Statistics and quantification assume an important role as one attempts to analyze the pattern of land distribution and utilization in eighteenth-century Lourmarin. Although figures for per capita income and land ownership were used mainly as a measurement of an individual's wealth vis-à-vis his neighbor and thus were employed primarily to ascertain a villager's tax payment, a great amount of data pertaining to the economy of eighteenth-century Lourmarin has survived. This extant data enables us to examine in detail a village whose economy was based on agriculture but which also was in the process of developing an embryonic textile industry.

Reflecting the primacy of the land, the most accurate and detailed figures compiled by the village are found in Lourmarin's tax roll (cadastre).¹ The cadastre listed in minute detail all real property, including houses and other structures, in the village.² Taxes were levied on the basis of the

¹ This judgment is based on the fact that the cadastre was drafted by expert surveyors and was checked by Lourmarin's notables and verified by all taxpayers. See Chapter IV for a more detailed discussion of the drafting of the cadastre.

² During the eighteenth century in other areas of France, it was the practice to include such items as household furnishings and animals in each individual's evaluation, but this practice had been ended in Provence and the cadastre listed only land of all types as well as every structure on or improvement to the land. Raoul Busquet, "Les cadastres et les 'unites cadastrales' en Provence du XVᵉ au XVIIIᵉ siècle," Annales de Provence, VII (April, June, 1910), 119-34, 161-84.
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cadastre, and from 1680 onward the village elders constantly complained that their tax roll, drawn up about 1640, was hopelessly out of date, but a new cadastre was not commissioned until 1770. Comprising two huge leather-bound volumes, this document is an invaluable source of information about the land, its utilization, and its distribution. A second tax roll was drafted in 1791 and, used in conjunction, these two documents provide a fairly accurate although not entirely precise description of the land which made up the territory of eighteenth-century Lourmarin.

The territory of Lourmarin had an area of 4,722 acres, or about seven and one-half square miles. If the irregular shape of the parish were regularized, it would have measured three by two and one-half miles. The village proper, containing most of the houses plus the church, town hall, clock tower, and the artisans' shops, was near the geographic center and adjacent to the chateau. The territory also contained the small, badly built cottages of the poorest peasants as well as a few comfortable country homes belonging to the gentlemen farmers. Most of the Lourmarinois lived in the village in houses and apartments clustered along the extremely narrow streets.

The land of Lourmarin was recorded in the 1770 cadastre with the following distribution according to use.\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain land</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasteland</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the general conservatism of rural areas and the absence of any mention of a significant change at Lourmarin specifically, one can assume that land was divided by cultures in about the same ratio throughout the entire period under study—that is, one half planted in grain, between one-fifth and one-sixth in vines, and the rest divided between meadow, orchard, and wasteland.

\(^3\) *A.M., Cadastre, 1770.*
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According to a detailed report drawn up in 1790, the village produced about equal amounts of wheat, rye, and maslin (a mixture of wheat and rye known locally as consegal or mèteil). Lourmarin, as well as most of Provence, used both the two- and the three-field system of crop rotation. Existing leases are not very informative because the lessee was instructed only to plant the land "in the usually prescribed manner." Occasionally leases were more explicit, as occurred in 1762 when Louis Lajon, travailleur, agreed to plant "one-third in wheat, one-third in rye, and leave one-third fallow." The second field was sometimes planted in vegetables rather than rye while livestock, primarily sheep, were grazed on the fallow.

An examination of Appendix A indicates that there were few oxen in Lourmarin in 1790; there is no reason to believe that this figure was ever higher earlier in the century. The existence of few draft animals combined with the small plots supports the conclusion that Lourmarin's agriculture was essentially a hoe-culture, a conclusion that agrees with Marc Bloch's description of Provence as a region of "irregular open-fields" where "fields were almost as broad as they were long and were scattered almost at random over the village lands." Bloch also notes an unusual feature still evident in Lourmarin today, that is, wheat and grape vines are often grown on the same parcel of land.

Yields averaged about five to one, or ten bushels per acre, and after seed was set aside each fall for the next spring's planting, only about one-half the grain necessary to feed Lourmarin's population remained.

---

4 See Appendix A for the complete État of the Community in 1790.
6 A.Not., Ailhaud, October 20, 1762.
8 Ibid., p. 23.
9 Lourmarin's yield of about five to one was typical in the eighteenth century. The actual yield, according to Appendix A, was wheat, six to one, maslin, five to one, and rye, four to one. Festy has examined the diversity of yields in France and concludes that four or five to one was not uncommon. Leroy-Ladurie and Baehrel have found the same fluctuation in Languedoc and Provence, depending upon the quality of soil, seeds, implements, etc. Paul Masson has found the five to one figure applicable to Provence as a whole. Michel Morineau has investigated, and provisionally rejected, the idea of an agricultural revolution in eighteenth-century France. What does appear evident to Morineau is that agricultural innovation never came from the south. Festy, L'agriculture pendant la Révolution française,
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The grain deficit was chronic although the amount which had to be purchased elsewhere depended upon the harvest; there was no possibility of a surplus. Cash needed to purchase grain in neighboring markets was obtained by selling the excess olive oil produced in Lourmarin since the yield of oil in an average year was about twice that consumed by the villagers. Severe winters, dry summers, and heavy rains adversely affected the grain harvest, but the effect on the olive trees was much more devastating. Extreme cold might destroy 90 percent of the olive trees, a loss which would continue for several years until the new saplings began to bear fruit. The extreme variability in the olive crop was demonstrated by the harvest of 1789 when the orchards produced only two percent of a normal year's yield because of the severe winter of 1788-89.\(^{10}\) When poor years occurred, not only was there not enough olive oil for domestic needs, there was no surplus to alleviate the deficit in grain. The tillable land also produced a variety of fruits, vegetables, and nuts, primarily almonds, all of which were consumed in the village.

Just over one-sixth of the land was devoted to the growing of grapes. Wine was a popular beverage and according to the 1790 report Lourmarin annually produced 20 percent more wine than was consumed, the excess being sold outside the village.\(^{11}\) Meadowland constituted slightly less than one-tenth of the territory of Lourmarin, a small amount barely adequate to support a few livestock. The irrigation and maintenance of the meadow was regulated by a board of governors made up of local residents who owned property watered by the Aigue Brun, the only creek flowing through the territory of Lourmarin. These property holders assessed themselves a special levy for repairs to the culverts of the Aigue Brun and met periodically to supervise the system. A lengthy 72-page document drawn up

\(^{10}\) A.M., D.M., May 10, 17, 24, 1789. See also Appendix A. \(État\) of the Community, 1790.

\(^{11}\) See Appendix A.

January 26, 1685, reiterated a 1616 agreement designed to preserve the system.\textsuperscript{12} Since Provence was a region of the taille réelle, its taxes were paid to the royal government in a lump sum.\textsuperscript{13} Each Provençal village's cadastre was very important because the provincial government in Aix apportioned the tax burden among the various cities and towns on the basis of the tax rolls. But a serious problem arose in Provence because each community evaluated its property differently, making an equitable division of the tax burden virtually impossible. In an attempt to remedy this deficiency, a royal declaration of July 9, 1715, ordered the drafting of new cadastres in which property was to be "evaluated at its true value."\textsuperscript{14} In 1724 the General Assembly of the Communities of Provence announced its intention to implement this reform throughout the province, but resolve seemed to be lacking. Furthermore, a staff of expert surveyors would have been required to insure that property actually was evaluated at its true value. It is therefore not surprising that many communities continued to undervalue their holdings when they drafted a new cadastre. Raoul Busquet, former archivist of the department of Bouches-du-Rhône, has found that 13 of 22 village cadastres drafted shortly after the announced regulation was promulgated were undervalued by at least 25 percent; some by as much as 60.\textsuperscript{15} Busquet felt that because of increased supervision, cadastres drafted after 1750 tend to reflect more accurately the true value of property, especially land.\textsuperscript{16}

When Lourmarin finally drafted a new cadastre in 1770, it was assumed that property would be recorded at its true value; however, the actual evaluation used was never mentioned. Busquet says that houses and other structures were always listed at a fraction of their real value and that the evaluation varied from community to community.\textsuperscript{17} An examination of Lourmarin's cadastre indicates that the various types of land were evaluated

\textsuperscript{12} A.M., Copie d'extrait des registres du greffe de Lourmarin, January 26, 1685, 72 pages.

\textsuperscript{13} In the south the taille réelle was a land-tax on the revenue from landed property whereas the taille personnelle in the north was a tax on all revenue. Albert Soboul, Précis d'histoire de la Révolution française (Paris, 1962), p. 74.

\textsuperscript{14} Busquet, "Les cadastres." p. 175.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., pp. 176–77.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
at slightly below their market value while the different types of buildings were seriously undervalued.\textsuperscript{18}

There were 365 individual entries in the 1770 \textit{cadastre}, one for each landowner. Of course 365 is not the precise figure of the number of families living in Lourmarin since some families owned no property at all while others who owned property in Lourmarin lived elsewhere, usually in a neighboring village. The total evaluation of real property in Lourmarin was 249,250 livres, a figure that certainly was too low. The average evaluation was 683 livres; the median was 249 livres. If the small property holdings of the "outsiders" who owned land in Lourmarin were excluded, both the average and the median figures above would be slightly higher.\textsuperscript{19}

The median figure is also lowered by the large number of small holdings since 109 entries, or 30 percent, included property evaluated at less than 100 livres while 67 individuals owned property valued at less than 50 livres (see Table I–1).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Capital Evaluation of Property in Lourmarin in the 1770 Cadastre}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Property Evaluation & Number \\
\hline
0–100 livres & 109 \\
101–200 & 52 \\
201–300 & 40 \\
301–400 & 36 \\
401–500 & 19 \\
501–600 & 12 \\
601–700 & 14 \\
701–800 & 8 \\
801–900 & 4 \\
901–1,000 & 11 \\
1,001–2,000 & 29 \\
2,001–3,000 & 16 \\
3,001–4,000 & 6 \\
4,001–5,000 & 1 \\
5,001–6,000 & 3 \\
6,001–7,000 & 2 \\
over 7,000 livres & 3 \\
\hline
Total & 365 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{18} A.M., Cadastre, 1770.

\textsuperscript{19} There were 60 individuals who owned property evaluated at 1,000 livres or more in 1770, all of whom were native Lourmarinois. In 1791 there were only 14 landholders classed as "outsiders" or "unidentified" and their holdings were all small. Because of the difficulty of identification in the 1770 \textit{cadastre}, the 1791 figure was used for "outsiders." It is very probable that the number of "outsiders" in 1770 was about the same as in 1791. A.M., Cadastre, 1770; Cont.Fon., 1791.
Georges Lefebvre has estimated that in Flanders, a reasonably fertile area, a minimum of about 13 acres (5 ha.) was needed in order that a peasant might be self-sufficient.\textsuperscript{20} Pierre Goubert has put forward the figure of between ten and 12 acres in the Beauvais.\textsuperscript{21} However, because of the extreme variation in the land even within a fairly well-defined area, these figures cannot, by their very nature, be precise, and of course a much higher acreage figure is needed in areas less favored. What does seem clear, however, is that even in the best agricultural areas, the majority of the inhabitants had less land than that required for self-sufficiency.

If the total amount of land in Lourmarin, excluding that of the seigneur, were divided by the number of landholders, the average would be slightly more than ten acres, divided into several small pieces scattered throughout the village. Since 60 Lourmarinois, about 16 percent of the total population, had land evaluated at over 1,000 livres, well over one-half of the villagers owned less than ten acres. Those who owned less than ten acres probably supplemented their income by farming as tenants and on shares. The income derived from the handicraft of the artisans and from the local textile industry, coupled with supplementary farming, spelled the real difference between starvation and subsistence to those who owned little or no land.\textsuperscript{22} The 109 Lourmarinois whose land was evaluated at less than 100 livres included 28 artisans, of whom seven were weavers engaged almost exclusively in the textile industry. Another 68 were travailleurs who also farmed land owned by others. Although no precise figures are available, one may speculate that most of these land-poor travailleurs supplemented their income by performing certain essential services in the textile industry, particularly during the winter.

Property belonging to Lourmarin’s seigneur and largest landholder, François de Bruny, of course was not included in the 1770 cadastre, and


\textsuperscript{21} Pierre Goubert, Beauvais et le beauvaisis de 1600 à 1730 (Paris, 1960), pp. 158–73.

consequently is not listed in Table I-1. Unfortunately it is impossible to determine the seigneur’s exact holdings in 1770. However, we do possess the entry for Jean-Baptiste Jérôme Bruny, François’s son, in the 1791 Contribution Foncière as well as an inventory of Bruny’s property in 1800. Bruny’s holdings in these two documents were the same, and since there is no record of any purchases in Lourmarin after 1770, one may project the seigneur’s holdings in 1770 by referring to the two documents discussed above. The seigneur owned about 150 acres of land, one half of it meadowland, plus a chateau, two ovens, grain mill, olive press, and assorted other buildings in 1770. It is impossible to know the exact value of this property, but by comparing the income from the seigneur’s property in 1791 with the income from the property of Pierre Henri Joseph de Girard, the largest roturier landholder in Lourmarin, we see that the evaluation of Bruny’s landed property in 1770 would have been about twice that of Girard’s, or about 25,000 livres.

Sieur Pierre Henri Joseph de Girard used the title écuyer although there is no record of his ever having received it officially. The Girard family originally came from Grenoble in the seventeenth century. Although almost all the large landowners were Protestant, the Girards were an exception. Like the few other wealthy Catholic families in Lourmarin who began as, and sometimes remained, officials of the government or the seigneur, Girard’s great-grandfather served as the seigneur’s agent. Girard’s father, who died in 1765, was mayor of Lourmarin for 11 years, including ten consecutive years from 1748 to 1757 when the community’s rules calling for annual elections and forbidding successive terms were ignored. Girard fils took an active interest in village politics and was elected mayor in 1783. He also served on the village council for 12 years and as auditor for three. By a judicious marriage in 1693 to Magdelene Ailhaud, daughter of a wealthy local bourgeois, by astute purchases, and by the happy accident that there had been only one surviving son in each generation, Pierre Henri Joseph de Girard owned property valued at 12,863 livres in 1770.

\[23\] A.M., Cont.Fon., 1791; M.C., 4580, fo. 132. January 12, 1800.
\[24\] A.M., Cont.Fon., 1791. This figure, of course, does not include the seigneur’s 1770 income from the various seigneurial monopolies and dues. See Chapter VI for a discussion of the seigneur and his income.
Pierre Henri Joseph de Girard was 41 years old in 1770 and was the father of one son, François Henri Joseph, and four daughters, all under seven years old. By 1775 he was the father of three more sons, Cézar François Henri, Henri Camille, and Philippe Henri. Like their older brother, the other sons were educated in Marseilles. The eldest, François Henri Joseph, became subprefect of Bouches-du-Rhône in the nineteenth century and was elected to the corps législatif under Napoleon and to the Chamber of Deputies after the Restoration. Henri Camille led the abortive Federalist movement in Lourmarin in 1793.

Philippe Henri, the youngest son, became Lourmarin’s most famous citizen as inventor of a mechanical flax-spinning mill and a steam engine. He went to Paris shortly after 1800 to pursue a teaching career in physics and chemistry begun in Marseilles six years before at the age of 19. Affected by the vicissitudes of Napoleonic policy, he worked with moderate success in Paris and although he had perfected his mechanical spinning mill, it went virtually unnoticed in the last days of the Empire. When the Austrians entered Paris in 1815, they were so impressed with his invention that they coaxed Girard to Vienna. He took most of his inventions with him and spent the next few years in Austria, Saxony, and Silesia until, in the early 1820’s, he found the village of Girardow in Poland and erected a giant spinning mill there. In 1825 he was named Chief Engineer of Mines in Poland. Philippe Henri Girard returned to Paris in the late 1830’s, wrote several articles about his inventions, and died there penniless in 1845. A statue of him was later erected in front of the railroad station at Avignon, chief-lieu of the Department of the Vaucluse. At present the Guide Michelin lists three things to see in Lourmarin—the restored chateau, the grave of Albert Camus, and the house where Philippe Girard was born, now housing Lourmarin’s public school on the first floor and a museum containing some of Girard’s inventions on the second.


The Girards were active in community affairs. In 1784 Pierre Henri Joseph and his sister contributed 800 livres to double the principal of a charitable foundation, the interest being used for poor relief. Pierre Girard was on friendly terms with the Marquis de Sade, a landowner in the neighboring village of Lacoste, donated considerable amounts of money to buy grain in the hard years of 1789 and 1790, did not openly oppose the Revolution, and died, a venerable senior statesman, in 1811 at the age of 82.

Girard owned 21 pieces of property comprising about 100 acres, including 50 acres planted in grain and 25 in meadowland. The remainder included orchards, vineyards, and a small amount of wasteland. He owned five houses, each of which had a courtyard and stable. Girard’s comfortable house in the village had 12 rooms, a balcony, and a terrace. Seigneur Bruny usually stayed there on his infrequent trips to Lourmarin rather than in his own chateau. Girard also owned two of the eight small buildings in the village where silk was spun, along with a sheepfold, a pigsty, a chicken coop, a poultry yard, and 14 other assorted buildings. After Girard, Lourmarin’s largest property holder was Sieur Jean Corgier, bourgeois, who owned property valued at 12,399 livres. His son, Jean Paul, had the unenviable position of mayor in 1789.

The median property evaluation in Lourmarin was 249 livres according to the 1770 cadastre. Barthelemy Reymond, travailleur, had property valued at exactly 249 livres. Reymond was 67 years old in 1770 and had been married for 42 years to Magdelene Chauvin. They were the parents of five daughters and one son, none of whom was living at home in 1770. Reymond had a small house in town and owned nine separate fields amounting to about three acres planted in grain, one of vineyard, one of wasteland, and one-sixth of an acre of orchard. His only son, also named Barthelemy, was 38 years old and owned slightly less land and an even smaller house. Holdings of this size could barely have provided a subsistence standard of living to their owners; about half of the villagers owned even less. Peasants like Reymond would have had to work on other land in order to survive.

29 This information is based on Girard's entry in the 1770 cadastre.  
30 This information is based on Reymond’s entry in the 1770 cadastre.
Altogether more than 3,100 pieces of land were listed in the 1770 cadastre. If one subtracts from the total area of Lourmarin the amount of land held by the seigneur, the average size of each piece of land was slightly less than one and one-half acre. And the average size was this large only because of the relative consolidation of property by the larger landholders such as Girard and Corgier. The average size of Reymond’s nine parcels was about one-half acre.

There were 266 houses (maisons) in the village ranging in size from Girard’s comfortable town house to the cramped apartments of the poor and the small combination shops and apartments of the artisans. There were also 88 farm houses, including Girard’s villa, which was only slightly less elegant than his town house. Many of the farm houses, however, were small hovels where the poor peasant family shared their daily life with a few tools, some chickens, and occasionally a pig. There were also 14 sheds (bastidons) normally used as storehouses, but housing on occasion the poorest peasants. In 1770 the total of 354 houses of all kinds in Lourmarin was supplemented by 150 stables, 91 pigstys, and 32 sheepfolds, plus a melange of various other structures. The care given to the drafting of the 1770 cadastre is obvious; when the experts scrutinized every staircase, terrace, and chicken coop, it must have been extremely difficult to hide even the smallest sign of real wealth.

Manufacturing in Lourmarin was important and was related to the village’s embryonic textile industry, which in the eighteenth century had not progressed much beyond the cottage industry stage; certainly no factories as we understand the term had been built. In 1790 the Etat of the Community listed the annual income from raw materials produced in Lourmarin and from the village’s manufacturing endeavors. The numerous flocks of sheep in the village produced about 3,000 pounds of wool annually which sold for 36 livres per hundred-weight (1,080 livres) while the 1,200 pounds of silk spun from cocoons brought 1,700 livres per hundred-

31 Listed in the 1770 cadastre were eight small buildings in which silk was spun, and a 1764 report noted that there were "10 or 12 stocking frames" in Lourmarin. Despite frequent references to the textile industry throughout the eighteenth century, there is no other quantitative information regarding the actual machinery used. A.M., D.M., July 15, 1764; Cadastre, 1770.
32 Appendix A, Etat of the Community. 1790.
weight (20,400 livres).\textsuperscript{33} The wool was woven into heavy and light woolen serge to be used for dresses and suits. Lourmarin's tailors and dressmakers retained a small quantity of serge for domestic consumption but most was exported and brought about 2,880 livres each year. Some wool was used locally in the manufacture of hats, worth 750 livres annually.\textsuperscript{34}

Lourmarin's most important manufacturing enterprise, valued at 12,050 livres in 1790, was the spinning of silk floss and the making of silk stockings by village weavers.\textsuperscript{35} Most of the thread, however, was exported in a rough state to Aix, Marseilles, Avignon, or Lyons where it was woven into the finished product.\textsuperscript{36} The value of flax produced in Lourmarin was estimated at 850 livres annually which, when made into linen, brought an additional income of 3,600 livres. Lourmarin's one lacemaker produced lace for the luxury trade valued at 600 livres.\textsuperscript{37}

The income from these varied manufacturing pursuits, combined with the smaller surplus from the sale of wine and olive oil, could be used to purchase grain in the markets of Pertuis, Aix, and Marseilles. The detailed figures in the 1790 report indicate that in a typical year Lourmarin's income would have been adequate to cover its expenditures for grain. Thus

\textsuperscript{33} There is an unfortunate lack of precise information on the silk industry in Lourmarin. For one thing it is difficult to measure the growth of this industry after 1680. We know from scattered references that there were several weavers in 1680 who were organized into an association that elected a syndic to oversee their operations in Lourmarin. There were mulberry trees in the village and the women were engaged in feeding the silk worms while the men were weavers. We also know that there were looms and stocking frames in Lourmarin, but no details of these operations have survived.

\textsuperscript{34} See Appendix A, \textit{Etat} of the Community, 1790.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{36} The value, which must have been an estimate, of the raw silk produced annually in Lourmarin was 20,400 livres, while the silk and silk products exported from Lourmarin brought only 12,050 livres. It is certainly probable, although not certain, that some of the silk remained in the village in the form of silk stockings for the Girards, Savornins, Sambucs, etc. This, however, does not explain a discrepancy of 8,350 livres. It is more likely explained by the fact that the higher figure is an estimate of silk produced "in an average year" while the lower figure is the value of silk exported in 1789, a year which must have been below average in yield because of the damage to the mulberry trees during the winter of 1788-89. But after all this has been said, it must be emphasized that in making out reports such as this, which did not directly affect them as did the drafting of the \textit{cadastre}, the Lourmarinois were prone to make rather crude estimates.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{A.M., D.M.}, March 1, 1790.
the income accruing from manufacturing was essential in providing at least a subsistence standard of living to the villagers.

Responding to the changes effected by the Revolution, in 1791 the National Assembly ordered each village in France to divide its territory into sections and to appoint officials who would record the type and extent of all real property within each section. Jacques Godechot has concluded that this was too much to ask because "it was a complicated operation for the ignorant municipalities, sometimes composed entirely of illiterates." 38 Whatever the situation might have been elsewhere in France, the Lourmarin council was conscientious, relatively competent, and remarkably literate. The resulting Contribution Foncière thus listed annual net revenue, based on a 15-year average, of each parcel of real property in the village. 39 A General Council meeting, open to all heads of families, was held in Lourmarin on two successive Sundays in February, 1791, to consider how best to comply with the edict of the National Assembly. The General Council decided to divide the village into six sections and selected the mayor and five municipal officers to supervise committees to evaluate the property in each section. Each of the six committees was augmented by three additional members elected by the General Council. Each man was assigned to the section with which he was most familiar. Although the General Council might have chosen anyone in the village, all of the men elected to the committees were independent peasants or bourgeois—the same men who probably would have been chosen before the Revolution. All property owners in each section were given two weeks to appear before the committee in order to agree upon the value and net revenue of their property. 40 It was at this point, of course, that the proprietor tried to see that the net revenue of his property was undervalued if at all possible.

Essentially the same process was followed with regard to the new tax on personal property, the Contribution Mobilière. 41 Antoine André Bernard was named village treasurer and was responsible for collecting these two taxes. In return he received five percent of the total tax he collected. 42

41 Godechot, Institutions, pp. 136–38; A.M., Cont.Mob., 1791.
42 A.M., D.M., February 13. 20, March 6, May 1, July 31, 1791.
Bernard, a *bourgeois*, had been treasurer before the Revolution as had his father and grandfather. The five percent return (*gages*) he received was about equal to the amount his ancestors had received earlier in the eighteenth century.

Fortunately the revolutionary tax rolls are still in the village archives and provide much useful information about the value of property owned by the Lourmarinois in 1790. With the exception of the seigneur, who was now titled citizen Bruny, the villagers are listed in Table I–2 by profession according to the percentage of net revenue which each group possessed.

### Table I–2. Occupations and Revenues of the Inhabitants of Lourmarin in 1791

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Total Net Revenue by Profession (Livres)</th>
<th>Average Net Revenue by Profession (Livres)</th>
<th>Profession as % of 360</th>
<th>% of Net Revenue by Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Former Seigneur</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Bourgeois</em></td>
<td>10,988</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>30.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><em>Ménagers</em></td>
<td>10,394</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td><em>Travailleurs</em></td>
<td>3,987</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Négociants</em></td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clockmaker</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Surveyor-Teacher</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Women-widows</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Former Tax Collector</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community land</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Residents Outside Lourmarin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 36,261 | 101 | 100.0 | 100.03 |

*Source: A.M., Cont. Fon., 1791.*

Although the Revolution and its effects will be discussed later, one of the most significant facts which emerged from this period is that Jean-Baptiste Jérôme Bruny, the former seigneur, survived the 1790's with all of the property he owned at the time of the Revolution intact. Of course he did not retain any of the seigneurial dues and monopolies which had pro-
vided him with a sizable income, but an extract from the tax rolls for 1800 showed that his real holdings were exactly the same as in the 1791 Contribution Foncière. Although the lucrative seigneurial monopolies had been abrogated, Bruny continued to own two grain mills, two ovens, and an olive press, as well as the chateau and the irrigated meadowland surrounding it.

Included in Table I–2 are only four unidentified individuals, none of whom owned much land, and ten property owners who resided outside of Lourmarin. In the absence of other evidence it will be assumed that these holdings were cancelled out by the holdings of Lourmarinois in neighboring villages so that, for purposes of analysis, the Foncière is relatively complete. This is also true of the tax roll listing personal property, the Contribution Mobilière, which showed that one male and 29 female domestics were employed in Lourmarin in 1791. Among those individuals paying an additional one livre, ten sous in taxes because they had a servant was Messire Fauchier, the Catholic priest. Most of the domestics were either daughters of poor peasants from Lourmarin or came from outside the village.

The term bourgeois was used rather loosely in eighteenth-century Lourmarin, but the Foncière restricted its use to the generally accepted definition of the class—those who did not engage in manual labor and who lived from their rents. The bourgeois's house was well furnished and his existence was comfortable by eighteenth-century standards. Comprising one-sixth of the landholders, the ménagers were the upper class among the peasants. In general they owned enough land to subsist and worked it themselves, aided by their sons. Any excess land was rented, either for money

---

13 M.C., 4580, fo. 132, January 14, 1800; A.M., Cont.Fon., 1791.
14 Ibid.
15 A.M., Cont.Mob., 1791.
16 After extensive examination of eighteenth-century records for Lourmarin it appears that a bourgeois was often a gentleman farmer with large landholdings who occasionally farmed some of his land himself.
17 See Appendix B for an inventory of the household furnishings owned by Pierre Vial. bourgeois, at his death in 1685. Notice also the number of public and private promissory notes owed to Vial, all but one of which was owed by men in Lourmarin. This may indicate that a mutually supportive network of rural credit existed.
It was not unusual, however, for a ménager also to be a tenant farmer or share-cropper on the land of other owners.

A travailleur is much harder to define, but the one factor common to all travailleurs was that they did not possess enough land of their own to make a living. Although virtually everyone in Lourmarin owned some land, many holdings were ridiculously small; the travailleurs therefore worked their own land in addition to other land which they either rented (arrentement) or cultivated on a share-cropping basis. Contracts governing land rentals and share-cropping agreements were usually for a four- to six-year period and stipulated how much money was to be paid annually and what care was to be given the land and buildings. In addition to caring for the land, "leaving it in the same condition at the end of his lease as he had found it at the beginning," a tenant farmer usually was subject to a number of small obligations, payable in either produce or labor.

Share-cropping, known throughout most of France as métayage, was called mégerie in Provence; the share-cropper was a mèger. Unlike other parts of France, in Provence a person was not known as a share-cropper by profession and regardless of what percentage of his income came from this arrangement, he was titled either a ménager or a travailleur. A share-cropper’s contract was, in general, more restrictive than that of a tenant farmer and was more likely to spell out exactly what the mèger could and could not do. The principle of a share-cropping contract was that the crop, after deduction had been made for the next year’s seed, was to be equally divided between the owner of the property and the lessee. In addition to dividing the crop, the share-cropper was often required annually to make a small, supplementary money payment or a payment in kind, a few dozen eggs or several chickens, and he was usually required to furnish some cartage service. The owner of the land paid the taxes on his property. The share-cropper was allowed to use meadowland for pasturing animals.

18 For a discussion of the ménager in Provence, see Masson, Provence, p. 591.
49 A.Not., passim; René Baehrel, in his study of Basse-Provence, found the median lease to be five years. Baehrel, Une croissance, p. 133.
50 A.Not., Ailhaud, October 26, 1759, Borrelly, October 22, 1787, and passim.
52 A.Not., Ailhaud, October 26, 1759, Borrelly, January 30, 1779, and passim. See also Masson, Provence, pp. 591–92.
but the owner retained the exclusive use of the manure for his fields. Mégerie arrangements could also be applied to animals, primarily sheep. On October 17, 1759, Guilhaume Paris, ménager, signed a mégerie contract with Jean Barthelemey, travailleur. Paris agreed to provide 11 sheep to Barthelemey, who accepted the responsibility for guarding and pasturing them for five years. Paris and Barthelemey shared the expense of winter feed with each man receiving one-half of the wool. Any losses would be divided equally.

After examining the extreme complexities of the Foncière, which listed those who actually worked the land as well as those who owned it, one must conclude that the great majority of peasants owned at least a small amount of land, rented some on a tenant-farmer basis, and worked still other land as share-croppers.

To further confuse the traditional eighteenth-century vocabulary, no peasant in Lourmarin was designated as a day-laborer, although obviously they existed. There were occasional references to travailleurs à la journée, but more often all members of this group were simply called travailleurs and in the Foncière no attempt was made to distinguish between the two. Indeed, such a distinction would probably have been as difficult for contemporaries to make as it is for us, because most of the travailleurs supplemented their income with day work, especially in the spring and fall.

If the former seigneur's holdings are included with those of the bourgeois in 1791 in Table I–2, less than five percent of the population would have owned 43 percent of the land. If the bourgeois and ménagers, the wealthier peasants, are added together, they form 21.2 percent of the population but they held almost three-fourths of the land in the village. The peasants (ménagers and travailleurs) held about 40 percent of the land, but this would be increased to nearly 50 percent if the miscellaneous entries in Table I–2 are added to the peasant holdings. Michel Vovelle has surveyed the distribution of property in 24 Provençal communities at the end of the ancien régime. In eleven of these communities the peasants

---

53 A. Not., Rey, December 5, 1775, and passim.
54 Ibid., Ailhaud, October 27, 1759.
55 This observation is admittedly impressionistic. Without an examination of the tenant holdings of each piece of land it is impossible to give a precise figure. A.M., Cont. Fon., 1791.
(ménagers plus travailleurs) held more than one-half of the property. There is no evidence that these ratios in Lourmarin changed much throughout the eighteenth century, nor did substantial changes occur during the more radical stages of the Revolution. There were no large blocks of church land to distribute and the seigneur became "citizen" Bruny and was accepted as such by the villagers.

One other large segment of the population must be analyzed. The artisan class, constituting 22.4 percent of Lourmarin's population, is listed in Table I-3 by occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total Net Revenue (Livres)</th>
<th>Average Net Revenue (Livres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turners</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quarrymen</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dyers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hatmaker</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lacemaker</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ropemaker</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Locksmith</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muleteer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A.M., Cont. Fon., 1791.

56 For an excellent survey of the latest work on the agrarian structure of Provence see Michel Vovelle, "État présent des études de structure agraire en Provence à la fin de l'ancien régime," Provence Historique, XVIII (October-December, 1968), 450-84.
THE LAND

Reflecting the importance of textiles in Lourmarin, one-third of the artisans were weavers (*tisserands*). The remaining artisans represent the usual occupations providing goods and services to a typical eighteenth-century French village. The average net income from real property for all 81 artisans was 30 livres; no single occupation group received income from property much higher than the average. Many of the craftsmen owned no land at all and their only entry in the *Foncière* was their shop in town, which probably included their living quarters as well. Since the *Foncière* did not list an artisan's tools, skill, or—most important—the income received for his services, it is obvious that his average net income must have been considerably higher than 30 livres.

There were no guilds in Lourmarin although the master artisans did have apprentices. On September 12, 1759, an apprenticeship agreement was recorded by the local notary. Sieur Pierre Fauchier, who made and sold silk hose, agreed to take the son of Jacques Anastay, aged 14, as his apprentice for two years. Fauchier agreed to teach the boy the trade of weaver in return for a cash payment of 80 livres. The father also assumed financial responsibility for any damages done by his son and agreed to continue providing him with board and room; the young boy simply went to Fauchier's shop each morning. These arrangements were common in the eighteenth century and were financially advantageous to the master craftsmen, who received a welcome supplement to their income as well as a willing, if inexperienced helper.

It would appear from an examination of Table 1–2 that, even excluding the former seigneur, the distribution of land within the third estate was very uneven with only the *bourgeois* as well as most *ménagers* and some artisans, or probably not more than one-third of the village population, owning enough for a secure existence. But we know from an examination of the village minutes that there was little extreme poverty. Fortunately the poor *travailleurs* and artisans could supplement their income by working in the textile industry or by day work in the fields.

57 The probable reason for the discrepancy between the 81 artisans listed in the 1791 *Contribution Foncière* and the 65 in the 1790 *État* of the Community is that the 1790 report counted only full-time artisans while the 1791 tax roll recorded a person's primary occupation and therefore discounted the fact that some artisans were also farmers.

58 *A. Not.*, Ailhaud, September 12, 1759.
THE LAND

An examination of the distribution and utilization of land in eighteenth-century Lourmarin clearly shows that, when the traditional division of land into small, scattered parcels was combined with rudimentary agricultural practices, the result was a land shortage in the village. Little land was uncultivated, and although Jean-Baptiste Jérôme de Bruny, seigneur after 1772, was interested in agricultural reform, no attempt was made to alter the traditional eighteenth-century pattern of exploitation to provide for the increase in population which will be examined in Chapter II.