



Local History

Author(s): Pierre Goubert

Source: *Daedalus*, Vol. 100, No. 1, Historical Studies Today (Winter, 1971), pp. 113-127

Published by: [The MIT Press](#) on behalf of [American Academy of Arts & Sciences](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20023993>

Accessed: 30/04/2015 04:15

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

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.



The MIT Press and American Academy of Arts & Sciences are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Daedalus*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

PIERRE GOUBERT

Local History

WE SHALL call local history that which concerns a village or a few villages, a small or middle-sized town (a large harbor or a capital is beyond the local scope), or a geographical area not greater than the common provincial unit (such as an English county, an Italian *contado*, a German *Land*, a French *bailiwick* or *pays*). Local history, which was practiced long ago with carefulness, zeal, and even pride, was later despised (especially in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries) by the supporters of general history. But, since the middle of this century, local history has risen again and acquired new meaning; indeed, some even maintain that only local history can be true and sound.

For a long period—at least until the time when ideas circulated faster (in the eighteenth century) and when men began to move frequently and quickly (during the revolution of the railways in the nineteenth century)—the setting of most Europeans was the parish in the country or the small town and the surrounding district—that is, roughly speaking, the stretch of land covered in a day's walk, from ten kilometers to ten miles, or in a day's ride, about two or three times more. The same laws (local custom) prevailed in this place, as well as the same cultural habits (methods of cultivating the soil, quality of crops, shapes of tools, date of opening for meadows and woods), the same social and economic habits (date of hiring servants, date of weekly markets and quarterly and yearly fairs), the same seignorial rules, the same judicial and administrative area, and the same religious beliefs. Most people never went beyond the boundaries of their districts; their children remained there; a priest, a judge, a seigneur, a notary, and a market were within reach. The cultured part of the population moved about easily: prospective lawyers would take some of their degrees in

the neighboring universities, future priests went to diocesan seminaries when they existed, nobles, when they did not travel far away because of a war, went to their parents' or their suzerains' castles situated outside the bailiwick, or sometimes outside the province itself. There were also vagrants and beggars, of course. But all of them felt they were first of all citizens of their native towns and provinces—from Dijon and Burgundy, from Amiens and Picardy, from Nimes and Languedoc, from Aix and Provence, from Saint-Brieuc and Brittany—and secondly they were French, though they always acknowledged themselves as the king's faithful and obedient subjects. Only small segments of society—the highest stratum and the lowest—could have felt no association with a particular region or place. The great financiers and captains, as well as the gangs of beggars along highways, were not purposely adrift from their homes; all of them knew (especially when the police questioned the beggars) what province, diocese, and parish they came from.

In such a confined life, the intellectual activities of the small minority dealt with either meditations on ancient texts, especially Roman and Greek, or with the history of the region, the region being understood as the land of the family. When they tried to produce histories—as histories were written before Voltaire's *Essai sur les Moeurs*—antiquities, particularities, and the famous exploits of the city or province were emphasized. By the end of the sixteenth century, provincial histories—which were merely lists of noble families, castles, fiefs, abbeys, and cathedral chapters—or histories of towns and cities—which were enumerations of charters, privileges, famous people, and gossip about the writer's native town—were commonplace. Later, the strongest institutions in the provinces (the Estates, the *parlements*), because of their corporate feelings, and as a way of protecting their interests, published their histories. Monks dedicated to research (for example, the Benedictines) often decided to gather and publish a corpus of documents regarding their own provinces; and such work was frequently carefully done.¹ These generally contained legislative or administrative acts, the founding charters, feudal documents, and other evidences concerning the great noble families, the pious priests, and abbots who had been influential. They were sometimes apologies, nearly hagiographies. But they cannot be dismissed, even today. They often refer to the text of lost documents and give the only extant version of them.

The nineteenth century, at least in France, was the golden age

of local history. Following and enlarging upon the example given by provincial academies in the second half of the eighteenth century, many "societies" that called themselves "scholarly" or learned (and occasionally were so) appeared on the scene, existing sometimes for only a few years. Their members were typical elements of bourgeois society: magistrates, notaries, priests, spinsters, *rentiers*, a few teachers, minor nobility. Among thousands of papers and hundreds of volumes issued in France from the middle of the nineteenth century, a tenth is perhaps worth glancing through, a hundredth worth keeping.² This "petit bourgeois" social science would profit from serious sociological and psychological analysis. The weakness of many of these pseudohistorical works partly explains the contempt with which professional historians of the early twentieth century regarded local history—a jumble of chance genealogies, usurped glories, proofless assertions.

Professional historians disdained such local history also because of their own conception of what they chose to see as "general" history. General history was political, military, diplomatic, administrative, and ecclesiastical. Studying the state involved a study of statesmen; studying war permitted a study of the military feats of generals; studying foreign relations involved the publication of ambassadors' memoirs; studying religion led to a recounting of the achievements of popes and bishops, generally holy and pious; studying administrative history (written from the records of offices located in Paris) was represented as being the history of a whole people. A retrospective psychoanalysis of the historians of the nineteenth century would probably reveal that many of the historians who chose to write about monarchy more or less identified themselves with the monarch, that the historian of a particular minister sometimes imagined he was himself governing the country. An elementary Freudian interpretation could explain many of the curious histories that were published.

Yet, the first serious attempts at local history were made by historians and intellectuals who rank with the best. They understood that a thesis or interpretation, however ingenious, needs to be supported by precise facts; precise facts have a space as well as a time dimension. Thus, Sébastien Vauban, pleading for fiscal reform, used the precise examples of the Vézelay election, his native *pays*, and Normandy, where he had often been.³ Thus Messance, a demographer,⁴ rightly opposing the thesis of French depopulation so brilliantly advanced by intellectuals as famous

though unqualified as demographers as Montesquieu and Voltaire, proved with a strictly regional analysis of numerous parishes in the Lyonnais, Auvergne, and Upper Normandy that the French population had risen markedly between the end of the seventeenth century and the end of the eighteenth. Alexis de Tocqueville, with his great design, which was to understand at the same time the dying Ancien Régime and the French Revolution, used the provincial record offices, particularly in Tours, and illustrated with actual examples the accomplishments of the states of Languedoc.⁵ But can a historical form depend upon the work of men of genius?

Alphonse Feillet's technique was more common and more commonly used. Feillet, an often-neglected historian of the misery in France at the time of the Fronde,⁶ was a contemporary of Napoléon III. He believed that the French people did not sufficiently know the misdoings of "legitimate" Bourbon monarchies. To support his rather simple thesis, having to do with the misery of the French before, during, and after the Fronde, Feillet used memoirs, letters, monographs, and essays published in large numbers in the nineteenth century: one could always find a French village where somebody was dying of the plague or malnutrition, or where soldiers' violence had created massive disorder in every month between 1640 and 1660. A careful reading of the same documents by a historian who wished to prove the opposite would certainly have been equally compelling. It is quite possible to prove that France was flourishing or that it was miserable during Louis XIII's reign: one needs only to choose one's evidence carefully in the sea of published local histories.

The Feillet method (though Feillet never thought of founding a method; this was still a time when few laid claim to being concerned with methodology) has in fact become very widely used. Any thesis, if it is brilliant, unexpected, or paradoxical, may be supported by selected examples chosen from old scholarly studies of different provinces. History becomes a game where the guiltless amateurs of local history provide others with materials they find useful.

Only in the last twenty years has a new kind of local history become possible. The return to the unexploited archives of a given region and a given period was brought back into fashion by historians who generally were not born in the region studied and were not therefore expressing filial piety. This new trend derived from dissatisfaction with current historical methods, and a concern to

establish new kinds of historical questions. Historians of the preceding generation were overwhelmingly preoccupied with the problems of the upper classes. To use French examples, it would be correct to say that the old school was interested in lawmakers and not in law enforcement, in those who governed and not in the governed, in the clergy and not in the faithful, in the memoirs of men of letters describing their countries and not in the realities of the country itself. The return to local history proceeds from a new interest in social history—that is, the history of a whole society, not only the happy few who governed it, judged it, ground it down, or taught it—the history of groups of men, sometimes called orders, classes, *états*, who lived together. This was history as keenly interested in the bodies and minds of the many as in the world-wide plans or profound thoughts of the few; as concerned with the history of bread, oil, and wine as with the history of corporate statutes and military rules. But a history that undertakes all aspects of human life in all classes of men meets first a major obstacle: numbers.

It is not too difficult to study thirty French intendants or twenty ambassadors; trying to study the hundreds of thousands of townsmen and millions of countrymen in all aspects of their lives presents insuperable difficulties. Historians concerned with such matters do not complain of the lack of documents but of their number. Lacking any adequate sampling techniques, and given the state of the archives, historians tried to limit their difficulties by restricting their gaze to a particular geographic region whose records were well gathered and could be analyzed by one man working alone. Lucien Febvre, as early as 1911, did this for the Franche-Comté; Gaston Roupnel did the same ten years later for the Dijon region.⁷ These early works went unnoticed, probably because they were too strictly regional. In the French universities of that time (and even of the years following), such history was thought too limited. But these pioneers soon had followers, and they were soon joined by others, so many others that a sort of overproduction of regional history, at least in France, is a real threat today.

Why were these regional monographs important? They established certain proofs, limited in some instances, but proofs nonetheless; their statistics, compiled with a safety-margin, challenged some of the “general” ideas, prejudices, and approximations that had held sway in the absence of more precise investigation.

A few examples may serve to suggest what has been achieved.

It had been common for a long time (and it is still too often common) to oppose unconditionally the nobility of the "sword" to the nobility of the "robe," that is to say, a hereditary nobility to a nobility conferred by appointment to certain important judicial functions. The judges of the French *parlements* were sometimes characterized as bourgeois. The careful thesis of Jean Meyer on the Breton nobility in the eighteenth century⁸ proved irrefutably that there was not a single bourgeois and very few former bourgeois in the *Parlement* of Brittany, and that the difference between nobility of the sword and nobility of the robe was nonexistent. The members of the Breton *Parlement* were the descendants of the oldest noble families that had dispensed justice in their province. Obviously, what holds for Brittany may not be equally true of other provinces; the historian's task is to make as painstaking a study of the membership of these other French provincial *parlements* as has been made in Brittany.

To take a very different example, the growth of the seignorial system (which the Marxists call feudal) in France seemed to be quite common; an edict by Louis XIV was sometimes cited to show how the last allodial tenures fared under that king. R. Boutruche, in his study on allodial tenure in the Bordeaux region, has drawn our attention to the fact that completely free lands and peasants sometimes survived the Middle Ages.⁹ In his book on the Lower Auvergne, Abel Poitrineau shows, on the basis of notarial documents, that the proportion of allodial tenures sometimes approached 50 per cent in many rural communities of eighteenth-century Auvergne.¹⁰ This phenomenon will probably be found to have been common in other parts of the country as well (mainly in central, eastern, and southern France). The result of these many researches is the inescapable (but unanticipated) conclusion that a part of France during the Ancien Régime (and, by definition, the Middle Ages as well) did not undergo the seignorial system.

It was known that certain feudal customs such as *mortmain* had survived in remote parts of eastern France. Voltaire once spoke of the "serfs du Mont Jura"; the king in the eighteenth century liberated the last serfs who lived on the lands of which he was seigneur. New researches by Abel Poitrineau and Pierre de Saint-Jacob suggest that important groups of peasants subject to *mortmain* were to be found in central France; the study by Régine Robin on northern Burgundy (Auxois) reveals many more of them. It is possible that a fifth of the peasants of this small region lived under a system

that was in fact a form of extenuated serfage.¹¹ Other discoveries of the same nature may be expected for eastern France. This phenomenon was neither known nor understood until minute studies carried on at the village level and seigniorial level were undertaken.

Our image of rural France in this period has been substantially altered by these new insights. Thus, for example, the penetration of Indian corn into Aquitaine in the eighteenth century (an old assertion that even Fernand Braudel thought to repeat recently) is now dated to the seventeenth century. This knowledge is based wholly on the research of young historians who took an interest in the small corn markets of southeast France.¹² The idea, often repeated, that the southern half of France used a biennial rotation system in its corn fields was blasted when a diary of the journeys made by J. F. Henry de Richeprey, an agronomist and officer of the king, was published by a regional learned society.¹³ It is now known that biennial rotation was not the rule; all types of rotations were used in the south (and an even greater variety in the west).

The very different attitudes of the peasants with respect to the clergy have been explained by referring to the rate of tithe that existed in a particular region. The tithe was very low in Lower Brittany (3 per cent) and very high in the southeast (from 10 to 12.5 per cent).¹⁴ The clericalism of one region and the anticlericalism of the other has roots that are more ancient than is sometimes realized. One could go on endlessly to indicate what the new researches, local and rural, have contributed to altering our perceptions of Europe's past. It must be said that the researches have not been only those of French historians working on French materials; mention must be made of the renewal of English, Belgian, and Dutch history as a result of the local studies undertaken by W. G. Hoskins on Leicestershire, Joseph Ruwet on the *Herve pays*, and B. Slicher van Bath on Overijssel.¹⁵

The careful practice of local history and the multiplication of monographs on specific regions may lead much further; they may serve to destroy many of the general conceptions that once seemed so strong and were embodied in so many books, papers, and lectures. Thus, for example, the so-called "crisis" of the seventeenth century and the so-called "agricultural revolution" of the eighteenth century are certain to be reconsidered in the light of the material now being developed.

A whole book would probably be needed to bring out the nuances of, let alone to destroy the myth of the seventeenth-

century "crisis," at least in France. The word "crisis" is itself unsuitable; *crise* in French means a violent but brief phenomenon; the use of the term in this sense seems to be disappearing. In my own study of Beauvaisis, I found no justification for the idea that there was a severe crisis in the period previous to the Fronde except for the incidence of epidemics and high mortality attendant on these, common in the seventeenth century (as well as the sixteenth). Population was rising, prices were going up, though slowly, the incomes of landowners were rising, and textile production had reached new levels in Beauvais in the 1630's. It was only in the second half of the century that conditions seemed to deteriorate. It is interesting that subsequent local studies in other areas suggested other patterns. In a thorough study of the northern textile cities, particularly Amiens, Pierre Deyon showed with impressive statistics the character of industrial growth in that area; in doing so, he supported my comments about the "blissful reign" of Louis XIII. After 1660, when Colbert was minister, textile activity came to life again; the industrial "crisis" was put off, and rightly, to the last years of Louis XIV's reign.¹⁶ In his blunt, strange, but substantial thesis, René Baehrel discarded for rural Lower Provence the conception of there having been a crisis in the seventeenth century: he advanced the idea of a general improvement in conditions interrupted by a more difficult period every thirty years.¹⁷ E. Le Roy Ladurie, in his researches focused on the neighboring region of Provence, postponed the coming of a depression till the years following the Holland war—that is, till the 1680's. His new research, especially his methodical use of documents relating to the ecclesiastical tithe, led him to the conclusion that prosperity continued during Colbert's age, and reached a sort of climax, with greater agricultural production in the years between 1660 and 1680. In southern France the Fronde was never important; as there were no famines in the fifties and sixties, nearly the whole of the seventeenth century—at least until 1680 or 1690—was characterized by expansion.¹⁸ Michel Morineau discovered through his studies in the Dutch record offices and libraries that the American treasures poured more lavishly into Europe in the second half of the seventeenth century than they did in the sixteenth century, so dear to E. J. Hamilton and P. Chaunu.¹⁹ Thus, a series of local studies has led to a serious questioning of the oft-repeated thesis about the general crisis in the seventeenth century. If it occurred, it came at the very end of the century, at least in France. The subject, obvi-

ously, is far from exhausted; new researches will perhaps bring new opinions and will revive old ones. It is quite certain, however, that without serious provincial monographs (written by professional historians and not by amateurs) a general revision of the kind suggested would not have been possible.

The "agricultural nonrevolution" associated with Michel Morineau involves a period even closer to us in time. A careful study of the accounts of ecclesiastical tithes and agricultural properties over several centuries allow Morineau to come to a striking set of conclusions: the same agricultural yields are observable in the Middle Ages, the sixteenth, eighteenth, and even nineteenth centuries where the same conditions of climate, political order, and good farming prevail; where, in some periods, outputs decline, there are always easily identifiable reasons: war, bad climatic conditions, social unrest, a closing down of markets. The eighteenth century generally combined fairly favorable conditions, but the outputs were not substantially higher than they had been; they merely reproduced the best outputs of earlier times. A young historian of Sicily, Maurice Aymard, using the same methods in a quite different place, maintains that the yields of good Sicilian corn fields are the same in the eighteenth century as in Cicero's time. An upper and unvarying limit of agricultural output would appear to have existed. No rapid growth can be observed before the nineteenth or the twentieth century. The changes that historians thought they were discovering were changes of short duration, or geographical variances between different regions.²⁰ Not all historians are ready to accept the rather startling theses propounded by Morineau. They try to discover other regional examples to refute him; often, they are more comparisons of the bad periods of the seventeenth century with the best periods of the eighteenth. The idea of a technological limit appropriate to most regions has certainly to be kept in mind. The slight rise and fall between a maximum and a minimum yield (the one and the other being proper to different regions) probably expresses what was true most of the time. The real agrarian revolution began to "take off" very late—nearly everywhere in the second half of the nineteenth century or even later; sometimes, even more recently.

A now very lively branch of history—historical demography—owes its development to the narrowest type of local history. This field was vegetating, with rumors and proofless theories as its staples, before historians and statisticians became interested in modest, neg-

lected, and widespread documents: parish registers. Using parish registers from Gien (on the Loire River) and from several other places, Jean Meuvret pointed to the link between economic crises and demographic crises in northern France in the seventeenth century and to the weakening of these crises after the middle of the eighteenth. An examination of about thirty parishes in Beauvaisis was the first attempt to make a serious demographic analysis of a whole region. Louis Henry, using the register of Crulai (in Normandy), gave new impulse to the professional use of such data; soon afterwards, he laid down the well-defined rules of method (now unquestioned) that are appropriate for such study. Recognition of the value of parish documents (at a time when, in France, censuses were rare, not well known, and not easy to use) allowed studies to be made of fecundity, marriage, and infantile mortality, with a possibility of accuracy never previously attained. The growing monographic literature soon demonstrated that neither France nor Europe looked like either Crulai or Beauvaisis, but it allowed historians to raise a whole series of new questions: thus, for example, about the beginning of birth control procedures, about nursing practices, about mobility more generally. The problem of illegitimacy and sexual intercourse prior to marriage, with patterns so different as between France and England, and perhaps so typical of a kind of modern mentality,²¹ could not have been examined before the arrival of good methodical censuses (1840 in France). Only the parish registers provide the key to all such problems for an earlier period; without them, such problems could not even be tackled.

The success of local and regional historical studies has been considerable in France. The reason for the success is not explicable simply in terms of the methods used. Rather, it must be seen how much of the inspiration for such study has come from the *Annales* school. That school, severely critical of traditional ideas and elitist prejudices, drew attention to new social groups and provided felicitous interdisciplinary associations between historians and scholars in economics, sociology, psychology, biology, and demography. A regeneration of historical studies, with new methods and ideas, was made possible by a new generation that had sufficient talent to make itself heard.

All success brings with it excess. As historical work in France is carried out mainly within universities, it tends to reproduce the

faults of the universities. Soon, a servile imitation of innovation establishes a new tradition, or a negative and violent contestation which often ends in reinforcing the thing originally disputed. One can already foresee the birth of yet another novelty, which will owe much to contact between linguistics, psychoanalysis, and history²² (just as soon as psychoanalysts and linguists agree to study archives, and historians agree to study linguistics and psychoanalysis). A brutal reaction, ideological and political, could also take place, throwing French historians back fifty years or more.

In the most recent period, large numbers of advanced students and young historians devoted themselves to parish monographs. For a year (for the certificate *mémoires de maîtrises*) or for several years (for the thesis of the *troisième cycle*, a kind of Ph.D.), they analyzed, using the archives, different aspects of life in one or several parishes, most frequently in the eighteenth century. That century left abundant archives, they were varied, and they were usually easy to read. The work of novices is generally worth about as much as their authors (and the professor who advised them) are worth. Most often, they simply confirmed what was already known. Some, however, did contain certain new ideas and provided unexpected information—thus, for example, on the early attitude toward birth control of the winegrowers of the Ile de France in the eighteenth century,²³ or on the composition of communities in the villages of Brie (to the east of Paris) in the same century,²⁴ new information has been provided. It had been thought that the communities of Brie were dominated by rich farm workers; one now finds that several were dominated by the poor, numerous *manouvriers*, who united against the rich peasants through the help of the Intendant General of Paris. Many such parish monographs are poor; they deserve to be forgotten; others are excellent.

Be that as it may, their multiplication approaches overproduction and presents at least three disadvantages. First, it is difficult to find them, read them, or make a synthesis, the more so as the majority of them are not published. Second, an advanced student or a fledgling historian is unlikely to have a sufficient competence to deal with the different elements necessary to good local analysis; law, institutions, economics, demography, sociology, religion are not subjects easily mastered. In the last analysis, there is always the danger of a return to amateurism. Third, even when the monograph is good, the description of an isolated village raises more

problems than it resolves: Does the exact information provided have local, provincial, or general significance? To decide such questions, one would need to have other monographs on neighboring parishes as well. The questions and the demands are endless.

The solution, obviously, lies in a systematization of monographic study. In the demographic domain, this systematization is assured by the Société de Démographie Historique in collaboration with the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, the Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques, and a number of universities; the first two institutions assure publication of the best monographs (or, failing that, of at least a résumé of them). At Aix-en-Provence, the work of advanced students has been directed toward social analysis of the rural communities in the eighteenth century. At Caen, Pierre Chaunu follows the same systematized effort for Normandy. At the Centre de Recherches sur les Civilisations de l'Europe Moderne de Paris, Roland Mousnier has centered the work of his students around several themes: revolts of the seventeenth century, governmental staff of the Ancien Régime, Parisian society during the same period.²⁵ The difficulty is to achieve genuinely good collaborative publications.

Large provincial studies continue to be undertaken, and many are nearing publication. We expect studies on Anjou, Upper Normandy, the region south of Paris, Lorraine, Dauphiné, Provence, Toulouse, and Gascogne; others will follow somewhat later.²⁶ These major studies are the only means of verifying the validity of old ideas and propositions, or of discovering new problems and hypotheses. The new trend, in my view a good one, is to examine one or two problems in one or two regions. Thus, for example, the interesting and original work by François Lebrun on men and death in Anjou during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is awaited with great impatience. Two of my own best students have recently chosen to concentrate their efforts on the problem of marriage in Champagne and the problem of *metayage* in western France from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Large provincial studies, concentrating on one important problem, analyzed over a long period (a century or more)—this is perhaps the best course to take for those who wish to remain faithful to the idea of investigating local/provincial history.

I warmly thank my daughter Annie Gresle for her gentle assistance in the English language.

REFERENCES

1. For example, the lawyer Guy Coquille (1523-1603) wrote the *Histoire du pays et duché de Nivernais* (Paris: Vefue A. L'Angelier, 1612); another lawyer, Antoine Loisel (1536-1617), wrote *Mémoire des pays, villes, comté et comtes, évesché et évesques, pairrie, commune et personnes de renom de Beauvais et de Beauvaisis* (Paris: S. Thiboust, 1617). A provincial history of the seventeenth century is *Histoire du Berry et du diocèse de Bourges* (1689). In the eighteenth century, the most famous provincial histories were: Claude Courtépée and Edmé Bégouillet, *Description générale et particulière du duché de Bourgogne*, 7 vols. (Dijon, 1751-1767), and those by Benedictine historians such as Dom Vaissete (Languedoc), Dom Maurice (Bretagne), and Dom Plancher. For a general knowledge of this kind of study, see French bibliographies such as: Henri Hauser, *Les sources de l'histoire de France, XVIe siècle*, 4 vols. (Paris: A. Picard, 1906-1915); Louis André, *Les sources de l'histoire de France au XVIIe siècle*, 8 vols. (Paris: A. Picard, 1913-1935), esp. vol. 8, chap. XIV, "Histoire provinciale et locale."
2. An almost exhaustive bibliography of this literature is in Robert de Lasteyrie and René Gandilhon, *Bibliographie générale des travaux historiques et archéologiques publiés par les sociétés savantes de la France* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1944-1961).
3. Sébastien Vauban, *Projet d'une dixme royale* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1933); for the memoir on the Vézelay election, see pp. 274-295; for examples in Normandy, see pp. 39-42 (and elsewhere).
4. Messance, *Recherches sur la population des généralités d'Auvergne, de Lyon, de Rouen . . .* (Paris: Durand, 1766); Messance, *Nouvelles recherches sur la population de la France . . .* (Lyon, 1788).
5. Alexis de Tocqueville, *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*; see the Appendix, *Des pays d'Etats et en particulier du Languedoc*, especially the last lines.
6. Alphonse Feillet, *La misère au temps de la Fronde et Saint Vincent de Paul* (Paris: Didier, 1862).
7. Lucien Febvre, *Phillipe II et la Franche-Comté* (Paris, 1911), to be republished shortly by the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes and the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme. Gaston Roupnel, *La ville et la campagne au XVIIe siècle, étude sur les populations du pays dijonnais* (1922), 2d ed. (Paris: Colin, 1955, by the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Section VI).
8. Jean Meyer, *La noblesse bretonne au XVIIIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1966).
9. Robert Boutruche, *L'alleu en Bordelais et en Bazadais du XIe au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1947).
10. Abel Poitrineau, *La vie rurale en Basse-Auvergne au XVIIIe siècle, 1726-*

- 1789, 2 vols. (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1965), esp. pp. 341-344.
11. Poitrineau, *La vie rurale en Basse Auvergne*; Pierre de Saint-Jacob, *Les paysans de la Bourgogne du Nord au dernier siècle de l'Ancien Régime* (Paris, 1966), pp. 38-40; Regine Robin, *La société française en 1789, Semur-en-Auxois* (Paris, 1970), p. 120: "L'Auxois est terre de mainmorte, 20% des paroisses du bailliage sont mainmortables."
 12. Fernand Braudel, *Civilisation matérielle et capitalisme*, I (Paris: Colin, 1967), 126 (Indian corn, eighteenth century); Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Les paysans de Languedoc* (Paris: Flammarion, 1969), p. 71 (Indian corn, 1637-1678); Georges and Geneviève Frêche, *Le prix des grains, des vins et des légumes à Toulouse, 1486-1868* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1967), esp. pp. 20-22 ("De l'apparition du maïs dans la mercoriale," in 1639 certainly, in 1618 perhaps).
 13. *Journal des voyages en Haute-Guienne de J. F. Henry de Richeprey*, in H. Guilhamon, *Archives historiques du Rouergue*, XIX (Rodez, 1952); see especially the cases of Sainte-Eulalie du Larzac, p. 140, of Compeyre, p. 168, and many others.
 14. For Brittany, Henri See, *Les classes rurales en Bretagne du XVIIe siècle à la Révolution* (Paris: V. Giard et E. Brière, 1906), and some studies by my former students in Rennes, unfortunately not published. For the south-east, see the excellent book by Armand Sarramon, *Les paroisses du diocèse de Comminges en 1786*, in *Collection de Documents inédits sur l'histoire économique de la Révolution Française* (Paris, 1968).
 15. W. G. Hoskins, *Studies in Leicestershire Agrarian History in Leicestershire Archeological Society* (1949), and *Essays in Leicestershire History* (Liverpool: University Press, 1950). Joseph Ruwet, *L'agriculture et les classes rurales au pays de Herve sous l'Ancien Régime* (Liège, 1943). B. Slicher van Bath, *Een samenleving onder spanning: geschiedenis van het platteland in Overijssel* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957).
 16. Pierre Deyon, *Amiens, capitale provinciale, étude sur la société urbaine au XVIIe siècle* (Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1967), esp. chap XIII, and *La production manufacturière en France et ses problèmes*, in *XVIIe siècle*, no. 70-71 (1966), 47-63.
 17. René Baehrel, *Une croissance, la Basse-Provence rurale, fin du XVIIe siècle-1789* (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1961).
 18. E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Les paysans de Languedoc*; and "Enquêtes en cours, Dîmes et produit net agricole," *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 24 (1969), 826-832.
 19. Michel Morineau, "D'Amsterdam à Séville, de quelles réalités l'histoire des prix est-elle le miroir?" *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 23 (1968), 178-205 (see p. 196 for the figures for 1661-1700).
 20. On the agricultural nonrevolution see: M. Morineau, "Y a-t-il eu une révo-

- lution agricole en France au XVIIIe siècle?" *Revue historique*, 92 (1968), 299-326; Denis Richet, "Croissance et blocages en France du XVe au XVIIIe siècle," *Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 23 (1968), 759-787; E. Le Roy Ladurie, quoted above in note 18; M. Morineau, *Révolutions invisibles en France au XVIIIe siècle, agriculture et démographie*, to be published in *Cahiers des Annales* (1970 or 1971).
21. See my forthcoming article "Historical Demography and the Reinterpretation of Early Modern French History: A Research Review," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, no. 1 (1970).
 22. Robin, *La société française en 1789*, pp. 229-343, "Le vocabulaire des cahiers de doléances."
 23. Michel Tyvaert and Jean-Claude Giacchetti, *Argenteuil, 1740-1790, étude de démographie historique*, in *Annales de démographie historique* (1969), pp. 40-61.
 24. Maryvonne Brassens, "Recherches sur les biens communaux à l'Est de Paris," unpublished *mémoire de maîtrise*, Sorbonne, Paris, 1970.
 25. See *Annales de démographie historique* (1969), pp. 11-292 (twenty monographical studies); Michel Vovelle, "Etat présent des études de structure agraire en Provence à la fin de l'Ancien Régime," *Provence historique*, no. 74 (1969), 450-484. *Annales de Normandie* and *Cahiers des Annales de Normandie* (studies directed by Pierre Chaunu). Publications of the Centre de Recherches sur les Civilisations de l'Europe Moderne, directed by Roland Mousnier; the most recent publications are Madeleine Foisil, *La révolte des Nu-Pieds et les révoltes normandes de 1639* (Paris, 1970), and Roland Mousnier and others, *Le Conseil du Roi de Louis XII à la Révolution* (Paris, 1970).
 26. To be published soon, thesis on Anjou by François Lebrun; to be published in the coming years, south Paris region by Jean Jacquart, Upper Normandy by G. Lemarchand, Lorraine by G. Cabourdin, Dauphiné by B. Bonnin, Provence by M. Vovelle and R. Pillorget, Toulouse by G. Freche, Gascogne by Anne Zink.