cast by fists and feet. These "popular votes" were transpositions to sovereign general assemblies of sovereign disciplines and subordinations prevailing on work sites or in ateliers.⁶ (3) Resident adult males among this populace were organized and armed in sectionary battalions, led by officers who were usually "sans-culotte" political leaders in the Year II. Forces of order for Jacobin Paris, they policed the metropolis, marched in the "journées," and provided a general reserve for the armies of the Republic. As Marcel Reinhard wrote:

It is there that one found numbers and mass: more than 116,000 men in January, 1793, distributed among 886 companies with an average of 2,400 per section, whereas the assemblies grouped only three to four hundred citizens.⁷

(4) During the twelve months of 1793, the plebeians of Paris gave the field armies almost 80,000 recruits, or regimented citizen-proletarians of war – for the soldier is also a proletarian and perhaps the most exploited of all, if one considers the wealth he creates for his employers. They were also testimony to the political efficacy of the "sans-culotterie." (5) Finally, plebeians were recipients of public charity and "sans-culotte"/Jacobin economic patronage: price regulation of subsistence commodities; statist provisioning of the City; and work in war manufactures.

The 3,800 to 4,000 individual officials who formed the cadres or the forty-eight sections and who ruled a city of 575,000 to 600,000 in 1793-Year II were not a "mass movement." They were an oligarchy. Each section had the following complement of officials: sixteen civil commissioners; sixteen to twenty-four welfare commissioners; twelve revolutionary commissioners; one justice of the peace with a recording secretary and six assessors; one police commissioner with a recording secretary; one hoarding commissioner; a president, vice-president and secretary of the section's general assembly; the same offices for the associated popular society; three deputies to the General Council of the Commune; one deputy to the Administrative Council of the "département;" one deputy to the Municipal Relief Commission; an average of eighteen electors; and a captain, lieutenant and two second lieutenants for each of an average of eighteen para-military companies (seventy-two officers). This meant an average total of 160 officials in each section, who formed a governing class. Theoretically, there would be 7,680 such officials for all Paris. In reality, the cumulation of political offices among this personnel (concurrences of roles) was very extensive, and most committees were not regularly staffed at full complement. On average during 1793-Year II, the 160 offices in a section were held by approximately eighty men. This meant a metropolitan ruling class of some 3,840. That ruling class also formed almost a numerical majority of the entire "sans-culotterie."

Democracy has been a highly paradoxical notion since the 1790s. Valuatively, it is one of the most consensually absolute in modern language. Empirically, it remains one of the most controversial and equivocal.

After August, 1792, the sectionary regime was based on universal manhood suffrage of residents. But from 1790 to 1793 and beyond, sectionary elections were rarely "free votes" or direct expressions of popular sovereignty, except in rhetoric and ideology. Most commonly, they were contests between factions of a small, assiduous political class and occasions for the perpetuation of oligarchical structures by co-optation and alliances.⁸ In revolutionary terms, the sectionary procedures for electing officials and deciding policies in 1792-93 were "democratic." In concrete terms, they were fusions of the forms and language of democracy with oligarchical power. The fusion was expressed consummately in the formula by which the Revolutionary Central Committee of Paris, executive arm of the elected sectionary delegates at the "Évêché" Palace in the *Cité*, arrogated supreme municipal authority during the Insurrection of 31 May-2 June: "By the Will of the Sovereign People, year II of the French Democratic Republic, this 31 May, 1793."⁹

This situation has not been unique in modern history. Oligarchy thrives in the soil of formal mass democracy.

The "sans-culotte" oligarchy of Paris had a small active and consistent plebeian following of militants in clubs and general assemblies, who provided voting majorities (whether by voices or fists) and who marginally participated in power. It also had a huge popular constituency that was civically passive. That constituency existed in three fundamental relations to the "sans-culotte" leadership: as a source for recruitment of plebeian militants (including a portion of revolutionary commissioners of the Year II); as a latent *masse de manoeuvre* to be mobilized for "journées," general labor, and military service; as a populace to be policed, educated, and transformed into a disciplined, industrious republican citizenry.

There were many social cleavages in late eighteenth century Paris. Perhaps the most politically significant of them, in 1792-94, was the one separating those who had the social means, and thus freedom, to choose the "sans-culotte" career and its vocation of power from those, constrained by wage or excluded by transience, who had only the freedom either to follow the "sans-culotte" leadership or to abstain from civic action.

Politically, there was no “autonomous popular movement” in Revolutionary Paris. Who, then, composed the “sans-culotte” oligarchy?

The “Sans-culotterie:” Rhetoric and Realities

Much of Soboul’s history of the “sans-culotterie” is transcription of political rhetoric – the rhetoric of “sans-culottes” and their enemies in 1793-95 – and then ascription of social identities and meanings to that rhetoric. He never isolated rhetoric as a problem, or distinguished it from actions and realities.

“Civisme” (good or militant citizenship) in Revolutionary Paris was indeed essentially rhetorical. Its dominant presence was words – statements, speeches, resolutions, petitions, denunciations – spoken by individuals and groups in clubs, section general assemblies, municipal councils, committees, public gatherings, and the streets. “Anticivisme” – the crimes of royalism, federalism, aristocracy or, in 1795, of terrorism and anarchism – was proportionately verbal and centered in the same forums. To be ostentatiously and assiduously expressive in these forums was to be militant, whether revolutionary or counter-revolutionary. In 1792-94, this militancy of the spoken word was a prerequisite for election or appointment to sectionary, municipal, or government offices, for monied careers of written discourse. Insurrectionary “journées,” days of action, occurred at long intervals. Always, they were prepared and decisively propelled by rhetoric. So great was the importance of rhetoric that silence – abstention from civic discourse and its forums – was rendered criminally suspect in October, 1793.¹⁰ Rhetoric attained extreme potency in 1792-95; the traditional authorities that disciplined public language and actions, Monarchy and the Church, had been recently destroyed or rendered powerless. In the policing of rhetoric by Terror and Counter-Terror, “sans-culottes” and their adversaries each achieved moral self-avowal, but not social self-revelation: we are what we are, not by our genuine class positions, but by our discourse; our enemies define themselves (and us) by their oppositional discourse. Discourse had extraordinary plasticity and force in Revolutionary Paris. It provided shifting definitions of political community and mechanisms of exclusion. Eminently manipulable, it could mask realities. Soboul read that discourse literally.

Soboul’s goal in *Les sans-culottes parisiens* was linear, but his general method was inadvertently circular. The goal was to formulate a materialist explanation for sectionary politics by reducing personnel and policies to forces and antagonisms of socio-economic class, and thence to narrate the development of the Parisian Revolution throughout the Year II. But his sources for this enterprise were political, and in large part rhetorical. He attempted to overcome this problem of possibly grave disjunctions between political sources and socio-economic realities simply by grafting onto these sources putative class interpretations of personnel, their motives, and the content of their politics. The grafting was accomplished by two equally deformational methods: the speculative and usually false derivation of class positions from the simple occupations revealed in the political dossiers of militants; and the circularity of rephrasing in modern class terms – such as “salaried workers,” “independent artisans,” “shopkeeper petty bourgeoisie,” “middle class,” or “upper commercial bourgeoisie” – the frequently tendentious identities that the protagonists either asserted for themselves or were given by their enemies in these sources. In his social analysis, Soboul never broke out of tautological entrapment by political documents, entrapment by their partisan distortions and their intended silences.

Some 347 cartons of individual dossiers in the F7 series of the Archives nationales formed the most important segment of Soboul’s documentation on the “sans-culotterie” and the political history of Paris in 1793-94. Rich and indispensable, but chaotic and

treacherous for any social analysis, these dossiers are transcriptions and polemical interpretations of politics. They are not a collection of authentic social identities. Solid indications of a person's wealth, class and status appear occasionally, but only under critical scrutiny of a dossier. Here, one listens principally to the strident voices of those imprisoned and who want the Committees of government to release them (and to jail their local persecutors) or the voices of those who have incarcerated them (as counter-revolutionary suspects or anarchists and terrorists) and are attempting to persuade the same Committees to keep them in prison. Voices of denunciation and counter-denunciation, they were necessarily hyperbolic even within a universe of charged rhetoric:

A man without an income, without even a domicile in 1789. . . he was living in the most dissolute misery that laziness, debauchery and ignorance can produce.

Fénéaux has that dark, sinister and ferocious look which reveals all the baseness of his soul.

Cordas, with his loud and presumptuous voice (a characteristic of the ignorant), got himself admired by the least educated class of the section. . . He deified anarchy in shouting at the top of his lungs that since the People has insurrected it should recognize no law other than its sovereign will, or, what is more accurate, the will of demagogues. . .

He was the abbé Maury [a prominent royalist writer] of the section and the orator of aristocracy, one of the leaders of the coalition formed in the general assembly to annihilate democracy.¹¹

By mid-1793, the period at which Soboul's history begins, "sans-culotte" rhetoric of characterization was rapidly narrowing down to the opaque dichotomy of "aristocratie" versus "peuple."

The "sans-culotte" officials of the Paris sections in 1793-Year II were a paternalist and populist oligarchy of the literate, skilled, and propertied. Jacobin orthodoxy in the Municipality and in the Committees of the Convention was equally paternalist and populist. In Paris of 1793-94, one of the principal techniques of rule – and of self-disculpation by the victims of rule – was hortatory self-assimilation to the laboring classes. Sectionary officials of the "sans-culotterie" most usually blurred or concealed their personal wealth or social status in the documents of F7. In depicting their conservative adversaries, they commonly exaggerated wealth. These latter, when ascendant during the purges of 1795, frequently misrepresented their "sans-culotte" enemies as "canaille," or rabble. Personal wealth was tainted in Jacobin Paris. It was to be admitted only *in extremis* and only in a paternalist or altruistic mode:

My imprisonment not only plunges my family into the most cruel indigence, but also paralyzes the operations of great numbers of ribbon, gauze and fringe manufacturers for whom I make tools and, I dare say, with such success that I have never been tempted by another trade.

A simple artisan of modest means, who has worked for more than thirty years. . . in 1792, I armed and equipped three volunteers for the armies.¹²

Rhetorical manipulations of social identities, and plain mendacity or contrivance in presentations of self, are almost systematic in the prison dossiers of F7, a reality unacknowledged by Soboul. Politics in the Revolutionary metropolis was, at multiple levels, an immense exercise in guile and cunning, in social masks and metamorphoses. These were also fundamental qualities of Parisian life and communications during the Old Regime and the Revolution, qualities of urban culture.¹³ For immigrants, initiation to arts of self-presentation was much of becoming Parisian. In 1792-95, this artfulness had stakes higher even than success in eroticism, business, clientage and election to office or appointment to government salaries. It could influence whether or not one went to prison and whether one remained there.

Social and economic documentation must be juxtaposed with political sources in the study of Revolutionary Paris. The following are the main categories of such documentation that I have used:

(1) The dossiers of wage-paying employers at all levels in sectors of production and manufacturing from forty-two of the forty-eight sections, for the years 1790-92, in the F30 series of the Archives nationales. I have copied their totality, some 3,800 individual dossiers. The socio-economic richness and precision of this source lie in disclosing specific ranges and hierarchies of production. I use it for the following purposes: (a) nominative identification of employers, including "sans-culottes" and their adversaries; (b) hierarchies in scale of production by all trades, section by section; (c) local geographies of enterprise within sections and throughout Paris, down to precise street addresses; (d) wage differentials and the organization of tasks within trades; (e) seasonalities of employment, expansions and contractions of the labor market.¹⁴

(2) Lists of "active" and "eligible" citizens of various sections during the censitary regime (in 1790-91); some of these give the amount paid by each in tax on annual income.

(3) The "cartes de sûreté" (identity cards) registered from thirty-one sections and encompassing some 75,000 of the adult male population resident in 1793-Year II. Marcel Reinhard and his colleagues discovered and developed this source during the 1960s and 1970s. It is extremely valuable for socio-biographical study of sectionary personnel, for the social geography of Paris, and for data on immigration and literacy. The typical registration gives name, age, trade, address, previous address, birthplace, date of immigration to Paris, and signature.¹⁵

(4) The *Sommier of biens nationaux*, sales of nationalized properties by section from 1790.

(5) Records of insolvencies and bankruptcies, especially in the Directorial years, in the Archives départementales de la Seine.

(6) Tables of municipal, "département," and government employees (notably the principal ministries), which often give occupational and salary histories of personnel.

(7) Records of sectionary police commissioners in the Archives of Prefecture of Police. These contain a wealth of material: descriptions and inventories of "cadres de vie" of all classes; disclosures of social relations; relations of commerce and production; sexuality; public and private conflicts; violence and crime.

(8) A large monographic and manuscript literature on the "quartiers" of late eighteenth century Paris.

From these socio-economic sources, we can derive a generalization: the "sans-culotterie" of 1793-Year II – the approximately 3,840 sectionary officials who ruled Paris was bourgeois in its social aggregate, and absolutely by comparison with the population it ruled. It was so by its manufacturing and commercial capital, by its real properties and salaried incomes, by its skills in literacy, manipulation of ideological formulae, and governance. It had the power to command labor on a large scale and to create dependencies, allegiances, and constituencies. From the vantage of this documentation, let us return to the F7 series and its biographies of militants, to the evidential foundation for Soboul's "social history" of sectionary politics in 1793-Year II.

Consider Aristarque Didot. He was frequently cited by Soboul as a spokesman for the social radicalism of the "sans-culotterie" and for its most plebeian stratum, the "quarante sols" (those who received an indemnity of two "livres" per session for attending section general assemblies during the Year II).

First imprisoned on the instigation of the revolutionary committee as a "Hébertist" in February, 1794, Didot was reincarcerated in May, 1795 for having been a principal terrorist of the Réunion section in 1793-Year II. Secretary of the revolutionary committee

from its formation on 28 March, 1793, he was its president in September and October. In applying the Law of Suspects within the section, Didot was harder, more adamantly proscriptive than his colleagues. After they excluded him from the committee in December, he and a few other renegade “sans-culotte” leaders mobilized the local popular society and the “quarante sols” of the general assembly to oppose the revolutionary committee.¹⁶ In 1793, Didot was a leading ideologist of the popular society and the general assembly. In July, he drafted a resolution against hoarding and speculation in foodstuffs and for national regulation of commerce in vital commodities. In November, the popular society published his *Précis sur la Révolution et le caractère français*, which attributed the distress of the Republic to the ferocity of the allied monarchs, successive betrayals by parlementarians, ministers and generals, and “the greed of merchants, the malice of the wealthy.”¹⁷

To Soboul, there was perfect symmetry between Didot’s apparent social position (“former law clerk” in the Parlement of Paris, aged twenty-five in 1793) and his democratic radicalism. Didot himself asserted that symmetry from prison and claimed no income beyond his modest and brief salary (150 “livres” per month) as revolutionary commissioner. But his baptismal act is also in his F7 dossier.¹⁸

Born in 1768 at St.-Firmin (Oise), he was the son of an affluent Royal provincial magistrate – judicial councillor, administrator of forests in the balliwick of Senlis, and chief receiver of fees in the chancellery of the Senlis Presidial Court. His godfather and consanguine relation was Pierre-François Didot, “bookseller, quai des Augustins in Paris” and a scion of one of the largest and wealthiest publishing dynasties of eighteenth century Paris. The central establishment of Firmin-Didot – a combined bookshop, typefoundry and printing factory on the rue Dauphiné near the quai des Augustins – employed an average of ninety-five workers on a payroll of 1,200-1,800 “livres” a week in 1790-91. The two family subsidiaries in Paris, Didot “ainé,” rue Pavée Saint-André, and Didot “jeune,” rue du Hurepoix, employed respectively averages of 46 and 107. The family also owned paper mills at Essonne.¹⁹

One may doubt that Aristarque Didot’s sole income during the Year II was his salary as revolutionary commissioner. In January, 1796 and from its creation, Didot gained employment in the Ministry of General Police; by October, 1797 he was a principal clerk.²⁰ From the Faculty of Law and clerkship to an attorney of the Parlement of Paris in 1787-90 to the Ministry of General Police in 1797 and probably beyond, Didot’s was a bourgeois career of governance (as had been his father’s), a career mediated and expanded by sectionary leadership in 1793-Year II. This was also the social trajectory of hundreds of “bourgeois lettrés” among the “sans-culotterie.”²¹

The populist imagery of the laboring “sans-culotte” was invoked from prison by enemies of the “sans-culotterie.” Two artficed voices speak for dozens from the Graviilliers section and hundreds throughout Paris during the Year II. Sylvain Caubert, a member of the section’s censitary elite, was a construction entrepreneur. In the words of his prison autobiography:

Sylvain Caubert was born into that most valuable of classes, the People, the class destined most particularly to reap the benefits of the Revolution; son of a worker, a long-time worker himself, always living in the midst of ‘sans-culottes’ he is proud to have learned from them the practice of republican virtues.

His F30 dossier reveals that in 1790-91 he employed an average of forty workers; from July through December, 1790 he paid 19,900 “livres” in wages. In 1789-92, Caubert was a captain in the district and section batallion. The revolutionary committee alleged that after the “journée” of 20 June, 1792 he exclaimed that had he commanded a unit at the Tuileries Palace, “he would have ordered volley-fire into that scum.”²² Guillaume

Desmonceaux, constitutional monarchist ally of Caubert in the Graviilliers, also “sans-culottized” himself from prison, but his autobiography has resonances of veracity. Born at Bouquetot in Normandy in 1739, he was the son of a saddle-maker and a seamstress; the youngest of three children, he left Paris in 1758 with thirty “livres” travel money:

I arrived on the rue Basse Porte Saint-Denis at the home of a relative, a descendant of my first cousin, who had come to Paris five or six years earlier; this relative was a building painter and, since I needed work in order to live, he got me into a painting shop. . . on the rue Grange-Batelière.

This was a classic pattern of immigration to Paris in the eighteenth century: in adolescence and to the home and employment connection of a relative already installed in the metropolis, the pattern of most immigrants who became “bourgeois de Paris.” Around 1770, Desmonceaux gained the “maîtrise” and established an atelier. In 1791, as a decorative building painter he employed five journeymen; in that year, he purchased the building of his atelier and residence (a nationalized property) in the Marché Saint-Martin.²³

The ranks of Desmonceaux’s enemies in the Graviilliers section contained a near-exact economic counterpart of almost the same age, François-Pierre Beaudouin. He presided on the revolutionary committee during the winter of the Year II and had been a long-time member of the “Société populaire de la rue du Vert-Bois.” He and his “sans-culotte” comrades imprisoned Desmonceaux, Caubert, and their political analogues. Also a master decorative painter, Beaudouin employed six skilled workers in 1790; in 1793 he supervised much of the section’s war production. He died of natural causes in 1795. We possess the inventory of his “mobilier” in the large apartment on the rue Phélippeaux, one of the most affluent residential streets of the Graviilliers: several large rooms facing a terraced garden; a spacious kitchen with two ovens; a study alcove; and superb furnishings – walnut cabinets, inlaid hardwood floors, copper plumbing, crystal chandeliers and goblets, settings in porcelain, tables of oak and marble.²⁴ The wealth was discreet, like that of much of the “sans-culotte” bourgeoisie.

What economic determinisms can explain for us these two bitterly opposed political choices, that of Caubert and Desmonceaux, and that of Beaudouin? Parisian bourgeois made these choices throughout the City in 1792-94. Yet Soboul evaded this central question of Revolutionary politics in Paris. From the first chapter of *Les sans-culottes parisiens*, he simply denominated the sectionary opponents of the “sans-culottes” as “moderates;” he dogmatically asserted, in a void of economic evidence, that they were of higher socio-economic class than the “sans-culotterie” – “affluent” or “rich” classes, “middle and upper bourgeoisie” opposed by supposedly “petty bourgeois” artisans, tradesmen and employees allied with wage laborers. Politically, he represented them as mechanistic dialectical foils to “sans-culottes” and Jacobins. They received no prosopographic investigation, either *en bloc* or within individual sections. In sum, Soboul described them by the populist rhetoric of their “sans-culotte” adversaries, by images of conservative, usurious, and exploitive wealth.

Among the thousands of sectionary and Municipal careers evoked in *Les sans-culottes parisiens*, one is outstandingly eloquent of the masking functions of ideological discourse in the Year II, the elusive meanings of trade denominations, the tautological encasements of Soboul’s methods, and some genuine dynamics of section power: the case of Joseph Bodson and his “sans-culotte” comrades in the Pont-Neuf section. On 21 March, 1794, Bodson and two revolutionary commissioners were imprisoned by order of the Committee of General Security as suspect of Cordelier intrigues and of “Hébertism;” a third commissioner, Nicolas Cochois, was imprisoned on the same charges in April. These four belonged to the “sans-culotte” elite of the section. There

had been denunciations of them by enemies within the section and in prison. Bodson was particularly vulnerable: he belonged to the “Société populaire à l’Évêché,” a trans-sectional club that had developed out of the Paris electoral assembly; in March he (or his younger brother) was “secrétaire-greffier” of its published by-law which excluded ex-nobles and priests from membership and criticized the government for bridling sectional popular societies; to the Executive Committees of the Convention, this was Cordelier and “Hébertist” agitation. In May, seventy-five citizens of the section petitioned the Committees of General Security Public Safety to release these four men:

We have seen them to be constantly patriotic and incapable of having participated in the Revolution for their own gain; since they were either born, or raised from childhood among us, we have known them long before the Revolution and therefore have been able to judge their conduct and integrity. . .

Chemin, haberdashery merchant, has lived for more than thirty years in the section; [aged fifty-seven, married, three children] . . . Ardently, he declared for liberty from its very dawning; on 14 July, 1789 he raced to the Invalides Arsenal to gather weapons; he participated in the festival of Chateau-Vieux, in the insurrections of 10 August and 31 May, and in all the events of the Revolution . . . He regularly attends the popular societies . . . He has always been of patriotic principles, but since his personality is rather harsh, he could have substituted coarseness for severity and his love for the Revolution could have degenerated into fanaticism (if one may use that word); because he possesses only the most common measure of intellect and no education, he could have committed errors with the purest of intentions.

Tarreau, jewelry worker [aged forty-seven, married, two children] hot-tempered and enthusiastic, he could have acted more from impulse than from reflection; the joy he experiences in civic festivals has caused him occasionally to forget rules of sobriety; he lacks education and has only the Raw Common Sense of Nature, which he has used to defend liberty and express republican opinions, but in doing so he often evinces more stubbornness than rigor. . . He could err innocently.

Bodson, painter [aged twenty-nine] . . . Although poorly educated, his natural intelligence has given him means which he utilizes to educate himself and to defend liberty; but with a distrustful personality, sensitive and easily offended, he can be excessively passionate in tenaciously supporting opinions that he believes are sound, all the more so because pride can cause him to overestimate his capacities. . .

Their involvement in the Revolution has occupied much of their time and has caused them considerable loss; their families are experiencing a respectable neediness, if not misery, that increases with each day of their absence.²⁵

Soboul read the petitioners’ F7 dossiers, but apparently only through the lens of this petition. It was the literal basis for his interpretation of the repression and of these careers:

Active since 14 July [1789], these men had participated in all of the ‘journées;’ in 1791, with others, they had founded the ‘Société populaire des Hommes-Libres;’ on 2-4 September, 1793 they contributed to the ‘regeneration’ of the section. Chemin and Tarreau were authentic ‘sans-culottes.’ A haberdashery merchant, without education, Chemin had a harsh personality. . . Tarreau was a jewelry worker, also uneducated, possessing only ‘the raw common sense of nature.’ . . Bodson was a painter by trade and ‘although poorly educated, his natural intelligence gave him the means which he utilized to educate himself and to defend liberty;’ Bodson rose to the position of assistant-judge [in the tribunal of the first ‘arrondissement’]. . . In them, the Committees had struck men who were less partisans of Hébert than devoted ‘sans-culottes,’ but ‘sans-culottes’ more receptive to popular pressures than to Jacobin influence. (pp. 851-52)

To Soboul, these four men were socially modest artisans or tradesmen who had been thrust upward by the “popular masses” of the section because of their militancy. They existed historically only as incarnations of the “sans-culotterie.” Their environment

was only the Révolutionnaire section and in the Year II. Soboul neglected the fact that this was the “quartier” of the Pont-Neuf, site throughout the eighteenth century of the most literate, skilled and affluent craftsmen of Paris – the masters and journeymen of the “orfèvrerie-bijouterie-horlogerie” (gold and silversmiths, jewellers, watch-makers and associated luxury trades). It encompassed the Renaissance symmetries of the Place Dauphine, the visual and social resplendencies of the quai de l’Horloge, quai des Orfèvres, and quai des Morfondus.

Here, in distillation, was much of Soboul’s method in *Les sans-culottes parisiens*. To probe realities ignored or obscured by that method, let us return to the collective petition. Its authors were trying to save their friends and comrades from prison and possibly the Revolutionary Tribunal. They succeeded: the four were released by order of the Committee of General Security in June and July. The rhetorical tactics of the petition were cunning: Bodson, Chemin and Tarreau were portrayed as industrious artisans and tradesmen, devoted fathers and husbands, Rousseauian “men of the people” – uneducated and therefore guileless, but frank, loyal, courageous, and utterly innocent of opportunism or malice. Who were these militants? What were their careers?

Joseph Bodson, thirty in 1794, was of the “promotion” of August, 1792, as were most of the “sans-culotte” officials of the Year II: from that summer, deputy to the Insurrectionary Commune and elector; national commissioner of the Commune and Provisional Executive Council in the “départements” of Brittany in September and October; re-elected to the General Council of the Commune in 1793; in April, selected with four others to form the Commune’s committee for correspondence with the 44,000 other municipalities; elected that same month assistant-judge of an “arrondissement” tribunal. He resigned from the Commune to keep his judgeship, and during the winter of the Year II was again appointed by the government to an executive mission with the army near Brest.²⁶ To Soboul, Bodson and his fellows appeared “more receptive to popular pressures than to Jacobin influence.” But Bodson’s career since August, 1792 had been essentially Municipal and Jacobin.

The other three were also of the Pont-Neuf’s leadership nucleus. They had been “eligibles” under the censitary regime. Chemin had been a civil commissioner of the district and section since 1789 and elector from 1792. Tarreau was a civil commissioner before his election to the revolutionary committee, and Cochois had been a deputy to the Insurrectionary Commune. Like the anthropologist who was watched the tribal dance a hundred times but is still ruthlessly uncertain of its meanings, I still ask: who were Bodson, Chemin, Tarreau and Cochois?

When the Committee of General Security interrogated Bodson in August, 1794 they asked his trade, and he answered: “formerly painter, now judge on a tribunal.” When re-interrogated a month later and asked his trade before the Revolution, he answered: “painter and engraver.” The simplicity was calculatedly deceptive, as was the image of modest labor abandoned for civic service. Joseph Bodson was a master gilding-painter and metal engraver “en taille douce” or “à burin.” Burins were expensive steel cutting and etching tools; their technique was the most skilled and delicate in eighteenth century engraving. In 1790-91, a journeyman “graveur à burin” could earn from six to seven “livres” a day, or up to 2,200-2,500 “livres” a year. Such a “sans-culotte” could afford ample bread, meat and wine.²⁷ When re-arrested as a terrorist in the Spring of 1795, Bodson was an entrepreneur contracted for painting, gilding and metal-carving at the Madeleine and other sites in western Paris. He belonged to at least the second generation of clan of bourgeois craftsmen of the Pont-Neuf; he and his two brothers, both precision craftsmen, were natives of the “quartier.” The eldest, Louis-Aléxis (thirty-four in 1793), concurrently a revolutionary and civil commissioner in the Year II, was a master watchmaker, jeweler and optician with boutique and atelier near the Pont-

au-Change. During the Years II and III, he was also a supervisor of manufacturing for the Agency of Powder and Saltpeter of the "département" of Paris; Jean-Antoine Chaptal, scientist and Jacobin technocrat, lauded his professional competence in a letter to the Committees of Government.²⁸ Joseph Bodson received a similar letter of attestation from his colleagues on the tribunal. These "sans-culottes," and their comrades, were endowed with far more than raw intelligence and Rousseauian common sense.

Jean-Charles Chemin, haberdashery and hosiery merchant, was hardly a precarious tradesman. Around 1789, he had established his eldest son (who was only twenty-seven in 1793) as printer and bookdealer on the rue Glatigny in the adjacent Cité section. This was one of the most capital-intensive trades of the Parisian economy. Chemin "fils" was official printer of the Cité section and the electoral assembly of Paris, both lucrative commissions. He was also editor-publisher of the *Journal des inventions dans les arts et métiers* and author-publisher of several republican tracts. From prison, Jean-Charles Chemin wrote to the Committees of Government in the proud, indignant language of a bourgeois patriarch:

I proclaim, and I call upon all patriots who know me to attest that since 1789 all of my time has been absolutely devoted to public service; I have figured in all the days of the Revolution. . . I sent one of my sons to the Vendée, where he died on the field of battle. I have another whose fortunate literary ventures on the subject of public education have won him the plaudits and encouragements of the National Convention and the Commune of Paris. Should the father who gave such sons to the State be suspected of being the enemy of that State?²⁹

Pierre Tarreau, simple jewel worker according to the petition, was a patented gemcutter and mounter with boutique, atelier and residence on the prestigious rue Saint-Louis. He worked principally on commission and through subcontracting with craft-masters.³⁰ Nicolas Cochois, the last of our quartet, was twenty-nine in the Year II and a native of the section. He was a master rugmaker and merchant who in 1790 employed six weavers, to whom he paid some six hundred "livres" a month in wages, about 7,000 a year.³¹

The crafting and sale of precious metals, gems, timepieces and precision instruments were the dominant activities within the Pont-Neuf "quartier" during the eighteenth century. This craftsmanship had been the most privileged, lucrative, and protected in Old Regime France. The guild of the "orfèverie-bijouterie-horlogerie" was alive juridically until June, 1791 and socially long after the Le Chapelier Law. It encouraged nepotism, the stability and continuity of production through its transmission from father to son. The sons of masters were exempted from the formal periods of apprenticeship and journeymanhood (six and three years) and had only to produce the "chef d'oeuvre" and the caution money of 1,000 "livres" to receive certification as masters. The structure of the craft was in fact nepotistic, even dynastic, within extended families. In 1793-Year II, there were more than six hundred masters and journeymen of the "orfèverie-bijouterie-horlogerie" and associated trades in the Pont-Neuf. They were sophisticated and cosmopolitan artisans, for they had produced directly for a clientele that encompassed every class from the court, the high episcopacy, and the nobility to artisans and tradesmen.³²

Most of the "sans-culotte" personnel of the section were of the guild, principally young or middle-aged masters who were at least of the second or third generation in craft families; this included nine of the twelve revolutionary commissioners of the Year II. Their political opponents were barristers and solicitors, notaries, clerks, bureaucrats of the Old Regime and the Revolution, and, by about 40 percent, masters of the guild, most of them older and more commercially successful than their "sans-

culotte” rivals (although the differences were those of gradations, not distinct economic class.) When imprisoning these latter as counter-revolutionaries, the “sans-culottes” of the Pont-Neuf were obliged to adopt clever social hypocrisies – notably, accusations of parasitical wealth and of working for nobles who had subsequently emigrated – just as they were obliged to resort to rhetorical contrivances in their self-presentations to the City and State.³³

The Bourgeois Core of the “Sans-culotterie.”

“Any attempt to fix a rigid system of classification upon an essentially fluid social order is arbitrary.” Soboul acknowledged this fact in part II, p. 441. But he then proceeded, mostly from the F7 dossiers and administrative records, to employ a rigid and arbitrary classification in his statistical descriptions of assembly officers and civil and revolutionary commissioners (the majority of “sans-culotte” officials) and in characterizing individual militants throughout parts I and III.

Soboul socially inventoried 454 revolutionary commissioners of the Year II (pp. 444-46): 45.3 percent were artisans, whom he enumerated by trades (weavers, shoemakers, tanners, cabinetmakers, tailors, stonemasons, etc.); 18.5 percent were tradesmen or merchants; 10.5 percent were of the liberal professions (including clerical employees); 9.9 percent were actual or former domestic servants or wage laborers (including journeymen); only 2.8 percent were manufacturers, entrepreneurs or employing masters. I have inventoried some 550 revolutionary commissioners: about 45 percent were in sectors of production; a near-majority of these were manufacturers, entrepreneurs and employing masters, as revealed in the F30 dossiers and other socio-economic documents. Civil commissioners – sixteen per section and who were not salaried until April, 1794 – were a politically and administratively very important force that Soboul dismissed as being of minor significance in the Year II. He socially inventoried 343 of them as follows: 34.9 percent were artisans; 23.6 percent were tradesmen or merchants; 22.8 percent were retired artisans or shopkeepers (described as a “category of small rentiers” or “these small pensioners, these modest rentiers”); 12.2 percent were of the liberal professions; a miniscule 2.3 percent were active manufacturers, entrepreneurs, or employing masters (pp. 442-44). In reality, the proportion of substantial “patrons” of enterprise was very high among the civil commissioners of 1793-Year II, approaching 65 percent within sectors of production and commerce. Many of them were indeed retired in the Year II, having consigned management of their enterprises to younger brothers, sons, or sons-in-law. They were often “sans-culotte” patriarchs, possessed of considerable social and moral power. Bonds and authorities of family were fundamental within communities and economies of late eighteenth century Paris. For this reason alone, neither civil commissioners nor many of the revolutionary commissioners should be perceived as a statistical collection of discrete individuals, as did Soboul.

Throughout *Les sans-culottes parisiens*, Soboul ascribed economic class to simple trade denominations. This cannot be done, unless one wishes to soar into altitudes of non-meaning in social history of the eighteenth century. “Tailor” could mean Guillaume Tesseyre, a revolutionary commissioner of the Louvre section who worked with his wife and doubled, to make ends meet, as “portier-concièrge” of his building on the rue des Prêtres Saint-Germain.³⁴ It could mean Jean Léchenard, frequent president of the Bon-Conseil section in 1793-Year II and a deputy to the Commune, who owned a garment factory employing some forty workers.³⁵ “Shoemaker” could mean a journeyman at three “livres” *per diem*.³⁶ It could also mean Philippe Saunier, civil commissioner of the Graviilliers section and owner of a factory employing twenty shoemakers.³⁷ “Carpenter” could mean a journeyman at four “livres” *per diem*.³⁸ Or

it could mean Jean Devèze, a “sans-culotte” leader of the Faubourg-du-Roule section with an average work-force of twenty-seven in 1790-91.³⁹ “Limonadier” (drink-vendor) suggested a classic small trade of the street; this could indeed describe the “sans-culotte” Delamarre, with a hole-like estaminet in the “Halles.”⁴⁰ It could also describe the “sans-culotte” Pierre Chrétien, owner of a sumptuous and fashionable establishment — a large café with reading and smoking rooms — on the rue Neuve Saint-Marc (which in 1796 was a favorite open political rendezvous for members of the allegedly clandestine Conspiracy of the Equals).⁴¹

Soboul’s central social definition of the “sans-culotterie,” and the definition from which he attempted to explain sectionary politics in 1793-Year II, may be summarized as follows: the “sans-culotterie” was essentially a petty bourgeois coalition of small-scale master artisans, small-scale tradesmen, salaried employees and wage laborers. “Petty bourgeois” is the decisive, operative component of the definition.

We must affirm that the revolutionary vanguard of the Parisian “sans-culotterie” was not composed of a factory proletariat, but rather of a coalition of small masters and journeymen working and living with them. (p. 451)

Popular and sectionary societies were dominated by men of the artisan and shopkeeper petty bourgeoisie. . . (p. 644).

Artisans and shopkeepers formed the cadres of the “sans-culotterie” and exercised a decisive ideological influence over their journeymen and clerks. (p. 469)

In sequel to *Les sans-culottes parisiens*, George Rudé, Kare Tønnesson, Gwyn A. Williams, R.B. Rose, and the authors of dozens of general histories of the Revolution have loyally concurred in describing the “sans-culotterie” as essentially petty bourgeois. So great has been Soboul’s authority in this regard that explicitly anti-Marxian historians such as François Furet and Guy Chaussinand-Nogaret have likewise accepted this definition.⁴²

“Petty bourgeois:” Soboul used this notion causally, to explain the social politics of the “sans-culotterie:” its attacks on large-scale propertied enterprises and “capitalist” wealth in general; its advocacy of state regulation of commodity prices and subsistence provisioning, public assistance for the indigent, graduated taxation, and state-enforced limits on private ownership of real property. Soboul insisted that the “sans-culotterie” was consciously threatened by “great capitalist concentration,” both commercial and industrial.

Because the “sans-culottes” produced their goods for immediate markets, they believed that ownership of property should be based upon personal labor, and their ideal society was a society of small owners, each man possessing his own field, his own workshop, or his own store. . . The economic structure based upon small independent producers favored the parcelling of land and the scattering of property: it excluded social cooperation and concentration of the means of production. (p. 503)

The triumph of the “sans-culotterie” during the summer of 1793 led to the organization of the Terror, which completed the destruction of the old social order. The upper bourgeoisie of the Old Regime, based on commercial capital and attached, in certain ways, to the old social and political order of the feudal aristocracy, was not spared. In the Year II, the artisan and shopkeeper “sans-culotterie,” its leading members recruited from among small independent producers (a fact proven by analysis of the Parisian revolutionary committees), formed the most effective weapon in the struggle to destroy outmoded forms of production and the social relations founded upon them. Thermidor was, in fact, the signal for an economic as well as a political reaction; for by that time, the Terror had cleared the way for the introduction of new relationships of production. In the capitalist society born of the Revolution, industry was destined to dominate commerce: commercial capital, against which the “sans-culotterie” had fought so bitterly in the Year II, would no longer have an independent existence; henceforth, it would be

subordinated to the sole productive form of capital — industrial capital. As for the “sans-culottes” themselves, economic evolution would divide their ranks. Among the small and middling producer-merchants who had provided cadres for the popular movement in 1793-94, some would succeed and become industrial capitalists, others would be eliminated to swell the ranks of wage laborers. (pp. 1034-35)

Were these indeed their personal destinies? Soboul ventured the above affirmations; the work is not an economic study of Paris, nor did he research the family and business histories of ex“sans-culottes” and their progeny in the nineteenth century metropolis. As these passages disclose, *Les sans-culottes parisiens* was shaped by teleological reasoning. The teleology, and its *non sequiturs*, may be summarized as follows. In Revolutionary Paris, the scale of employment and production by master artisans was small by nineteenth and twentieth century industrial standards, and by those of embryonic and dispersed “grandes manufactures” at the close of the Old Regime. Therefore, the aggregate of these artisan producers must be defined as “petty bourgeois.” They were doomed, by inexorable dialectics of economic development, to be supplanted by industrial concentration in the nineteenth century; their political economy was therefore defensive-aggressive and rearguard.

Soboul’s definition of master artisans within Parisian society and the “sans-culotterie” derived from his conception of the French economy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. That conception has been negated by recent economic research.⁴³ Teleological, Soboul’s perspective on artisan production in later eighteenth century Paris was also anachronistic.

Let us gauge the concept “petty bourgeois” for its validity in describing Parisian artisan enterprises of the Revolutionary era. Let us do so empirically — outside sterile academic theorizing about economic class — by examining the social composition of a civil committee (Faubourg-Montmartre section) and a revolutionary committee (Gravilliers section) during the Year II, and from within the productive economies of their respective “quarters.”

Of the fifteen civil commissioners in service in the Faubourg-Montmartre section at the end of the Year II (table I), eight were active in production (and the three rentiers may have been retired artisans). One, Pierre Lancelin, was a token and co-opted proletarian who was also invested with the dangerous office of hoarding commissioner. Five were heads of enterprise: Godefert, with 24 workers; Presle, with 22; Massonet, with 20; Menagé, with 10; and Lecoœur, with 9. Within the scales of enterprise in the section (table II) these five were at median or higher ranges of employing capital. They were solidly implanted bourgeois. Within the general social structure of the “quartier,” they were an economic aristocracy.

In the Year II, the population of the section was 10,104, of whom 1,567 (15.5 percent) were officially indigent and subsisting on public relief. In 1791, there were only 687 citizens qualified and registered to vote in the section, only 687 resident adult males paying the very modest tax of the censitary regime. Even retaining the figure of 10,104 as total population (for the City’s resident population declined considerably between 1791 and 1794), this was one of the lowest percentages of voters within total population among all Paris sections. These are statistics of poverty. Eighty-one heads of enterprise in 1790-92 employed at wage approximately 1,200 workers (most of whom lived in the section); this figure must be juxtaposed to the 1,567 indigent. These are statistics of power.

This region was fully incorporated with Paris only in 1787-88 by the new customs wall and integrated with the metropolis only during the Revolution. During the last quarter of the century, there were two Faubourgs-Montmartre tensely co-existing within this space. One was semirural with farms, pastures and stock pens, traversed by the

Table 1
CIVIL COMMISSIONERS OF THE FAUBOURG-MONTMARTRE SECTION, YEAR II

1 = name; 2 = age in 1793; 3 = trade or profession (average number of workers in 1790-92); 4 = birthplace; 5 = years of residence in the section; 6 = date of election to the committee; 7 = previous or concurrent section offices.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J.-B. Bien-Aimé	54	master jeweler	Dieppe (Seine-Inférieure)	10	1794	welfare commissioner
J.-B. Chalamel	40	wholesale merchant	Brignières (Rhône-et-Loire)	5	1793	welfare commissioner
J.-B. Godefert	50	master sawyer (24)	Bure (Aube)	31	1789	
I.-J. Huméry	48	tailor	Orléans (Loiret)	8	1794	
M.-F. Humet	44	retired haberdashery merchant	Paris	12	1789	
P. Lancelin	33	day laborer	Evreux (Eure)	3	1794	hoarding commissioner
J.-L. Landrin	64	rentier	Paris	44	1791	welfare commissioner
L.-D. Lecamus	79	retired architect	Paris	40	1792	
M. Lecoeur	56	master wheelwright (9)	Argentan (Orne)	30	1789	
P. Massonet	31	paper manufacturer (20)	Remiremont (Vosges)	5	1794	company captain
N.-R. Menagé	45	master building painter (10)	Bernay (Eure)	4	1793	welfare commissioner
C.-G. Naudin	53	rentier	Beaumont	5	1794	
C.-J. Presse	70	master building painter (22)	Paris	20	1790	welfare commissioner
C. Sandras	34	restauranteur	Paris	5	1794	
P.-J. Saulnier	52	rentier	Paris	52	1790	

SOURCE: A.N. F1b II Seine, 18.

Table II
**HIERARCHIES OF PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT IN THE
 "FAUBOURG MONTMARTRE," 1790-92**

(The rubriques 1-4, etc. contain the number of employers whose average work-forces in 1790-92 were with those ranges.)

	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-24	25-39	40-59	60-79	80-99	100+
<i>general building trades:</i> (joiners, carpenters, metal-crafters and forgers, locksmiths, roofer, pavers, stone-masons, landscapers, window-makers, wheelwrights, plumbers and coppersmiths)	12	16	16	9	7	3	1		1
<i>Luxury artisanate:</i> (painter-gilders, saddle and carriage makers, sculptors, fancy-turners, glazier-varnishers)	1	2	7	3					
<i>paper manufacturing:</i>				1					
<i>haulage and transport:</i>		1							
<i>fabric manufacturing:</i>								1	81
									TOTAL

Source: A.N. F30 138.

northern sewer and its effluvia, morally conditioned by proximity to the notorious “guingettes” of the Porcherons, the Petite Pologne, and La Nouvelle France, intensely plebeian and poverty-stricken. The other Faubourg-Montmartre was a zone of real estate speculation and building construction, a prime zone of new “hôtels” and residential edifices for the wealthy of the inner City who were evacuating from the spatial constrictions and social promiscuities of the “vieux quartiers.” Slowed by the general economic contraction of 1789-95, this conquest of the Faubourg through investment and construction was resumed and accelerated by parvenus of the Directory, Consulate and Empire. For the building contractors and master craftsmen who financially survived the hard years of the mid-1790s, this was a paradisiacal region at the end of the eighteenth century and across most of the nineteenth. They were agents and profiteers of the “quartier’s” transformation. They could select, at minimal wage, from a massive labor reserve, most of it concentrated in the scabrous enclave of the Boule-Rouge, a warren of old buildings and alley-ways between the rue Montyon and the rue du Faubourg-Montmartre. Within their socio-economic environment, these “maîtres” were no “petty bourgeoisie.”⁴⁴

By size and population (24,774 at the end of 1794), the Gravilliers was the dominant section within the principal manufacturing zone of late eighteenth century Paris: the center of the Right Bank, from the Ramparts to the River along the axes of the rues Saint-Denis, Saint-Martin and Temple-Sainte-Avoye. It contained the highest number of “patrons” of production, 368 (table III), of any section. More than 5000 workers, from skilled journeymen to a majority of wage or piece-rate laborers, lived in this space; the 368 “patrons” directly employed almost 4000 of them (table III). In the most “industrial” zone of late eighteenth century Paris only twenty-four “patrons” among 368 employed more than forty salaried workers, and only five employed more than one hundred; this included even the comparatively labor-intensive sectors of textile and garment production. Many artisan enterprises of the Gravilliers section combined several skills and commonly enjoyed the versatility of triple markets: direct production for clients at retail; specialized work on commission for contractors; and production for sale to wholesale merchants and merchandizing or export of the commodities by them. Family capital and labor were often conjoined, as exemplified by the Scharf brothers. During the 1760s and 1770s, the three of them had immigrated to the Gravilliers *en echelon* from the village of Metzereche (Moselle). By 1791, they were master carpenters or joiners in the rue Phélippeaux and the carré Saint-Martin. Their combined labor forces totalled thirty, within the highest five percent on the scale of the building trades, and they themselves worked.⁴⁵ These enterprises were tenacious; relatively few of them appear in bankruptcy proceedings from the Directory through the Empire.⁴⁶

The passage from the first revolutionary committee to the second, in October 1793, meant enhanced representation of the “quartier’s” central socio-economic elite, masters of production, and an enhanced presence of heads of enterprise among them (table IV). Eleven of the fourteen commissioners who served during the Year II – commissioners elected to enforce the Law of Suspects and the Terror – were producers of commodities; six were wage-paying “patrons” and at median or higher levels on the scales of enterprise of their trades (tables III-IV). As producers and often as purchasers of real property or consumers of durable goods (as with the previously cited “moblier” of F.-P. Beaudouin), these men were solid bourgeois within the social hierarchies of the Gravilliers. They certainly wore the tricolor “cocarde” and they probably wore the red Phrygian cap while on duty. But one may doubt that Beaudouin, Cruzy, Lachaussée and their colleagues habitually donned wooden clogs and rough cut baggy trousers or trailed a pike.

Table III
HIERARCHIES OF PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT IN THE
“GRAVILLIERS” SECTION, 1790-92

(The rubriques 1-4, etc., contain the number of employers whose average work-forces in 1790-92 were within those ranges; the percentage under each number, reading across, is of the total number of employers within that sector of production; the percentages at the bottom of the table are of the number of employers by each rubric within the total of 368.)

	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-24	25-39	40-59	60-79	80-99	100+	Total
<i>general building trades:</i>	28 19.7%	56 39.4%	31 21.8%	16 11.2%	6 4.2%	5 3.9%	0	0	0	(142)
<i>luxury crafts:</i>	38 27.3%	51 36.6%	23 16.5%	17 12.2%	7 5%	1 .7%	2 1.4%	0	0	(139)
<i>garment, fabric and accessories:</i>	4 5.5%	19 26.3%	14 19.4%	14 19.4%	9 12.5%	5 6.9%	1 1.3%	3 4.1%	3 4.1%	(72)
<i>other:</i>		4 26.6%	1 6.6%	2 13.3%	4 26.6%	1 6.6%	0	1 6.6%	2 13.3%	(15)
Totals:	70 19.2%	130 35.3%	69 18.7%	49 13.3%	26 7%	12 3.2%	3 0.8%	4 1%	5 1.3%	368

Source: A. N. F30 133, 134, 135.

Table IV
REVOLUTIONARY COMMISSIONERS OF THE GRVILLIERS SECTION, 1793-YEAR II

1 = name; 2 = age in 1793; 3 = trade or profession (average number of workers in 1790-92); 4 = birthplace; 5 = year of immigration to Paris (age at arrival); 6 = previous section offices (concurrent offices).

1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>First Committee (April-September 1793)</i>					
Beurlier					
Butot		government clerk			
J.-B. David		master jewel cutter			
L. Derouvrouis	53	smelter-caster	Paris		
P. Egasse	40	wine merchant	Berchères (Eure-et-Loire)	1766 (13)	elector, deputy Insurrectionary Commune
J.-C. Lambert	33	gauze-maker	Tours		
G.-P. Leblanc	45	former govt. clerk	(Indre-et-Loire)		
P. Mermillod	34	master fancy-turner (72)	Someille (Meuse)	1789 (41)	
A. Peillon		clerk in municipality	Villars (Jura)	1782 (23)	treasurer of the section assessor
N. Petillon	49	public writer	Provins (Seine-et-Marne)	1782 (38)	
N. Petit	35	fan and parasol maker (2)	Paris		elector
G. Truchon	49	barrister	Vincelles (Yonne)	1759 (15)	elector, deputy Insurrectionary Commune

Second Committee (Year II)					
P.-F. Aubin	42	sculptor			elector
C. Barbot	50	haberdashery merchant	Paris		civil commissioner
F.-P. Beaudoin		master decorative painter	(6)		(concurrent)
T. Boursault	47	schoolmaster	Brie-sur-Marne (Marne)	1763 (17)	assessor to justice of the peace
J.-M. Bruyas	40	silk-weaver	Lyons (Rhône-et-Loire)	1782 (29)	
J.-B. Cazenave	34	surgeon-apothecary	Lus (Haute-Pyrénées)	1779 (21)	
J. Cruzy	38	master fabric painter	Lyons (Rhône-et-Loire)	1773 (18)	
J.-B. Duhamel		fanmaker			elector
P.-M. Dusaussais	52	paper manufacturer	Paris		elector
J. Épillet	37	master metal-carver and chaser	Paris		elector
J.-C. Haguier		master fancy-turner	(6)		
P. Houdemard	43	master scabbard maker	Paris		
Lachaussée		master enameller	(15)		
E. Planson	34	master jeweler	(5)	1770 (11)	
			Le Puy (Haute-Saône)		

Source: A. N., F7* 2486, register of the revolutionary committee, 1793-Year II; Archives départementales de la Seine, 3 AZ 260; A. N., F7 4795, register of *cartes de sûreté*; F30 133, 134, 135; individual dossiers of F7; and a variety of other sources.

Let us examine this committee more closely. It was restaffed by the general assembly of the section in late September and early October 1793, as were most revolutionary committees. Contrary to Soboul's general schema (pp. 177-241) this was no "regeneration" of authority by the "popular masses" of the section. The incumbent members of the first committee were not purged: they were replaced by a sophisticated process of voluntary withdrawal and co-optation; this process was controlled by the enduring "sans-culotte" elite of the general assembly and the Société populaire de la rue du Vert-Bois (of which most commissioners of the first and second committees were members). In the words of the committee's register, the incumbents were replaced "some for reasons of weakness" (reluctance or unsuitability to execute the hard mandates of the Law of Suspects), and others "because they had to choose between this and other [salaried] offices." Most of the replaced commissioners either moved laterally into other sectionary or Municipal offices or upward into government positions.⁴⁷ The new commissioners, armed with the legislation of the Terror, were chosen to preserve both "sans-culotte" rule and the bourgeois integrity of the "quartier." They became revolutionary commissioners of the Year II by choice, militancy, and, one suspects for the "patrons" among them, because of their socio-professional status.

The Gravilliers section harbored a large, volatile mass of plebeians. As the "cartes de sûreté" reveal, the majority of them were raw provincial immigrants, illiterate and transient within the City and its labor markets. Here, and throughout Paris, one of the primary tasks of revolutionary commissioners was policing, disciplining, and regimenting this mass. This task required men of robust physical and emotional constitution. And it required knowledge of the plebeian classes, a knowledge possessed in pre-eminence by master artisans.

The social power of master artisans — in the Faubourg-Montmartre, Gravilliers and Pont-Neuf sections and throughout most of Paris — was the power to command labor. They had no serious rivals for this power. Manufacturers and merchants whose workforces exceeded one hundred, and who were mostly isolated and fragile summits of success within the artisanate, were few and dispersed. To characterize master artisans as petty bourgeois is to misapprehend both the meaning of bourgeois and the realities of political economy in the Revolutionary metropolis. These men and their families were the dynamic, expanding core of the Parisian bourgeoisie. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries a probable majority of the professionally lettered and governing classes of urban France emerged, at removes of one to three generations, from families of the master-merchant artisanate.⁴⁸

Bourgeois: in late eighteenth century Paris that reality embraced not only capital and command of labor. It signified additional exclusivities and potencies: literacy, skills in recording and administering; abilities to establish and enforce rules of conduct, to punish. These were also potencies of the Parisian master artisanate. Here again, one must avoid anachronistic conceptions of social class, for these artisan bourgeois did not have the characteristics of a modern urban bourgeoisie, notably one remote from labor and relatively insulated from violence, narrowly specialized within professions or enclosed in managerial satrapies, acting politically only through intermediaries, and almost obsessed with economic security, private life, and consumption. Nor did they share the attributes of the mercantile, rentier and stipendiary bourgeoisie of Old Regime Paris. They were virile, physically, socially and politically. They ventured both skills and capital, assumed governing responsibilities in sections, the Municipality, and the administration of the Terror, and frequently gave themselves or their sons and brothers to the blood-drenched battlefields of the Republic, from the Vendée to the Midi, the Alps, the Rhine and Flanders.

Within this sensuous and experiential context, let us further explore the concept

of “sans-culotte,” by posing the following problem: were there congruences between the predominantly bourgeois composition of the “sans-culotte” cadre, the manifest self-consciousness of the “sans-culotterie,” and its combative ideology?

The “Sans-culotterie:” Self-Consciousness and Ideology

What was a “sans-culotte?” An insolent and subversive question during the Year II, it remains one of the most perplexing for modern historians of the Revolution. In language and fact, “sans-culotte” was invented in Paris.⁴⁹ Its primary reference was to social appearance: the trousers of the laboring classes as against the tight breeches (“culottes”) of the affluent. From 1792, revolutionary publicists and leaders continually adjusted its meaning for propaganda — self-presentations, mobilizations, exclusions and repressions. Soboul gave a plurality of contemporary definitions of “sans-culotte” — moral, political and social — both positive and negative by oppositions (pp. 408-33). He concluded the following: the “sans-culotterie” did not, and could not, possess a central social self-definition, much less a “class consciousness;” the only positive general element of its social ideology was consumerism — “les subsistances,” or the demand for state provisioning of vital commodities at controlled prices.

The ‘sans-culotterie’ asserted its identity only by opposition to aristocracy, wealth and commerce: these antagonisms reflected both the vagueness of social frontiers within the old Third Estate and the impossibility of defining the ‘sans-culotterie’ as a social class. It differentiated itself only by reference to the aristocracy. As a coalition of disparate social groups, it was undermined by internal contradictions. (p. 427)

The ‘sans-culottes’ were, however, not genuinely class conscious. Divided into different social categories, sometimes with conflicting aims, it was impossible for them to constitute a class; their unity was only negative. . . . According to popular mentality, a ‘sans-culotte’ could not be defined by social characteristics alone: a counter-revolutionary worker could not be a genuine ‘sans-culotte;’ a patriotic and republican bourgeois was readily accepted as one. The social definition is rendered precise by a political definition; one cannot exist without the other. (p. 431)

Price-controls on basic commodities were demanded with all the more insistence by the militants because they were subjected to pressure in their own sections, not only from wage-earners, but also from the thousands of destitute Parisians, tormented by hunger. Hunger — an essential factor of all popular movements — was the cement which held together the artisan, the shopkeeper, and the workman. . . . (p. 454)

The connotations of “sans-culotte” were indeed moral and political, for they signified patriotic and republican behavior (much of it speech-actions). “Subsistances” were indeed a consensual demand in the politics of the “sans-culotterie.” But contrary to Soboul’s affirmations, “sans-culotte” did possess a central social meaning. Across the spectrum of definitions in 1792-94, one meaning traversed most attributes and uses: the “sans-culotte” performed useful, productive labor — economic, civic, or intellectual.⁵⁰ Through social and political necessities in Jacobin Paris, the “sans-culotte” as worker-fabricator was often described as “poor;” this usually meant someone living honestly at subsistence levels from wageearning, and this was Soboul’s favored description. But the axial social meaning was productive utility, not economic class. Masters and entrepreneurs of commodity production; inventors of techniques; administrative servants of the Republican state; purveyors of civically useful ideas, discourse and knowledge: they also belonged to this axial meaning.⁵¹ The opposites of this meaning of “sans-culotte” were less social classes of wealth, than social existences of usury, parasitism, or indolence. “Aristocratie” and “gueuserie” (mendicancy, vagabondage and pilferage) defined those existences.

This definition of “sans-culotte” was essentially bourgeois, by its supreme valuation of productivity and its articulation (the authorship of most documents). It was mandated

to embrace plebeians — but as workers, not as a migratory begging, scavenging and hustling populace. For the majority of plebeians, labor at wage or piece-rate was occasional and a miserable, attritional necessity that enabled consumption and pleasures; many of them regarded it as an incarceration. They did not define their own worth in this exclusive manner. Nor did traditional elites of wealth (noble, clerical or bourgeois) who were predominantly concerned with honors and display, refinements of titles and possessions. “Sans-culotte” as producer encompassed, in valuation, virtually all groups of the Parisian bourgeoisie that fabricated commodities of general utility and adjunctively merchandized them. As with the abstract universalism of democratic citizenship, the definition erased, in ideology, the socially necessary but politically dangerous boundaries between masters who purchased and supervised labor and workers who sold their labor. Common language of the eighteenth century and much of the nineteenth conveyed an analogously wide social and ideological prehension in the notion of “industry:”

‘Industry:’ this word means two things; either simple manual labor, or inventions of intellect in the form of machines useful to the arts and trades; ‘industry’ comprises sometimes one, sometimes the other of these two things, and often combines the two. It stands for the cultivation of the land, manufacturing, and crafts; it animates all vital activities and propagates abundance and life everywhere. . . .⁵²

As producer of social utility, one could be “sans-culotte.” Active allegiance or service to populist republicanism were required to realize that potential. “Sans-culotte” also comported choice: this reality was confirmed by the large presence of the economically successful and even affluent, including numerous “grands patrons” of production, among the leadership of the “sans-culotterie.” One could “sans-culotiser.” A crafted and malleable term, in Jacobin Paris “sans-culotte” was intended to have those functional meanings.

Anyone useless to society is detrimental to it. Each individual should contribute to public prosperity by the means with which nature has endowed him. Work is a social duty, and society therefore must exact the performance of that duty. (La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt in the Constituent Assembly, May, 1790, *Réimpression de l’Ancien Moniteur*, IV, 497-98).

The most common source of crime is need; and need is the child of idleness. The system of penalties [in the criminal law] therefore must be based principally on labor. (“Rapport sur le projet du Code Pénal” May, 1791, in *Oeuvres de Michel Lepeletier Saint-Fargeau*, Brussels, 1826, p. 105).

Strength, dexterity and industriousness are the ‘natural property’ of human beings; they form the true natural basis for civil society. . . . The first purpose of civil society should be the perfecting of industry. (François Chabot, “Discours. . . sur les finances de la République,” Paris, 1793, pp. 10-11. *Brit. Mus. F. 184 21*).

Today, the problem of the general welfare may be expressed as follows: Everyone must work and respect themselves and each other. (Louis-Antoine Saint-Just, *Fragments sur les institutions républicaines*, ed. R. Mandrou, Paris, 1963, p. 150)

Anyone henceforth convicted [by the Revolutionary Tribunal] of publicly complaining about the Revolution who lives in idleness, [“vivait sans rien faire”] and is neither aged over seventy nor invalid, will be departed to Guyana. (Article XV, Law of 26 germinal Year II, *Moniteur*, XX, 225).

Nature has imposed on everyone the obligation to work. To refuse that obligation is a crime. (Gracchus Babeuf, Article III, “Analyse de la Doctrine de Babeuf. . .,” Paris, 1796, A.N. W3 563).

From La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt of the first revolutionary generation to Gracchus Babeuf, of the last, there was continuity in the social and civic imperative of productive work. This imperative was a central tenet of Jacobin ideology and political economy in 1793-Year II, for productivity was crucial to a program of both economic development

and distributive social justice in a non-mechanical civilization whose resources were human and animal energy. The Jacobin State, with which the Parisian “sans-culotterie” was thoroughly imbricated, began a legislative redefining of “citizen” as producer by use of the criminal sanction, among several instrumentalities. In Jacobin polity, productive utility distinguished a “sans-culotte” (or a citizen) from an “aristocrat;” it also distinguished him from vagabonds, “gens sans aveux,” and “gueux” — the other outlawed pariahs of Republican France, tens of thousands of whom swarmed in Paris.

The root definition of “sans-culotte” as producer was, in Montagnard legislation and “sans-culotte” politics, a double-edged blade that was swung both upwards and downwards in the social stratification of Paris. Soboul described only upward cuts of that blade, although he did not track them across the incidence of Terror. He neglected to discuss, perhaps for ideological reasons, the massive and consequential downward cuts into the plebeian classes.⁵³

This definition isolated for coercion or repression the indolent of unearned income or inherited wealth (if they did not devote full personal labors to the Republic): nobles; monastic clergy; rentiers; financiers; wholesale merchants; speculators; and former magistrates of the Old Regime who had accumulated capital from offices. These classically usurious and sumptuary groups had formed a dominant portion of the governing elite of Old Regime Paris, and a large segment of the censitary oligarchy of 1789-92. Their municipal power was broken through the insurrection of 10 August, 1792. But in 1793 they, with social dependents and allies, formed a substantial proportion of the local adversaries to Jacobins and “sans-culottes” until the Terror mandated by the National Convention in the Law of Suspects of 17 September, 1793.

Contrary to Soboul’s insistence, the sectionary ascendancy of the “sans-culotterie” in 1793-94 was not a radical social devolution of power. It was largely a displacement of power from non-producing bourgeois to masters of production and their allies of intellectual and administrative labor. The beginnings of the displacement were not in mid-1793, as Soboul asserted, but in August-September, 1792. (*Les sans-culottes parisiens* commenced abruptly, with no “pre-history,” in June, 1793 when the “sans-culotterie” already controlled most sections). Between 1789 and 1795, the most extensive social mutation of power occurred during the late summer of 1792, in the immediate passage from Monarchy to Republic. It can be measured in the composition of the electoral corps, the General Council of the Commune, and major sectionary offices.⁵⁴ There was no further systematic change in the social character of local authority until the spring of 1795.

Jeremiads against the rich emanated from the “sans-culotterie” of all sections in 1793-94. Soboul described them at length, as expressions of class warfare (pp. 412-33, 457-91). Examination of their substance, contexts and authorship suggests more precise meanings. Many jeremiads were threatening exhortations, summoning the wealthy to contribute to sectionary democracy, to cease abstention or opposition. The following three were archetypical of the genre:

... Tear down the huge barrier that mis-conceived pride and disastrous arrogance have caused you to erect between yourselves and the people, that people which I have heard you insult a thousand times and whose wisdom you have never dared to trust, that people whose happiness lies in its virtue, its energy, and its disdain for those artificial pleasures and possessions that have become indispensable needs for you... Welcome the people frankly into the midst of your assemblies; you have more education, but it has more sensibility; never use you learning to deceive the people, and it will use its strength to defend you... but never attempt to subjugate it!⁵⁵

Traucherous abstentionists, cold and cowardly men! It is to you that I am speaking and for the last time... Listen well! Never, no, never will the insolent opulence that you parade before the gaze of the indigent destroy the equality that is our unity and force...

Renounce your projects of counter-revolution and all hope of defeating us; recognize your errors and our superiority of character; come to our assemblies, as we have fraternally invited you to do. . . Choose! Either the hope of regaining our friendship, or our most implacable hatred!⁵⁶

Rich detractors of the Revolution, who complain of the burdens it imposes on you, what have you done for the Revolution? You have given a few 'assignats,' [paper money] while the impeccable patriot gives himself to the service of the Nation, with a fervor beyond praise. . . Of the two of you, who had done the most for the Republic? It is certain that you are the least inclined to support in good faith the costs of a sublime Revolution undertaken for the glory of enlightenment and of humanity.⁵⁷

These were admonitions to reform, not declarations of annihilatory intent. And they carried strong echoes of Jansenist Catholicism. The context for most of these threatening pressures on the wealthy was expressed by the spokesman for the Poissonnière section's battalion of volunteers for the Vendée, at the Convention on 20 March, 1793: "Now, let the comfortable and egotistical rich for whom we are marching open their purses!"⁵⁸ From February to November, 1793 the Paris sections had to finance directly the recruiting and equipping of most of their quota contingents for the armies.⁵⁹ This burden coincided with the intense crisis of provisioning in foodstuffs ("substances") out of which the "sans-culotterie" finally obtained the General Maximum on Prices and Wages of 29 September, 1793. By these necessities of Republican defense, the latent hostilities of bourgeois of work and their allies of labor toward rivals of unearned, speculative or superfluous income were released and given ideological formulation. Excoriation of the rich and adulation of the poor came simultaneously from the Jacobin summit in 1793-94. The unanimity was not accidental. Jacobinism, not hunger, provided the ideological cement of the "sans-culotterie," and virtually every section of the City had members of the Jacobin Club among its "sans-culotte" cadre.

In the language of "sans-culotte" leaders, "rich" was usually accompanied by the denoting adjectives "opulent," "lazy," "greedy," "egotistical," or "blood-sucking." "Mercantile aristocracy" and "capitalist" were also common epithets in 1793-94. Neither retail merchants who sold at honest or regulated price nor masters of production were intended for embrace by this language; its targets were manipulators of mercantile capital, speculators who presumably controlled surreptitiously the flow of money and vital commodities. Images of usury, luxury, parasitism and counter-revolution were fused in these stigmata. By this language, Revolutionary bourgeois of work allied with a citizenry of labor violently repudiated Old Regime plutocracy and an emerging class of speculators in national properties, currency, and the grain trade. The repudiation was tempered: by renouncing usury and luxury, by sacrifice and service, these persons could join the Republic. The social egalitarianism of that Republic was also tempered: "In a Republic of brothers, no one enjoys superfluity until all virtuous and industrious citizens possess the necessities of life."⁶⁰ Wealth was tainted, but affluence was not intrinsically anathema. It became anathema if it was unearned by work, hoarded, consumed in narcissistic display, or used to multiply itself outside circuits of production. These distinctions within "sans-culotte" ideology were also integuments of a new political economy.

The hostility of the 'sans-culotterie' toward large landowners was only an emphatic manifestation of its instinctive opposition to the rich. . . This instinctive reaction of the most humble ['sans-culottes'] became a systematic attitude among the most aware and a rule of political conduct (pp. 416, 418).

Here, Soboul distorted both the content and provenance of the "sans-culotterie's" social politics. Several militants whom he cited as direct voices of this "instinctive opposition" were, in fact, prescient bourgeois leaders. J.-E.-A. Lebrun, justice of the

peace and frequent assembly president of the Croix-Rouge section, was accused of having “aroused uneducated citizens against the rich, merchants, and respectable, enlightened men.” Lebrun was an elderly master-merchant rugmaker with some ten workers in his atelier; the son of a rugmaker, he had lived in the Faubourg Saint-Germain for over forty years and held important district and sectionary offices since 1789.⁶¹ Pierre-Henri Blandin, successively justice of the peace of the Lombards section, deputy to the Commune of 1793, and Vice-President of the Criminal Tribunal of Paris in the Year II, allegedly “flattered . . . the class that he called the ‘sans-culottes,’ by his speeches and insulting comparisons with the wealthy.” He owned a retail and wholesale business in oils and spices, and had been an elector since 1790.⁶² Balthazard-Marie Laugier, justice of the peace of the Fontaine-de-Grenelle section in 1793, was accused of sustained verbal attacks on the rich and of proposing the confiscation of rentier, banker, and financier properties. A young former secretary to a noble family of the Faubourg Saint-Germain, he moved through sectionary offices and Jacobin militancy to concurrent directorships in the Subsistence Commission of Paris and the Commission of Agriculture and Trades in the Year II.⁶³ Antoine Marlée, police commissioner of the Faubourg de Bondy section and president of its general assembly at the time of the previously cited “*Dernier mot aux insoucians*,” also thundered against the rich as “egotists” and “counter-revolutionaries.” He was a young stone sculptor and active citizen in 1789-92.⁶⁴

The attacks on monetary and landed riches by these men and their counterparts within the “sans-culotte” elite throughout the City formed part of a general strategy of popular mobilization and social control. In the terribly astringent Parisian war economy of 1792-94, sumptuary wealth was both parasitical and corrosive of republican community. Only major sacrifices among the possessing classes could guard the institution of property itself from plebeian rage.

Sectionary leaders of the “sans-culotterie” did not suffer from hunger in 1793. The mass of their constituents did, and almost obsessively. For Albert Soboul, Kare Tönnesson, George Rudé and Richard Cobb, the issue of “subsistances” – or statist provisioning of the metropolis in adequate quantities of vital foodstuffs at regulated and tolerable prices – was the most galvanic and radical component of the “sans-culotte” program. In fact, it was one of the most conserving of urban manufacturing interests and urban bourgeois power.

The General Maximum on Prices and Wages of 29 September, 1793, by which the State guaranteed the provisioning of Paris at regulated prices, was crucial to domination and mobilization of the plebeian City by “sans-culotte” and Jacobin bourgeois. The Maximum, and the great auxiliary laws against hoarding and currency speculation, were benefactions for plebeians and simultaneously Parisian master artisans, manufacturers, retail tradesmen, and the bulk of urban property owners. Those laws deflected popular animosities from these latter groups to rural proprietors – farmers, shippers, and grain merchants. Price stabilization undercut wage agitations and meant fewer, and more easily repressed, strikes. “Assignats” – the paper money through which the Revolutionary State transformed itself into capital – were made the standard mode of wage payment and commodity purchase, as most Parisian employers had desired since 1790-91. In symmetry to the “assignats,” ration coupons for bread and meat strengthened bourgeois control of non-laboring plebeians; they were issued to the “deserving poor” by sectionary civil and welfare commissioners, thus obviating begging, scavenging, and “direct appropriations” of subsistence.

By imposing fixed-price requisitioning of foodstuffs and raw materials at their sources, the Jacobin State forced the provincial propertied classes to pay the social wage of the urban laboring classes, with the additional benefit to Parisian bourgeois

of exporting thousands of the City's more violent plebeians to do the hard work of requisitioning in the ranks of the Parisian Revolutionary Army. Those laws established an economic imperialism of manufacturing cities and towns – with Paris as capital of the imperium – over the provisioning countryside of France. And they rendered the metropolis vulnerable to savage provincial reaction in 1795-96.

The survival of the Republic in 1793-94 depended on the requisitioning of superfluous wealth and the regulation of trade. These measures were also stages in a larger Montagnard Jacobin project, a superbly daring and unrealized project shared by much of the “sans culotte” leadership – the divestiture of speculative landed, mercantile and finance capital, and a statist transformation of the French economy centered on expanded production and just distribution of vital commodities. Their project was the creation, from the disorder of war and civil strife, of a new polity and political economy founded on universal service and productivity. And this was a project of bourgeois.

Conclusion

In *Les sans-culottes parisiens*, Soboul discovered and charted from archives an immense, vitally important historical expanse – sectionary Paris of 1793-94. For one historian, alone, to have navigated that immensity was a heroic accomplishment. Subsequent exploration has been possible only because of his voyage. In the historiography of Revolutionary Paris, Albert Soboul was a Magellan.

But *Les sans-culottes parisiens* cannot be considered a social history of Revolutionary Paris, of sectionary and municipal power: the biographies of the protagonists were either not established or were presented tendentiously; the socio-economic strata and environments to which protagonists belonged and within which they acted were not reconstructed. It is equally difficult to credit this work as precursive to “historical ethnology” as Ernest Labrousse and others have done; the methods of ethnology are empirical.⁶⁵ Soboul's monumental work projected the ambition and a rhetoric of social history, but not its substance. This was a descriptive political history whose explanatory foundations are untenable.

In critically evaluating *Les sans-culottes parisiens*, this essay has concentrated on the predominantly bourgeois composition of the “sans-culotte” cadre, socially and ideologically, and on its most “valent” groups: master-merchants of production; professionals of discourse and administration (who accounted for 20 to 25 percent of sectionary officials in 1793-Year II). But static class identities cannot be ascribed to a large segment of the Revolutionary personnel of Paris.

Any class-bound social analysis of a political revolution is vulnerable to contradictions and reifications, for revolutions alter social structures, at least temporarily, and create new socio-economic roles. Numerous “sans-culotte” leaders were “déclassés” before and during the Revolution, a process often begun with immigration to the City. Late eighteenth century Paris was a metropolis of immigrants; 60 to 70 percent of its population in 1789 were of provincial origin.⁶⁶ Immigration was a salient phenomenon whose ramifications Soboul never examined. For both immigrants and native Parisiens within the “corps de métiers,” the passages from apprentice to journeyman to master were often changes of class identity (particularly if the aspirant was not of a craftmaster's family): the apprentice was a dependent proletarian; the journeyman a skilled proletarian; the craft-master could become an entrepreneurial bourgeois, but far less easily in the depressed Parisian economy of the Revolutionary years. Soboul reduced militancy to assumed class positions. In the concrete lives of protagonists, the reverse was more often the truth: through successful militancy and leadership, class positions could be preserved, strengthened, or created anew.

The Revolution both accelerated “déclassement” and created arenas and a bureaucratic

spoils system for the forging of a new class identities or the expanding of preexistent ones. This central process in Paris of the 1790s was treated by Soboul on two pages (1033-34) at the end of the work, only as a *post mortem* and lament on the demise of sectionary autonomies and the supposed “popular movement” in 1794.

The magnetism by which governance of the City and the State was regenerated had operated since 1789, and with accelerating force since the insurrection of August, 1792 and the foundation of the Republic. Relations between sectionary officials, Municipal elites, those of the “département,” and the Revolutionary State had been ladders of recruitment and ascension – by local militancy and prominence, municipal elections, triumphal “journées,” clientage and patronage at the Jacobin and Cordeliers Clubs, and comprehensive networks of “the politics of friendship.” By the Spring of 1793, these relationships stretched from the benches and committee rooms of the Convention, the entourages of proconsuls, and the executive divisions of the ministries (especially the vast Ministry of War) to revolutionary committees, justices of the peace, police commissioners, assembly officers, and batallion officers.⁶⁷ The power of this magnetism is visible in the careers of the electors of 1792-94, the deputies to the Insurrectionary Commune of 1792 and to the Commune of 1793-Year II. At the base of the Revolutionary metropolis, more than one-third of the some 160 men who served as justices of the peace or police commissioners in the sections between 10 August, 1792 and the purges in the spring of 1795 won some government employment or appointment (often a prestigious mission to “révolutionner” and “sans-culottiser” provincials); of some 550 revolutionary commissioners, a similar proportion received such benefices. (All revolutionary commissioners were appointed and salaried by the State after October, 1793). The relations between sectionary personnel and the Jacobin State were not, as Soboul insisted, antinomies of “popular movement” and “revolutionary government;” they were a complex and, during the Year II, increasingly frictional symbiosis.

For many of those who emerged to Parisian status and significant income in 1792-94 by avenues of sectionary leadership, the Revolution was, objectively, something of a last chance. The majority of “sans-culotte” leaders were well implanted socially in their “quartiers” at the advent of the Revolution. In 1792-94, they shared power with numerous other men, no longer exactly young, of ruptured careers or decayed trades and businesses (particularly in the debris of Old Regime bureaucracies and the luxury trades): redundant scribes, men of the law and “men of letters;” recent master artisans without capital to become or remain entrepreneurs; journeymen poised for mastership but unable to make the financial leap; and many immigrants possessed of education and skills but “déclassé” and “dégringoleur” (tumbling downward) – fugitives from the provinces (or sinister terrorist “marauders” to their thermidorian enemies), often once-bourgeois, ex-this and ex-that in Normandy, Anjou, Picardy, the Franche-Comté (among hundreds, one thinks here of Jacques Roux and Gracchus Babeuf), who strove ardently for metropolitan political office and thus social redemption. In the language of Soboul and in their own, they were collectively “militants devoted to the popular cause.” In my language, they had to be. To their action, the “sans-culotterie” owed much of its political creativity and suppleness.

The leaders of the “sans-culotterie” were not surface particles of a mass. Most of them were victors in fierce internecine sectionary competitions; for each winner, many other contestants had bitten the political and even social dust. By mid-1793, they formed a metropolitan elite, almost a collectivity of their own. That elite linked the forty-eight sections and bound them to the Municipality, the “département” and, by the crucial mediations of the Jacobin and Cordeliers clubs, to the Montagnards of the National Convention. More than any other force, the “sans-culotte” elite created and maintained

the Montagnard Jacobin hegemony within the state in 1793-Year II. And yet, their collective militancy was too original, comprehensive, and danger-fraught to have derived primarily from self-aggrandizing materialism. Their ideology was also one of self-compulsion and self-sacrifice; they took enormous risks in a struggle for a new polity and political economy. They perceived their goals not as expediences but as objects of national duty. Many of them obstinately pursued those goals into bitter, deadly *culs-de-sac* in the Spring of 1795 and in 1796 with the doomed Conspiracy of the Equals.⁶⁸

The general posterity of the former "sans-culotte" cadre beyond 1815, their biological, socio-economic and political posterity, remains virtually unknown. Historians have neglected that research, preferring to study the brief insurrectionary scuffle of July, 1830 or the more dramatic effusions of rhetoric and blood in 1848 and to make sociological assumptions about revolutionary traditions in nineteenth century Paris. How many younger brothers, sons, sons-in-law, and grandsons of the former "sans-culotte" elite were among the insurgents of the July Monarchy and the Second Republic, and how many progeny gave allegiance on the other side of those barricades?

Soboul tangled the individualities of the "sans-culotte" leaders in an imaginary "mass movement," and he misconstrued their complex, and often authoritarian, relations with the plebeian classes. To unravel interests, duties, purposes, risks and consequences among the "sans-culotte" cadre, to uncover subjective and objective meanings of politics in Paris of 1793-Year II, the appropriate methods are not simply those of class analysis. They should also encompass the investigation of moral and cultural formation (the sources of ideological adhesions) and of honorific and role stratifications in Parisian and provincial society. These research methods and paths lead back into the Old Regime, into its guilds, businesses, bureaucracies, law courts, parishes, schools, and literary circles, back into the formative *milieux* of Jacobins and "sans-culottes." Ultimately, they are the methods of prosopography, the most venerable in the craft, the least abstract, the closest to experience.

That the Parisian "sans-culotterie" of 1793-94, the most radical movement within the French Revolution, was fundamentally a bourgeois movement may seem a startling, even bizarre conclusion. (The Conspiracy of the Equals was not a movement; it was a desperate plot, of some five months duration, by remnants of the "sans culotterie.")⁶⁹ But if one examines Parisian society from outside the perspectives of Soboul and his historiographic school, that conclusion becomes comprehensible. Only bourgeois could have ruled the fragmented and embattled Revolutionary metropolis of 1792-94, for only they possessed economic autonomies, programmatic capacities, and the means to mobilize and regiment plebeians.

To contemporary adversaries, and for a lineage of historians from Thiers and Taine to Augustin Cochin and François Furet, the rule of the "sans-culotterie" in 1793-94 was an aberration, or a brutal "dérapiage" (side-slip) from legitimacy.⁷⁰ Despite the populist visage and the complexity of motives, "sans-culotte" rule constituted, in fact, an authentically hegemonic period in the history of the Parisian bourgeoisie – through its domination of the City, reconstruction of the State, and tutelage of the Nation in republican discipline. By this revolutionary enterprise, the composition and form of the Parisian bourgeoisie were altered. The protagonists of the enterprise shattered the authority of the French monarchy, destroyed the political power of the nobility and the clergy within the metropolis, and forced bourgeois elites traditionally allied with monarchy, nobility and clergy to new identities and roles. They also began the epochal task of molding violent and mercurial plebeian masses into an industrious citizenry. Precisely how and by whom this hegemony was achieved are questions that remain to be answered.

Political revolutions are about power and populations: the sources, environments,

and institutions of power; its protagonists and those whom they ruled; how power was gained and preserved; the purposes to which it was used and their consequences; and how power was transferred, lost, or conquered by successors. These analytical problems of power in Revolutionary Paris still await solutions. They will not be solved by theoreticians of revolution, but only by empirical progression through “quartiers” – their populations, structures, hierarchies, conflicts and solidarities – to establish the metropolitan entity and its politics, and thence its relations with the state and the provinces of the Nation.

*Heyman Center for the Humanities,
Columbia University
N.Y.C. 10027*

Richard Mowery Andrews

FOOTNOTES

1. All citations and translations from the work are from the original edition, *Les sans-culottes parisiens en l'an II: mouvement populaire et gouvernement révolutionnaire, 2 juin 1793-9 thermidor an II* (Librairie Clavreuil, Paris, 1958). Soboul never revised or modified his theses in subsequent editions and translations of the work. In preface to the Flammarion abridged edition (Paris, 1973) he defiantly wrote:

During the past fifteen years, scholarly research on the French Revolution has expanded and deepened. Despite certain sterile polemics, we do not consider that our interpretations of the historical problems treated here have been altered or refuted, either by scientific erudition or by critical thought. And the relevance of those problems endures; it is carried onward by the very movement of history.

For an incisive summary of the polemics, see Geoffrey Ellis, “The ‘Marxist Interpretation’ of the French Revolution,” in *English Historical Review* XCII (1978): 353-76. The Year II of the Republic was from 22 September, 1793 to 21 September, 1794; the Year III from 22 September, 1794 to 22 September, 1795. 1792-94 refers to the period from the Insurrection of 10 August, 1792, that destroyed the Monarchy and created the Republic, to the close of the Year II and the end of the Jacobin/“sans-culotte” hegemony. I have used the following abbreviations for archives and libraries: A.D.S. (Archives départementales de la Seine); A.N. (Archives nationales); A.P.P. (Archives de la Préfecture de Police); B.HV.P. (Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris); B.N. (Bibliothèque nationale); B.V.C. (Bibliothèque Victor Cousin); Brit. Mus. (British Museum).

2. *Les paysans du Nord pendant la Révolution française*, 2nd edition (Bari, 1959), vi.

3. The Panthéon-Français section was the most populous in Paris (23,000-24,900), one of the most plebeian, and politically quite “sans-culotte” in 1793-94. The official voting population totalled perhaps 4,500 after August, 1792. There were only 636 voluntary beneficiaries of the indemnity of two “livres” between 5 November, 1793 and 19 April, 1794; during that period there were thirty-four meetings of the general assembly. Over half of the 636 attended seventeen or fewer meetings. Haim Burstin, “Les citoyens des quarante sols: analyse socio-politique à l’intérieur de la sans-culotterie,” *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 53 (1983): 93-113.

4. The rhythms of labor were not those of politics. Most laborers worked from dawn until dusk; assembly meetings usually began at 6:00 P.M. and lasted, or were prolonged for important decisions, until 10:00 or 12:00 P.M. To be an assiduous citizen, the laborer had to sacrifice income, “chopines,” supper, and sleep. More significantly, from April, 1793 through the Year II nearly a majority of the plebeian classes of the City were excluded officially from participation in sectionary assemblies. The “carte de sûreté” (an identity card) was required for entry to them. It was obtained only from the revolutionary or civil committee and only after certification of a year of residence, actual employment or “respectable” means of existence, and usually performance of guard service. The policing mechanism of the “cartes” both excluded those transient

and unemployed and reinforced the authority of employers over their workers (see the registers of the revolutionary committee of the Réunion section and Observatoire section, A.N. F7 #2494, 2514).

5. On the socio-economic fluidity of the plebeian classes in eighteenth century France, see the following: A. Abbiateci and F. Billacois, eds., *Crimes et criminalité en France sous l'Ancien Régime, 17e-18e siècles* (Paris, 1971); Richard Cobb, *The Police and People: French Popular Protest, 1789-1820* (Oxford, 1970) and his *Reactions to the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1972); J. Combes, "Population mouvante et criminalité à Versailles à la fin de l'Ancien Régime," in *Hommage à Marcel Reinhard: sur la population française au 18e et au 19e siècles* (Paris, 1973), 135-60; Arlette Farge, *Delinquance et criminalité: le vol d'aliments à Paris au 18e siècle* (Paris, 1974) and her excellent *Vivre dans la rue à Paris au 18e siècle* (Paris, 1979); Arlette Farge and Andre Zysberg, "Les théâtres de la violence à Paris au 18e siècle," *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations* 34 (1979): 985-1016; Jean-Pierre Gutton, *La société et les pauvres: l'exemple de la Généralité de Lyon (1534-1789)* (Paris, 1971); idem, *La société et les pauvres en Europe, 16e-18e siècles* (Paris, 1974); B. Geremek, "Criminalité, vagabondage, pauperisme: la marginalité à l'aube du temps moderne," *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 21 (1974): 337-75; Pierre Goubert, "Le monde des errants, mendiants et vagabonds à Paris et autour de Paris au 18e siècle," in his *Clio parmi les hommes* (Paris, 1976): 265-78; Olwen Hufton, *The Poor of 18th Century France* (Oxford, 1974); T.J.A. Legoff, *Vannes and its Region: A Study of Town and Country in Eighteenth Century France* (Oxford, 1981); Jean-Claude Perrot, *Genèse d'une ville moderne: Caen au 18e siècle* (Paris, 1975), and the discussion of this work by Perrot, Jean-Pierre Bardet, Jean Bouvier, Marcel Roncayola, and Daniel Roche in *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations* 32 (1977): 1237-54; A. Poitrineau, ed., *Entre faim et loup---les problèmes de la vie et de l'émigration sur les hautes terres françaises au 18e siècle* (Clermont-Ferrand, 1977); Michel Vovelle, "Le prolétariat flottant à Marseille sous la Révolution française," *Annales de démographie historique* 3 (1968); idem, "De la mendicité au brigandage: les errants en Beauce sous la Révolution française," in his *Ville et campagne au 18e siècle (Chartres et la Beauce)* (Paris, 1980), 277-306. Such empirical investigation of the plebeian classes during the Old Regime and the Revolution rarely appears in the *Annales historiques de la Révolution française*, of which Soboul was general editor from 1967 to 1982; instead its pages have remained filled with elitist hagiography of Robespierre, Saint-Just, Babeuf, et al.

In *La grande peur de 1789*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1956), Georges Lefebvre described peristaltic waves of migrations across Northern France during the 1780s. The records of police, revolutionary, civil and relief commissioners, of prisons and the courts, reveal continuance of this massive flow to and within Paris in the 1790s. *Les sans-culottes parisiens* ignored vagabondage, mendicancy, scavenging and criminality among the plebeians of Paris. Soboul envisioned only a sanitized, morally scrubbed metropolitan populace; it was muscled, but it lacked hair in its arm pits or fangs in its mouth. His narrow, distortional presentation of plebeians as wage-earners and consumers probably derived from historiographic priorities obtaining within the French Communist Party during the 1950s – notably, the genetic search for capitalist relations of production (centered on wage) and exchange (centered on commodity prices), and disdain for those identifiable as "lumpenproletarians." For a discussion of those priorities among British Communist Party historians during that decade – and of the socially protean character of British plebeian life in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – see Peter Linebaugh, "All the Atlantic Mountains Shook," *Labour/Le Travailleur: Journal of Canadian Labour Studies* 10 (1982): 87-121.

6. The conquest of power by the "sans-culottes" of the Arsenal section, on 26-27 May, 1793, was well documented by "sans-culottes" and their opponents. On 24 and 25 May the anti-"sans-culotte" faction gained control of the general assembly and projected a purge of the revolutionary committee. The "sans-culotte" counterattack was mounted on 26 May, a Monday and payday for wage laborers. The latter knew that "this evening there will be fighting in the assembly;" the "sans-culotte" leaders, many of whom were entrepreneurial masters, urged or ordered them to attend. The decisive "bagarre" ensued that evening. It was won by the "sans-culottes," reinforced by "fraternizing" deputations from other sections. The gladiators of the Arsenal were principally craft-masters, journeymen and laborers versus merchants, lawyers, notaries and their clerks. On this struggle, see A.N. W 41, dos. 2764; C 355, plaq. 1859 (memoir of Ledru); F7 4733.

dos. P-A. Grillot; "Arrestations et désarmements de la Section de l' Arsenal en vertu de la loi du ler prairial [Year III]," AD XVI 71; F¹⁶ III Seine, 27 (Dutard's report, 27 May 1793).

7. Marcel Reinhard, *Nouvelle histoire de Paris: la Révolution* (Paris, 1971), 259.

8. The Contrat-Social section ("quartier" of the Halles and Saint-Eustache) illustrates most fully this general pattern. Many of the nominative minutes of its assemblies have survived: those from 4 December, 1790 to 5 September, 1792 were published by Frédéric Braesch in *Procès-verbaux de l'Assemblée générale de la Section des Postes* (Paris, 1911); the records of the primary assemblies (for election of officials) from 22 October, 1792 to 11 February, 1793 are in A.D.S. D 9* 1002; the minutes of the general assemblies from 18 April to 19 May, 1793 are in A.N. C 355 plaq. 1860. In the censitary period, the section had approximately 1,000 active and eligible citizens; after August, 1792 the voting population officially totaled 3,224. Between 4 December, 1790 and 5 September, 1792 approximately 400 citizens participated at least once in the assemblies; those who attended frequently, and from among whom the section's leadership was elected, numbered about 200. In the primary assemblies from October, 1792 to February, 1793 attendance oscillated between 367 and 101 over a total of twenty-two meetings; the average attendance was 204. Here, as in most sections of Paris, April-May, 1793 was a time of intense political conflict and activism, with the assemblies meeting almost each evening. The protagonists of the Contrat-Social remained a small elite of regular participants: 328 on 7 May for the election of a new police commissioner; about 350 (supplemented by "fraternizing" deputations from six other sections) in the "regeneration" session of 18 May. In 1793, as before, a majority of the same names recurred in the minutes. There is no evidence of an expanded electorate in the Contrat-Social during the Year II.

Local "popular societies" were the interior base from which "sans-culottes" won power in most sections of the City. Their membership was also proportionately quite small and, in many cases, more propertied than plebeian. The society of the Lepeletier section ("quartier" of the Bourse) had about 60 members in April, 1792 and about 170 in February, 1794, on the eve of purges (B.N. nouvelles acquisitions françaises ms. 2662, fols. 31-32, 74-77). In late September, 1793 the Société populaire des Hommes Libres of the Pont-Neuf section attained its maximal membership, 104, of whom almost one-half were sectionary officials and more than one-third were craftsmen of the "orfèvrerie-bijouterie-horlogerie" and related precision trades (B.N. nouv. acq. franc. ms. 2713, fol. 114). The voting population of that section totaled 1,500-1,800. The Société populaire et républicaine de l'Unité (Quatre-Nations section, in the Latin Quarter) had 280 members in January, 1794, from a voting population of over 3,000. Politically, this was an avant-garde section and a Cordelier stronghold in 1792-94; it also had a substantial plebeian population. Of the society's 280 members, more than half were skilled craftsmen, mostly in luxury trades; the remainder were principally tradesmen or municipal and government bureaucrats ("Liste des membres composants la Société populaire et républicaine de l'Unité," Paris, an II, Brit. Mus. F 827 5). Sectionary clubs had far more the character of exclusive debating and coordinating groups than of mass organizations. They were conduits between Jacobin orthodoxy, defined in the club on the rue Saint-Honoré, and the "sans-culotterie." And they were forums for concerting "sans-culotte" defenses, initiatives, and nomination lists for general assemblies.

9. A.N. BB3 80, dos. 6.

10. This was done in the Commune's instruction to revolutionary committees on enforcement of the Law of Suspects voted by the Convention on 17 September, 1793: "Caractères qui doivent distinguer les hommes suspects et à qui on doit refuser le certificat de civisme . . ." (Brit. Mus. F 615 3). Only two of the Convention's six categories of "suspect" referred to rhetoric or speech-actions; nine of the Commune's twelve "characteristics" denoted rhetorical behavior, or its refusal by abstaining from section assemblies.

11. Denunciations of the following: Claude Fiquet, architect, deputy of the Temple section to the Commune, 1793-Year II, and an administrator of Municipal Police (A.N. W 559, dos. Fiquet, F7 4774/32, dos. Mallais); Joseph Fenéaux, shoemaker, deputy of the Faubourg-de-Bondy

section to the Commune, 1793-Year II, and juror of the Revolutionary Tribunal (A.N. F7 4775/32, dos. Toupiolle); Jacques Cordas, embroiderer, assembly leader of the Lonbards section and deputy to the Commune, 1793-Year II (A.N. F7 4653, dos. Cordas); Gérard-Jean Arfillière, construction entrepreneur in the Ponceau section (A.N. F7 4581, dos. Arfillière).

12. François-Réné Ferrand, master joiner and revolutionary commissioner of the Ponceau section, who, in 1790-91 employed five journeymen in making spindles for garment manufacturers of the region (A.N. F7 4774/76, dos. Piot, F30 136, dos. Ferrand). Alexandre Belanger, architect and rentier, Faubourg-Montmartre section (this "simple artisan" was also a considerable purchaser of nationalized properties in his section and the region of the Place-Vendôme, A.N. F7 4592, dos. Belanger).

13. On these qualities see especially Restif de la Bretonne, *Monsieur Nicolas ou le coeur humain dévoilé*, 16 vols. (Paris, 1794-97); idem, *Les nuits de Paris*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1788); L.-S. Mercier, *Le tableau de Paris*, 12 vols. (Amsterdam, 1781-88); idem, *Le nouveau Paris*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1798); the essays on chroniclers of eighteenth century Paris in *La ville au 18e siècle: colloque d'Aix-en-Provence* (Aix-en-Provence, 1974); Robert Darnton, "The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France," in *French Society and the Revolution* (ed. Douglas Johnson, Cambridge, 1976) 53-87; Cobb, *The Police and the People*; Farge, *Vivre dans la rue à Paris au 18e siècle*. For a fine study of the highly valued obverse of mendacity and contrivance, see Yves Castan, *Honnêteté et relations sociales en Languedoc (1715-1780)* (Paris, 1974).

14. The dossiers of these employers in production of commodities date from the spring of 1790 to early 1792, with the bulk of them concentrated from mid-1790 to the end of 1791 (A.N. F30 115-160). They resulted from requests made to the Treasury by employers for small denominations of "assignats" (in exchange for equivalent value in coin) with which to pay workers. Without this official exchange at equivalence, employers were forced to pay wages in gold or silver coin (which they did not wish to do, especially at short intervals) or to purchase "assignats" from moneychangers (which in 1790-91 entailed losses of from 6 to 7.5 percent). Each request had to be accompanied by lists of the numbers of workers at wage or piece-rate and their aggregate pay each fortnight or month; the enumerations had to be certified by commissioners of the district or section and by inspectors of the appropriate trades. For these reasons, the lists may be considered fairly accurate.

Collectively, these heads of enterprise were the summits of production in late eighteenth century Paris, for they were the master artisans and manufacturers who possessed sufficient capital to hire wage labor. Marcel Reinhard (*Nouvelle histoire de Paris*, 46-47) estimated that in 1789 Paris contained 40,000-50,000 masters of production and commerce. Only 3,800 of them were capitalized on a scale adequate for representation in F30. The great majority of the master artisanate either did not employ labor (and sold its own) or remunerated workers primarily by the ancient, patriarchal modes of lodging, food, job training, small coin, and permission to retain some products for personal marketing, barter or use. The bulk of artisan enterprises were familial: in the majority of them, labor was not purchased; rather, it was accomplished by sons, brothers, nephews, cousins and in-laws, who were often imported from the provinces in adolescence. The "patrons" of F30 were those who remunerated principally in monetary wage. Even those among them with fewer than five workers belonged to the higher tiers of capital in the structure of production. For every F.-R. Ferrand, master joiner with five salaried journeymen, there were scores of tenuous masters who worked alone, for others, or with a few relatives. In certain trades, the actual workforces of masters in F30 were larger than the enumerations in the dossiers, for these latter did not necessarily include relatives and others remunerated by non-monetary means. The case of Alexandre Duval in the Gravilliers section illustrates this phenomenon. His dossier of September, 1790 listed only four salaried workers in his roofing and paving business on the rue des Vertus. In August, 1793 he, his associates, and his workers all registered on the same day for "cartes de sûreté;" the register suggests that in 1790-91 there were at least thirteen journeymen, apprentices, common laborers and clerks in his business, of which only four were paid regular wages. The Duval brothers had imported labor, most of it consanguine, from their region of origin — the environs of Saint-Martin-Don (Calvados) in the western Norman "bocage."

(A.N. F30 133, dos. Duval; F7 4795, register of "cartes de sûreté," 12th company.)

These dossiers were studied first by Frederic Braesch, "Un essai de statistique de la population ouvrière de Paris vers 1791," *La Révolution française* 63 (1912): 289-321. Soboul (pp. 435-36) summarized and criticized Braesch's statistical presentation. Like Braesch, Soboul perceived only the laboring component of this source; he did not apprehend its genuine social richness, the materials for an economic profile of the Parisian bourgeoisie of production at the advent of the Revolution. Even regarding the wage-labor populace, these documents cannot be used, as did Braesch and Soboul, to establish its geographical distribution in the City. The dossiers often specify that many workers were not resident in the sections in which they worked, but lived simply "en ville" or "en faubourg." Finally, Soboul wrote: "The figures given by employers denote only masculine labor; female labor was not yet significantly employed in Paris" (p. 435). Both statements are false. In relevant sectors of production, the gender of workers was often specified in the dossiers. Garment, fabric, and accessories manufacturing was the third largest productive sector of the Parisian economy; the majority of that workforce was female. In the "orfèvrerie-bijouterie-horlogerie" (of which there were approximately 850 masters in 1788-89) the polishing of precious metals was done almost exclusively by women.

15. For demographic studies of Revolutionary Paris based on the "cartes de sûreté," see the volumes of *Contributions à l'histoire démographique de la Révolution française*, ed. Marcel Reinhard (Paris, 1962, 1965, 1970).

16. The Réunion section (the western portion of the Marais, between the rue Saint-Martin and the rues Sainte-Avoye and Temple) was exceptionally strife-ridden in 1793-95. For a description of the factional struggles, see my "The Justices of the Peace of Revolutionary Paris, September 1792-November, 1794," in *French Society and the Revolution*, op. cit., pp. 208-12.

17. "Précis sur la Révolution . . .," A.N. AD I 66. In 1793, Didot was a primary leader of both the revolutionary committee and the popular society (their registers are in A.N. F7* 2494 and 2495).

18. A.N. F7 4677, dos. Didot.

19. A.N. F30 151, dos. Firmin-Didot; F30 152, doss. Didot "aîné" and Didot "jeune." François Didot (1689-1757), the founder of the dynasty, was in 1753 "syndic" (senior master) of the Parisian guild of bookdealers-printers; in the 1850s his great-grandson was president of the Book Publishers Circle of Paris; their lineal descendent, Robert Firmin-Didot, was vice-president of the National Federation of Printers and member of the Council of the Bank of France until shortly before his death in 1961. The firm is still today one of the largest in French publishing. On these geneologies, see Henri Costan, *Dictionnaire des dynasties bourgeoises et du monde des affaires* (Paris, 1975), 230-34.

20. "Ministère de la police générale: tableau des noms et déclarations des employés . . . du 12 vendémiaire an VIème," A.N. AF III 28, liasse 95.

21. These trajectories from sectionary politics into the national state are a principal theme of my forthcoming work on Revolutionary Paris. On bureaucratic recruitment and expansion in 1793-96, see Clive H. Church, *Revolution and Red Tape: The French Ministerial Bureaucracy, 1770-1850* (Oxford, 1981).

22. A.N. F7 4635, dos. Caubert; F30 133, dos. Caubert.

23. A.N. F7 4669, dos. Desmonceaux; F30 133, dos. Desmonceaux.

24. A.N. F7* 2486; F30 133, dos. Beadouin; F7 4795, "cartes de sûreté," 25th company; A.D.S. D 6U/1 3, liasse "scellés."

25. A.N. W 149, liasse 2. Cochois was probably imprisoned after the petition was written. The revolutionary committee sent a similarly laudatory report on him to the Committees of Government (A.N. F7 4650, dos. Cochois).
26. On this richly elitist career in 1792-94, see A.N. F7 4604, dos. J. Bodson; BB 80, liasse 1; AD XVI 72; D III 251-52, liasse 2; Flb II Seine, 18; W 27, liasse 1654; B.N. nouv. acq. franc. ms 2713 (minutes of the Société populaire des Hommes-Libres); J. Bodson and J.-B. Félix, "Extraits du rapport des commissaires Félix . . . et Bodson . . ." Paris, 1792, B.N. Lb41 2321; Pierre Caron, *Les missions du Conseil exécutif provisoire et de la Commune de Paris* (Paris, 1950).
27. " 'Burins' must be made of the purest steel, preferably from Germany or England . . ." *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné . . .* (Paris, 1791), vol. V, 610. "Engravers" are among the "artistes" whose talents can gain them membership in the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture. *ibid.*, vol. XIV, 551. Jean-Baptiste Fosseyeux, revolutionary commissioner of the Panthéon-Français section in 1793-Year II, was one of four master engravers "à burin" qualified as "artistes" in Boissier's enterprise of gilding and engraving on the rue de la Contrescarpe in 1790. Fosseyeux had an apprentice-pupil (who was paid by Boissier) and earned an average of forty-five "livres" a week, or about 2,400 a year. He exhibited in the Academy salons of 1800, 1808, 1819 and 1822. A.N. F7 4710, dos. Fosseyeux; F30 157, dos Boissier "frères;" B.H.V.P. ms 758, fol. 146; Etienne Charavay, *Assemblée électorale de Paris, 2 septembre 1792 - 17 frimaire an II* Paris, 1905 III, 80).
28. A.N. F7 4604, doss. J. Bodson and L.-A. Bodson; F7 4803, register of "cartes de sûreté" Pont-Neuf section; A.P.P. Aa 216, fols. 323-28.
29. A.N. F7 4645, dos. J.-C. Chemin; F7 4803, register of "cartes de sûreté;" F7 4645, dos. J.-B. Chemin; AD XXc 72, fol. 132.
30. A.N. F7 4475/25, dos. Tarreau; A.P.P. Aa 216, fols. 207-9.
31. A.N. F7 4650, dos. Cochois; F30 149, dos. Cochois.
32. On the guild, see especially the *Répertoire universelle et raisonné de jurisprudence civile, criminelle, canonique et bénéficiale* (Paris, 1787), vol. XII, 461-68.
33. Among their conservative opponents (also of the guild) Étienne Gide, "of haughty and imperious character," allegedly enjoyed 6000 "livres" a year in rental income; Pierre George, a jeweller imprisoned for "anti-civic conduct," had produced for nobles who emigrated (A.N. F7 4725, dos. Gide; F7 4722, dos. George).
But George and his anti-"sans-culotte" comrades had used similar hypocrisy: on 30 May, 1793 the conservative leaders of the Pont-Neuf assured the Jacobin Commune that "the entire mass of the Section is patriotic, being composed exclusively of workers [i.e. craftsmen] who, because of this fact, desire only freedom and equality" (B.N. nouv. acq. franc. ms 2712, fols. 4-6).
34. A.N. F7 4775/26, dos. Tesseyre; A.P.P. Aa 185, fols. 124-25.
35. A.N. F30 127, dos. Léchénard. These forty workers were able to manufacture 2,740 garters, 1,040 pairs of breeches, and 1,700 collar stocks for the national guard of the Sône-et-Loire "département" during the second half of 1791, in addition to producing for Léchénard's customers in Paris.
36. "Département de Paris: marchandises et denrées, journées et main-d'oeuvre," July, 1793, A.N. Fl1 218, liasse 1793.
37. A.N. F30 135, dos. Saunier; Flb II Seine, 18.
38. "Marchandises . . . main d'oeuvre," A.N. Fl1 218, liasse 1793.

39. A.N. F30, 117, dos. Devèze. He also paid the second highest direct tax (1,035 "livres") among the 233 active citizens of the Faubourg-du-Roule listed in July, 1790 (A.N. F7 4718, dos. Gaudet).

40. A.N. F7 4666, dos. Delamarre. Or Jacques Fouchy, "marchand limonadier" on the rue Saint-Denis, "selling coffee at one 'sou' a cup and heating water for those who wish to shave" (A.P.P. Aa 171, fol. 29).

41. A.N. F7 4648, dos. Chrétien; A.P.P. Aa 80, fols. 237-41.

42. See Georges Rudé, *The Crowd in the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1959); idem, *La défaite des sans-culottes: mouvement populaire et réaction bourgeoise en lan II* (Paris, 1959); Gwyn A. Williams, *Artisans and Sans-culottes: Popular Movements in France and Britain during the French Revolution* (London, 1968). R.B. Rose, *The Making of the "Sans-culottes": Democratic Ideas and Institutions in Paris, 1789-92* (Manchester, 1983) is the most recent case of this academic "suisisme": Rose transferred Soboul's formulations and methods back in time to describe Parisian politics in 1789-92. And see François Furet, *La Révolution française* (Paris, 1981); and Guy Chaussinand-Nogaret, "Villes en Révolutions," in *Histoire de la France urbaine*, ed. Georges Duby (Paris, 1980) vol. III, 539-89.

43. Soboul's conception was a *teleos* of smoke-belching factories inhabited by capitalists and proletarians. In regard to the Parisian master artisanate of the Revolutionary era, the *teleos* is a myth; as a class, they were not threatened with extinction by industrial production. In 1847, the wage-earning labor force of Paris numbered 342,530 (and was roughly the same proportion to total population as in the 1790s); it was employed by 64,816 "patrons," of whom only 7,117 employed more than ten workers (R. Price, *The French Second Republic: A Social History* [Ithaca, 1972], pp. 5-8). In 1848, according to statistics of the Paris Chamber of Commerce, the average number of workers to employers in the City was 5.3; the median was 7.5. (Charles Tilly and Lynn Lees, "The People of June, 1848," in *Revolution and Reaction: 1848 and the Second French Republic* [ed. R. Price, New York, 1975], pp. 192-193). In 1872, the average unit of "grande industrie" in France employed nineteen workers; the average workforce for all producing enterprises was five (R. Price, *The French Second Republic*, pp. 5-8). In 1911, by a national census, 23.4 percent of all persons in commodity production were artisans, either self-employed or independent with small workforces (R.D. Anderson, *France, 1870-1914: Politics and Society* [London, 1977], p. 32). In 1906, there were a total of 673, 688 enterprises of non-agrarian commodity production in France: 591,811 employed five or fewer workers; 55,004 employed six to twenty; 3,950 employed 101 to 500; 611 employed more than 500. In 1926, there were a total of 588,094 such enterprises: 485,115 employed five or fewer workers; 69,786 employed six to twenty; 5,944 employed 101 to 500; 953 employed more than 500 (Jacques Néré, *La Troisième République, 1914-1940* [Paris, 1967], p. 90). See also, Steven M. Zdatny, "The Artisanate in France: An Economic Portrait, 1900-1956," *French Historical Studies* XII (1984): 415-40. Smoke-belching factories, not artisan workshops, were economically the most vulnerable and fragile units of manufacturing in France from the late eighteenth century into the twentieth.

44. On the region, see Louis Bergeron, *Banquiers, négociants et manufacturiers parisiens du Directoire à l'Empire* (Paris, 1978), p. 15; idem, "Croissance urbaine et société à Paris au 18e siècle," in *La ville au 18e siècle* op. cit., pp. 127-34; Adeline Daumard, *Maisons de Paris et propriétaires parisiens au XIXe siècle, 1809-1880* (Paris, 1965), pp. 83-115, 175-231 and idem, *La bourgeoisie parisienne de 1815 à 1848* (Paris, 1963), pp. 181-211; J.H. Hillairet, *Connaissance du Vieux Paris: Rive Droite* (Paris, 1951), pp. 318-21.

45. A.N. F30 133 and 135, doss. Scharf; F7 4795, "cartes de sûreté," 14th and 42nd companies. In March, 1796, the eldest, Frédéric, died of a cardiac seizure while raising a heavy beam. A.P.P. Aa 155, fol. 57.

46. Temporary insolvency was more frequent. The "Tableau statistique de l'industrie et du commerce du Sixième arrondissement de Paris" (A.N. F20 255) reveals that in 1807 the majority of these artisan enterprises were still in business and in the same locales.

47. Since the 1780s, Germain Truchon had owned, by inheritance, 300 acres of wheatland and vineyard near Semur in the Côte-d'Or; he left the committee for an executive position in the Commission of National Properties of the Paris "département." Louis Derouvois became the section's hoarding commissioner, a well-salaried position. Jacques Lambert had been absent from the section and the committee since late May, as captain in the Gravilliers battalion in the Vendée; in November, he was promoted by the Montagnard proconsuls to the rank of adjutant general. (Lambert had enlisted at age sixteen in the Royal Infantry Regiment of the Perche; he served from 1776 to 1784 and in the American War.) Georges Leblanc acquired a position in the Police Bureau of the Municipality. Antoine Petillon also had municipal employment. Nicolas Petit left the committee for the salary of recording secretary of the tribunal of the sixth arrondissement. Pierre Égasee was appointed a director of the Central Post Office. These transactionary and government positions were the dispensations of Jacobin patronage. They were rewards for the 9-10 August, 1792 and 31 May-2 June, 1793.

48. See E. Labrousse, "Voies nouvelles vers une histoire de la bourgeoisie occidentale aux 18e et 19e siècles (1700-1850)," *Relazioni: Storia Moderna*, International Congress of Historical Sciences, Rome, 1955 (Florence, 1955), 367-96; Daumard, *La bourgeoisie parisienne*. For the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, see Pierre Goubert, *Beauvais et les beauvaisis de 1600 à 1730* (Paris, 1960).

49. Ferdinand Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*, (Paris, 1937), IX, 712-17.

50. The best known definitions of "sans-culotte" as laboring producer were by J.-B. Vingternier, ". . . he is useful; he knows how to plough a field, forge and hammer, saw, file, tile a roof, make shoes, and shed the last drop of his blood for the preservation of the Republic" (in W. Markov and A. Soboul, *Die Sansculotten von Paris: Dokumente zur Geschichte der Volksbewegung, 1793-94*, Berlin, 1957, p. 2) and Jacques Hébert in *Le Père Duchesne*, "sans-culottes are those who make the fabrics that clothe us, those who forge the metals and make the weapons that serve to defend the Republic." Productive and virtuous work was not exclusively manual or proletarian. Hébert lauded the entrepreneurial luxury craftsman who renounced his sumptuary clientele and produced vital implements for the Republic (ibid, no. 339) and affirmed that bourgeois who "are fathers to their workers. . . content themselves with honest and modest profits, and do not seek to amass immense riches" can also be "sans-culottes." (ibid.)

51. Texts expressing the socio-civic expansiveness of this axial meaning abounded in 1792-94; the following are some sectionary examples. In May, 1793 the cannoners of the Réunion section defined themselves to the National Convention: "We belong to that useful and industrious class that does not feed its families from the odious revenues of speculation and hoarding, but from the modest profits of craftsmanship and honest trade." (B.V.C. ms. 118, fols. 64-65.) A petition to the Convention from the Sans-culottes section in September, 1793 declared: "Each individual in the Republic must devote his intelligence and his muscles to its welfare." (B.N. Lb40 2140.) In August, 1792, during the selection of electors, André-Louis Caillouet — master sculptor and future revolutionary commissioner — advised the primary assembly of the Arsenal section:

. . . a moderate is more dangerous than an avowed aristocrat. A moderate is a cowardly man, who secretly hates the People. . . do not nominate those wealthy men, for very few of them are prepared to serve your interests. A worker, an artisan, or simply a just man whatever his profession, is preferable. (A.N. F7* 2505, f. 122)

In his "Instruction patriotique et nationale," Louis Collignon-Dumont, publicist and militant of the Lombards section, stated that "in general, the bourgeois, the farmer, the worker, and the artisan" are rarely "aristocrats." (Brit. Mus. F. 493 2.) The three sections of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine petitioned the Convention in July, 1793 for a comprehensive law on public instruction:

. . . we hope to find there the means to provide the farmer, nourishing father of the Republic, with techniques that will simplify his operations and increase their productivity, that will allow the 'artiste' [master craftsman], the soul of commerce, to perfect his craft, and the worker his talent. (Markov and Soboul, *Dokumente*, p. 92)

Among the five chief officials of these sections who presented the petition were Noel Suchet and Alexandre Gillet-Ducoudray. Suchet was chief administrator of the Hospital for Abandoned Children and supervisor of its curriculum; he had been a member of the Popincourt section's civil committee since 1790 and a deputy to the Insurrectionary Commune. (A.N. F1b II Seine, 18; F7 4587, dos. Barry; F30 141; *Almanac national*, 1793; F. Braesch, *La Commune du 10 août 1792. Étude sur l'histoire de Paris du 10 juin au 2 décembre 1792*, [Paris, 1911], p. 262.) Gillet-Ducoudray had been a notary's clerk until 1789; from then, he lived on inheritance (he owned the building of his residence) and salaries of sectionary offices. In 1792-94, he was a principal leader of the assembly and popular society of the Quinze-Vingts section. (A.N. F7 4725, dos. Gillet-Ducoudray; F7 4635, dos. Castille; A.P.P. Aa 220, fol. 472.) These men were "sans-culottes" not by manual labor or poverty, but by efficacious militancy and social utility. Jean-Henri Hassenfratz was a distinguished young chemist and engineer; he had been director of Lavoisier's laboratory and in 1793-Year II was an administrator of war materiel in the Ministry of War and a director of arms manufactures for the Committee of Public Safety. He was also a principal militant of the Faubourg-Montmartre section – president of the civil committee, 1792-93, deputy to the Insurrectionary Commune, frequent officer of the general assembly. Education for productive utility was the central theme of his "Réflexions sommaires sur l'éducation publique" of 1793 (B.H.V.P. 509 625):

The institution of civic festivals is an excellent metaphysical idea . . . They were useful to the peoples of Antiquity, who did not have between them relations as intimate as those between the peoples of Europe, and who lacked printing and postal services that can propagate ideas almost instantly. But among a commercial, manufacturing and agrarian people surrounded by other industrious populations, take heed that our neighbors do not organize their industry and destroy our manufactures and trade while we are organizing civic festivals. The most splendid "festival" that one could give to the French Republic would be to organize public education in arts and trades, to give impetus to national industry, activity to factories and trade, and thereby to destroy forever tyranny, intriguers, and all the seeds of divisiveness that exist among us.

Indisputably bourgeois, Hassenfratz was also, by his civic labors, an excellent "sans-culotte" to the revolutionary commissioners of the Faubourg-Montmartre: "During the two years of his residence in the section, citizen Hassenfratz has never ceased to prove himself a true democrat and a good republican, by his speeches and by his conduct." (A.N. F7* 2482, minutes for 14 ventôse and 24 thermidor an II; F7 4739, dos. Hassenfratz.) As a final example of self-definitional expansiveness, in November, 1793 the revolutionary committee of the Graviilliers castigated the former censitary elite of the section for having been opposed to " 'sans-culotte' bourgeois doing guard service with them" in 1789-92. (A.N. F7 4706, dos. Festiaux.)

52. *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des Sciences, des Arts et des Métiers*, XVII, 648 (Paris, 1778).

'Manufactory: 'place where several workers are occupied in the same sort of production (ibid, XX, 103)

'Worker' ["ouvrier"]: refers generally to any artisan who labors in any trade. (ibid, XXIV, 216.)

'Work: 'daily activity to which man is condemned by need, and to which he also owes his health, his subsistence, his equanimity, his common sense, and perhaps even his virtue (ibid, XXXIV, 46).

'To work: 'to occupy oneself with some productive activity, to make something or perform a task that requires effort [peines] and labor (ibid, XXXIV, 49)

None of these basic definitions of commodity production distinguished between the employing master and his journeymen, apprentices and laborers. Within the eighteenth century Parisian economy, masters of production – even large-scale entrepreneurs – had virtually all "put their hands to the matter" as apprentices and journeymen. In the language of the *Encyclopedia* and in that of the "sans-culotterie," "industry" and "work" were practically co-terminous; both words had intensely moral significance. In "sans-culotte" ideology, work established the validity of private property. But their conception of property was not strictly Lockean, for private property was not an absolute right. By article nineteen of the Montagnard Constitution of 1793, property could be confiscated (with indemnity) in the name of "public necessity;" the properties of "émigrés," hoarders, speculators, and convicted counter-revolutionaries were systematically confiscated and transformed into public capital. Perhaps the most radical statement for limitation of property right was made by the Sans-culottes section on 2 September, 1793: "private property has no

just basis other than the extent of physical needs." (B.N. Lb40 2140.) Sans-culotte and Jacobin demands for limitations of property rights mostly aimed at commercial or agrarian – and not manufacturing – holdings.

53. In Paris, the institutional grid of surveillance and policing was tighter in 1792-94 than at any other period of the eighteenth century. The "cartes de sûreté" and the numerous laws defining suspects were intended and used as instruments for "transformational policing" of the plebeian classes by sectionary and Municipal authorities. In the Year II the Jacobin State and the Paris Municipality developed a generous system of poor relief; the Janus-face of that generosity was the most draconian legislation against begging and vagabondage in the history of French criminal law. In the "Law for the Extirpation of Mendicancy" (15 October, 1793), the Convention decreed that second offenders would be imprisoned at labor for one year, third offenders for two years, and fourth offenders – deported to penal labor in Guyana for a minimum of eight years (J. Duvergier, *Collection complète des Loix, décrets, ordonnances, règlements et avis—de 1788 à 1824*, Paris, 1824-25, VI, 283-88).

54. The internecine sectionary conflicts of 1793 were largely struggles for dominance within the ranks of the Parisian bourgeoisie, and sequels to the unresolved antagonisms of the censitary regime. The electoral corps was one of the most socially representative and politically significant institutions in Paris until late 1793. The majority of electors were sectionary officials, and the composition of the corps reflected changes in sectionary power. The corps of 809 electors in 1791-92, the final year of the censitary regime and the Monarchy, was composed of the following main social groups: 171 artisans and commodity producers; 113 men of the law; 99 merchants and tradesmen; 97 persons of the "liberal professions," mostly clerics and educators; 81 wholesale merchants and commodity traders; 68 bureaucrats and functionaries; 55 rentiers. Of the 850 electors of September, 1792-Year II, 720 have been socially identified: 297 artisans and commodity producers; 137 retail merchants and tradesmen; 98 persons of the liberal professions; 59 bureaucrats; 57 men of the law; 27 "men of letters;" only 25 wholesale merchants and 11 rentiers. (Charavay, *Assemblée électorale de Paris*, II and III.) The post-10 August, 1792 political ascent of producing bourgeois was also registered in the composition of the Commune (Braesch, *La Commune du 10 août...*, pp. 245-63).

55. "Chénaux de la Section de l'Oratoire à ses concitoyens" (A.N. F7 4718, dos. Gaudet). Chénaux was a former attorney at the "Châtèlet" and a public defender after 1790. During the grocery riots of 25-26 February, 1793 he allegedly declared: "In truth, I am not shocked by the pillage; I believe that it has a moral purpose." (A.N. F7 4645, dos. Chénaux.)

56. "Dernier mot de la Section de Bondy aux Insoucians," 10 April, 1793 (B.N. Lb40 3228).

57. Pierre Jault, "Adresse aux français sur la nécessité d'une prochaine réunion," 22 June, 1793 (B.N. Lb40 1740). Jault also insisted that only through victory by the Republic would the wealthy conserve any of their property.

58. B.V.C. ms. 118, fol. 57.

59. In the BonConseil section, as throughout Paris, the contingent for the Vendée was recruited by voluntary enlistment, with each volunteer promised 500 "livres." The "sans-culottes" gained control of the assembly on 7 May and on the 10th, to pay for recruitment, the assembly and revolutionary committee levied a forced loan of 150,000 "livres" on the rich of the section. The committee instructed several dozen of them to pay fixed sums in three installments, the first due within forty-eight hours, the second within a week, and the third within a month. It threatened to declare "suspects" those who defaulted and to confiscate and auction their possessions. On 22 May, the assembly justified this coercion of the wealthy:

Recruitment time completely unmasked them; their cowardly egotism was revealed in all its nudity... They wanted to ruin the recruitment at its inception; they wanted to paralyze it [by not contributing] (A.N. C 255, plq. 482, fol. 2)

Several persons who delayed payment were disarmed or arrested by 2 June; many others were incarcerated as suspects after the Law of 17 September ("Rapport . . . des Commissaires . . . 20 germinal an III, B.N. Lb40 1733). Most of the "rich" on whom this loan was levied were of mercantile or rentier income. The revolutionary commissioners – almost all of whom were incarcerated as terrorists in 1795 – were not "men of the people" waging class war. Eight were involved in production and five were masters or entrepreneurs: J.-B.-A. Leprince, president of the committee in May-June, master shoemaker with twelve workers in 1790-91; J.-B. Cambrier, ribbon and braid manufacturer with ten workers; Joseph Wabe, shoemaker with two workers; Charles-Antoine and Louis-Francois Lamotte, sons of one of the major fabric manufacturing families of the region those enterprise employed an average of 97 workers in 1790-91 (A.N. F30 127, doss. Leprince, Cambrier, Wabe, Lamotte; "Rapport . . . 20 germinal an III). Leprince defended the requisitional politics of the committee, from prison in the Year III:

The general assembly should remember our situation then: urgent requirements for the Vendée; the volunteers refusing to march without receiving 500 'livres' each . . . and not a 'sou' in the war chest; extraordinary revenues were absolutely necessary (A.N. F7 4774/19, dos. Leprince; F7 4663, dos. Dautancourt; F7 4775^B, dos. Sarrazin).

60. "Projet d'adresse à la Convention nationale," L'Homme-Armé (Marais) section, late 1793 (B.N. Lb40 1946).

61. On Lebrun, see my "Justices of the Peace of Revolutionary Paris," pp. 185-86.

62. On Blandin, see *ibid.*, pp. 186-87.

63. On Laugier, see *ibid.*, pp. 199-203.

64. A.N. F7 4774/35, dos. Marlée; F7 4775/32, dos. Toupiolle; Brit. Mus. F. 1191 17. Antoine Marlée was neither bourgeois in 1789-92, nor plebeian. His career was socially dynamic. In 1771, he had immigrated from Tournay (Nord) to the Faubourg de Bondy and the atelier of a relative from previous immigration. Aged thirty-three in 1789, he was then a sculptor of statuary and student at the Academy. In the summer of 1792 he was elected police commissioner at a salary of 3000 "livres," the highest for all section offices. After release from imprisonment as a terrorist in 1795, he was re-appointed police commissioner by the Directory. In April, 1800 he was promoted by the Consulate to the very well-paid rank of peace officer of the "arrondissement" (A.N. AD I 87; F1b 102, liasse "commissaires de police; F7 3271). Chénaux, Jault, Leprince, Lebrun, Blandin, Laugier and Marlée formed almost a social microcosm of the "sans-culotte" leadership: two master-merchants of production; a merchant; two skilled craftsmen; an attorney; a professional administrator.

65. E. Labrousse, "Les histoires sociales d'Albert Soboul," *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 54 (1982): 527-36.

66. See Reinhard, *Nouvelle histoire de Paris*, part I; *idem*, *Contributions à l'histoire démographique de la Révolution française*, (1962, 1965, 1970); Raymonde Monnier, *Le Faubourg Saint-Antoine, 1789-1815* (Paris, 1981) part I; Daniel Roche, *Le peuple de Paris; essai sur la culture populaire au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1981), chs. 1-2.

67. From 1792, section assemblies and clubs pressured the government to purge its bureaucracies of Old Regime personnel and replace them with "sans-culottes." Soboul explained the pressures only by invoking class hostility or democratic idealism. In the Spring of 1793, Xavier Audouin, adjoint to Bouchotte (Jacobin Minister of War), circulated the sections urging them to denounce to him "counter-revolutionaries" and "false patriots" among the personnel of the ministry, and to recommend for employment "sans-culottes" motivated by "ardent love of the Nation joined with necessary knowledge." Audouin wanted especially to recruit from among the "hidden Cincinnatuses, William Tells, Catos, and Scaevolus" of Paris. (B.N. nouv. acq. franc. ms 2684, fols. 6-7.) The ministry was soon deluged with recommendations and applications from heroes of republican antiquity who had suddenly become reincarnate in Paris. See A.-P. Herlaut, *Le*

colonel Bouchotte, *ministre de la guerre en l'an II* (Paris, 1946); and Church, *Revolution and Red Tape*, ch. 3.

68. On the careers of oppositional revolutionary "exclusifs" from the Directory through the Empire, see R.C. Cobb, "Note sur la repression contre le personnel sans-culotte de 1795 à 1801," in *Terreur et Subsistances* (Paris, 1964), pp. 179-210; Isser Woloch, *The Jacobin Legacy: The Democratic Movement under the Directory* (Princeton, 1970).

69. Soboul and fellow historians described the Conspiracy of the Equals as the resolution of contradictions that had supposedly undermined the "sans-culotte" movement – popular democracy versus revolutionary authority, social egalitarianism versus preservation of private property – and as a genuine, organized political force. See the following: *Babeuf et les problèmes du babouvisme: Colloque international de Stockholm* (Paris, 1963); Claude Mazauric, *Sur Babeuf et la Conspiration pour l'Égalité* (Paris, 1976); Robert Legrand, *Babeuf et ses compagnons de route* (Paris, 1981). For similar, if slightly more cautious, histories in English, see Martyn Lyons, *France under the Directory* (Cambridge, 1975) and R.B. Rose, *Gracchus Babeuf, The First Revolutionary Communist* (Stanford, 1978). For a refutation of these epic interpretations, and an empirical study of relations between former "sans-culottes" and Jacobins, the Conspiracy, and the Directional regime, see my "Réflexions sur la Conjuration des Égaux," *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* XXIX (1974): 73-106. Far from being a resolution of contradictions or an innovation, the Conspiracy was almost a laboratory case of mimetic political behavior – protagonists re-enacting their own pasts.

70. François Furet's writings on the Revolution give little evidence of research in Parisian sectionary documents of 1793-95, but there is a striking concordance between his conception of the "sans-culotte" regime and the conception of it manifested by Parisian thermidorians in the Year III: for both, that regime was one of apocalyptic demagogues, homicidal psychopaths, avaricious "déracinés," delusional mediocrities, upstart tyrants from the "arrière-boutique," the work bench or the scrivener's desk, and political brigands. See *La Révolution française*, vol. II (Paris, 1966) and *Interpreting the French Revolution* (Cambridge, 1981). Similar imagery of the "sans-culotte" regime is conveyed by Richard Cobb's later works on the Revolution – an ironic affinity that neither Cobb nor Furet would wish to acknowledge. See *The Police and the People, Reactions to the French Revolution*, and *Paris and its Provinces 1792-1802* (London, 1975). In their respective accounts of the Year II, one frequently has the impression, by tone and content, of reading avatars of Edmund Burke. Denigratory "socio-pathology" of "sans-culottes" and Jacobins may be once again a fashionable Tory pastime on both sides of the Channel, but it is not history of the Parisian Revolution.

This essay originated in a paper delivered to a session on the scholarly work of Albert Soboul in the February 1984 conference of the Consortium on Revolutionary Europe at Duke University. An abridged version of this essay is in the 1984 volume of the Consortium's proceedings, with comments by Lynn Hunt and Jeffrey Kaplow. I thank the editors of that volume for permission to reprint. For their critical reading of the essay, I wish to thank Christine Gros, John Gillis, Patrice Higonnet, Peter Linebaugh and Isser Woloch.