Notes

Preface

1. For the history of the phrase see Iris Origo, “The ‘Domestic Enemy’: The Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,” *Speculum* 30 no. 3 (July 1955), 322. (I wish to thank my colleague at Syracuse University, Edward Muir, for this reference.) For the use of the phrase in ancien régime France see John Andrews Van Eerde, “The Role of the Valet in French Comedy between 1630 and 1789 as a Reflection of Social History,” (Ph.D. diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1953), 104–5.


4. The rise of these new fields incidentally turned the former liabilities of servants as topics (the fact that so many servants were women, and they lived and worked within the private and domestic rather than the public and productive spheres) into assets. Consequently the late 1970s saw an outpouring of excellent studies on domestic servants in various times and places, including Theresa McBride’s pioneering work on domestics in nineteenth-century France and England (*The Domestic Revolution* [New York, 1976], and David Katzman’s study of servants in the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (*Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America* [New York, 1978]). Even servants in Old Regime France received some attention: they were the subject of two excellent dissertations, one French and one American (Marc Botlan, “Domesticité et domestiques à Paris dans la crise [1770–1790]” [thèse, École des Chartes, Paris, 1976]; Sarah Crawford Maza, “Domestic Service in Eighteenth Century France” [Ph.D. diss. Princeton University, 1978]), and one fine book, Jean-Pierre Gutton’s *Domestiques et serviteurs dans la France de l’ancien régime* (Paris, 1981). My work draws heavily on these studies, and I thank M. Botlan and Professor Maza for generously making copies of their work available to me. But my approach differs from these largely prosopographical studies in its attention to the psychology of master-servant relationships.

5. A model for such a study is a recent work on English farm servants, Ann Kussmaul’s *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1981).

6. In this my major inspiration was Lawrence Stone’s magisterial *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500–1800* (New York, 1977), which makes superb use of memoirs to explore family relationships. Alert readers will notice that I borrowed not only the use of memoirs but also much of my interpretation of the timing and causes of changes in family life from Stone.

Chapter 1

1. For the estimate of 100,000 see J. C. Nemeitz, *Séjour de Paris, c'est-à-dire, instructions fidèles pour les voyagers de condition* (Leyden, 1717), 92. This is undoubtedly exaggerated. But
there were probably 75,000 to 80,000 servants in Paris by the eve of the Revolution. See Botlan, “Domesticité et domestiques,” 190.


5. A higher figure, 17 percent for the city as a whole, is often cited (e.g., in Maza, “Domestic Service,” 6, and “Porphyre Petrovitch,” “Recherches sur la criminalité a Paris dans la seconde moitié du 18e siècle,” in A. Abbiatet et al., *Crimes et criminalité en France sous l’ancien régime: 17e–18e siècles* [Paris, 1971], 246). This figure is Daumard and Furet’s calculation (Adeline Daumard and François Furet, *Structures et relations sociales à Paris au milieu du XVIIIe siècle* [Paris, 1961], 18–19) of the percentages of servants among the male Parisians who made marriages contracts in 1749. But marriage contracts are a source weighted to favor servants over less prosperous and sophisticated members of the lower classes like gagne-deniers, who were much more likely to marry without a contract. Therefore the figure is probably slightly inflated, and 15 percent is a more realistic estimate. The latter is the calculation of Daniel Roche, *Le Peuple de Paris* (Paris, 1981), 27.

6. For Aix in 1695 see Jean Paul Coste, *La Ville d’Aix en 1695: Structure urbaine et société* (Aix, 1970), 2:712; for the mid-eighteenth-century figure, see Maza, “Domestic Service,” 6. The figures for Toulouse are my calculations based on the number of servants listed in the capitation rolls for these years; they will be explained at length later.

7. For Bordeaux see Paul Butel and Jean-Pierre Poussou, *La Vie quotidienne à Bordeaux au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris, 1980), 40; and Poussou, “Les Structures démographiques et sociales,” in F.-G. Pariset, ed., *Bordeaux au dix-huitième siècle* (Bordeaux, 1968), 367. For Marseilles see Maza “Domestic Service,” 8. In minor commercial centers the proportion of servants was even smaller. In Elbeuf, a Norman textile town, there were only 150 servants in a population of 4,000 to 5,000 (Jeffry Kaplow, *Elbeuf during the Revolutionary Period: History and Social Structure* [Baltimore, 1964], 74).

8. An example is the Provençal town of Digne, where around 3 percent of the population were servants (Maza, “Domestic Service,” 6).

9. These figures are based on the statistics in Gutton, *Domestiques et serviteurs*, 102, and Peter Laslett, *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations* (Cambridge, 1977), 32. In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to say what factors determined the employment of farm servants, rather than sharecroppers or hired day laborers, as agricultural laborers. The two areas where farm servants were most frequently found, Gascony and the Rouergue, were otherwise very different in social and family structure, patterns of landholding, and type of agriculture practiced (see Gutton, *Domestiques et serviteurs*, 102–3; 108–9). Much more research is needed on this subject.

10. There are no reliable statistics on the socioeconomic makeup of both country and town in the ancien régime. But given what we know about it, these seem good guesses.

11. This was the estimate of the eighteenth-century statistician Moheau, and it is generally accepted today. See Gutton, *Domestiques et serviteurs*, 7–8, and Maza, “Domestic Service,” 5.

12. There are no reliable statistics for the proportion of servants in the population in the Middle Ages. In the seventeenth century Marcel Cusenier estimates that about one-sixth of the population were domestics ( *Les Domestiques en France* [Paris, 1912], 13), but this seems doubt-
ful. A more likely figure is 6–7 percent (Maza, "Domestic Service," 4). In the nineteenth century only around 2.5 percent of the population were servants (McBride, Domestic Revolution, 35).

13. For de la Touche see Robert Forster, Merchants, Landlords, Magistrates (Baltimore, 1980), 112–14; for Jeanne Leconte, see Archives Départementales, Gironde (hereafter ADG) 12B 287, Procédures et informations de la jurat de Bordeaux, 1746. (See Bibliography for archival abbreviations.)


15. Quoted in Gutton, Domestiques et serviteurs, 11.

16. The best description of the medieval household is Mark Girouard, Life in the English Country House (New Haven, 1978), 13–29. He deals primarily with England, but there is no reason to suppose that French households were significantly different.


18. For a sixteenth-century household which included such types see Nancy L. Roelker, Queen of Navarre: Jeanne d'Albret, 1528–1572 (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 26.

19. For this usage see Charlotte Arbaleste de Mornay, Mémoires de Mme. de Mornay (Paris, 1868), 175.


21. For the provisions of the capitation see Marcel Marion, Les Impôts directs sous l'ancien régime (Facsimile ed., Geneva, 1974), 48–61. For laws on the police des domestiques see Des Essarts, Dictionnaire universel de police (Paris, 1787), 3:467; and BN Manuscripts FF 21800, Collection Delamare, Ordonnance de Roi, April 8, 1717.


24. Comte d'Avaux, Correspondance inédite du Comte d'Avaux (Claude des Mesmes) avec son père, Jean-Jacques de Mesmes, Sieur de Roissy, ed. A. Boppe (Paris, 1887), 38; [Audiger], La Maison réglée d'un grand seigneur et autres, tant à la ville qu'à la campagne, et le devoir de tous les officiers et autres domestiques en général (Paris, 1692), preface, pages unnumbered.

25. The changing nature of family life and family ties over the centuries has recently received much attention from historians. The two best works on the patriarchal phase of the family unfortunately deal with England; they are Stone, The Family, Sex and Marriage, 123–221; and Randolph Trumbach, The Rise of the Egalitarian Family (New York, 1978), 119–65. The nearest French equivalent to these studies is Flandrin, Familles, but it is rather idiosyncratic. David Hunt, Parents and Children in History: The Psychology of Family Life in Early Modern France (New York, 1970), and Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life, trans. Robert Baldick (New York, 1962), are suggestive but not definitive.


27. For more on the patriarchal vision of the servant, see below, chapter 5.


31. This table (and also tables 2, 3, and 4) are drawn from the tax rolls of seven of the eight districts, or capitoulats, in the city of Toulouse: those of Daurade, La Pierre, St. Pierre, Pont-Vieux, St. Sernin, St. Barthélemy, and Dalbade. The tax roll for the eighth, St. Etienne, also exists for 1695, but I omitted it because its tax rolls do not exist for the years 1750 and 1789, and
therefore a table that included it would not be valid for later comparisons. This omission is unfortunate, because St. Etienne was a large and fashionable district with a high concentration of domestics.

32. For more on the payment—or nonpayment—of servants, see below, chapter 2.

33. These estimates are based on the costs of feeding hospital inmates in this period from Cissie C. Fairchilds, *Poverty and Charity in Aix-en-Provence, 1640–1789* (Baltimore, 1976), 63, 75, and are deflated to the level of seventeenth-century prices.

34. This income estimate is based on the chart of page 518 of Pierre Deyon, *Amiens: Capitalie provinciale* (Paris, 1967), with salaries of wife and children added.

35. ADHG C 1082, Rolle de la capitation de la ville de Toulouse, 1695, Dalbade.


37. It should be noted that merchants, *procureurs*, surgeons, and the like often employed large numbers of male clerks (or in the case of surgeons, apprentices) in their businesses, but this was not the same as employing a liveried lackey.

38. In Bordeaux the *capitation* was recorded by occupation, not district, and few of its records have survived. I was unable to find the *capitation* rolls of Bordeaux's prosperous overseas merchants, the *négociants*, for the late seventeenth century. But one indication that even these dynamic merchants were reluctant to employ male domestics is the fact that only 16 percent of the male servants who made marriage contracts in Bordeaux in 1727–29 were employed by middle-class households, while 72 percent were employed by the nobility. (For sources for these figures see Bibliography, section I, B, 3.)


42. [Jean Meusnier], *Nouveau traité de la civilité qui se pratique en France parmi les honnestes gens* (La Haye?, 1731), 39–40.

43. In Bordeaux in 1716 the judges of the Cour des Aides averaged 2.93 servants each, while those of the Parlement averaged 5.80. And in the Parlement the households of *conseillers* averaged 4.44 domestics each, and those of *présidents* 8.69, while the *premier président* of the Grande Chambre had a household of 20 (ADG C 1082, Rolle des domestiques de la cour de Parlement, 1716).

44. ADHG C 1082, Rolle de la capitation de la ville de Toulouse, 1695.

45. Charles de Ribbe, *Une Grande Dame dans son ménage au temps de Louis XIV, d'après le journal de la Comtesse de Rochefort (1689)* (Paris, 1889), 137.


48. The family and domestic life of the nobility is thoroughly described below, especially in chapters 2 and 7. See also the works cited in note 25.


50. E. P. Thompson, "Patrician Society, Plebeian Culture," *Journal of Social History* 7, no. 4 (Summer 1974), 382–405. This brilliant article inspired much of my thinking about master-servant relationships and social relationships in general during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.


52. This table is less trustworthy than the earlier ones, for after 1695 *capitation* rolls became both less abundant and less accurate. For the 1750 figures I was able to find tax rolls from approximately that date for the same seven of Toulouse's eight capitoulats that were used for the 1695 figures. The rolls for Daurade, La Pierre, and St. Pierre dated from 1750 itself; those of Pont-Vieux and St. Sernin are from 1757; that of St. Barthélémy is from 1748, and that of Dalbade is from 1741. But for the 1789 figures I could find rolls for only five capitoulats: La Pierre,
Pont-Vieux, and St. Pierre for 1789; Dalbade for 1788, and Daurade for 1764. Therefore the figures for 1789 are not truly comparable with those of 1695 and 1750. Also, the capitation rolls became progressively less accurate in the course of the eighteenth century, with more people listed only by name with no occupation given (as the large category of “other” in my table show) or even omitted entirely. This makes these later figures even more dubious. But in the absence of better data I think their use is justified.

53. The figure probably was even larger, for many of the unknowns in the category “other” were middle-class types who employed servants.


56. For an explanation of why these figures rather than the capitation rolls were used, see above, note 38.

57. Craven, A Journey through the Crimea, 31.

58. This change will be traced in detail below, especially in chapters 2, 6, and 7. For further information see Flandrin, Familles; James F. Traer, Marriage and the Family in Eighteenth Century France (Ithaca, 1980); Margaret Darrow, “French Noblewomen and the New Domesticity, 1750–1850,” Feminist Studies 5, no. 1 (Spring 1979), 41–65; Cissie Fairchilds, “Women and Family,” in French Women and the Age of Enlightenment, ed. Samia Spencer (to be published by Indiana University Press), and Elisabeth Badinter, Mother Love: Myth and Reality (New York, 1981).


60. See below, chapter 2.

61. See for example Abbé Grégoire, De la Domesticité chez les peuples anciens et modernes (Paris, 1814), 1.

62. This is how freedom is defined in the Social Contract, for example. See Maurice Cranston’s introduction to the Penguin edition (New York, 1968), 42.

63. Ordinance of police, of November 6, 1778, quoted in Des Essarts, Dictionnaire universel de police, 3:478.

64. Quoted in Gutton, Domestiques et serviteurs, 11.

65. Quoted in ibid., 12.


Chapter 2

1. Christophe de Bordeaux, “Chambrière à louer à tout faire” and “Varlet à louer à tout faire” in Anatole de Montaiglon, ed., Recueil de poésies françaises des 15e et 16e siècles (Paris, 1855).

presented at the Library of Congress, 1981), has an excellent discussion of the uneven rhythm that characterized not only the eighteenth-century printing trade but preindustrial work in general. I thank Professor Darnton for sending me his paper, which has since been printed in Robert Darnton, The Literary Underground of the Old Regime (Cambridge, 1982), 148–66. My citations are to the original paper.

3. Audiger, La Maison réglée, 136-42.

4. Affiches, Annonces... de Toulouse, April 2, 1788.

5. See below, chapter 3.


8. Audiger, La Maison réglée, 34–36.


10. AN T 18645, 18650, 1866, Papiers du duc et duchesse de Fitz-James.

11. Comtesse de Genlis, Le La Bruyère des domestiques, précédé de considérations sur l'état de domesticité en général et suivi d'une nouvelle (Paris, 1828), 30; Mémoires de Mlle. Avrillon, première femme de chambre de l'Impératrice, sur la vie privée de Josephine (Paris, 1833), 369; Audiger, La Maison réglée, 53; G. Vanel, Une Grande Ville au 17e et 18e siècles: La Vie privée à Caen, les usages, la société, les salons (Caen, 1912), 165.

12. [Anon.], La Malalité des cuisinieres, ou la manière de bien ferter la mule: Dialogue entre une vieille cuisinière et une jeune servante, reprinted in Franklin, La Vie privée d'autrefois (Paris, 1898), 344–56.

13. Grégoire, De la Domesticité, 140; AN T 254, Papiers de Pierre Farcy, valet de chambre.


15. [Anon.], Avis à la livrée par un homme qui la porte (N. p., 1789), 4–5.


17. For an amusing description of these hair styles see the Mémoires de la Baronne d'Oberkirch sur la cour de Louis XVI et la société française avant 1789, ed. Suzanne Burkard (Paris, 1970), 56.


20. Laurette de Malboissière, Lettres d'une jeune fille, passim.


22. For an example of servants joining in entertaining guests, see Mme. de Genlis, Mémoires inédites, 1:183; for a discussion of their involvement in their employers' love-lives, see below, chapter 6.


24. Mémoires de Madame du Hausset, femme de chambre de Madame de Pompadour, ed. M. F. Barrière (Paris, 1847), esp. 129.

25. Evidence about the hours of meals comes from Le Grand d'Aussy, Histoire de la vie privée des français (Paris, 1815), 3:309–10; and Laurette de Malboissière, Lettres d'une jeune fille, 6, 7. These are the hours for meals during the last decades of the ancien régime. Meals had been getting progressively later since the seventeenth century, when the diner took place at twelve or one and the souper in the early evening. These earlier hours would return during the Revolution.

27. [Menon], La Cuisinière bourgeoise, suivi de l'office à l'usage de tous ceux qui se mêlent de dépenses de maisons (Paris, 1746), 12–14.
28. See the description of a dinner in a great noble household in [Nicolas de Bonnefons], Les Délices de la campagne, suite de jardinièr fransois (Amsterdam, 1655), 373–78.
30. See the sample table settings in Le Cannameliste français, ou nouvelle instruction pour ceux qui diserent d'apprendre l'office . . . (Nancy, 1768), and the description in Wheaton, Savoring the Past, 138–42.
31. Wheaton's is the best history of the evolution of French cuisine during the Old Regime.
32. See the instructions for molding and coloring ices and jellies in M. Erny, L'Art de bien faire les glaces d'office . . . (Paris, 1768).
33. Wheaton, Savoring the Past, 102, 106.
34. Marquise de Villeneuve-Arifat, Souvenirs d'enfance, 4.
38. The Marquise de Villeneuve-Arifat tells of chambermaids in her grandfather's household who refused to eat at the same table with the lackeys; her grandfather pointed out that they did not refuse to sleep with them, so they could surely share a table (Souvenirs d'enfance, 4).
41. For the ordinances see Dubois de St. Gelais, Histoire journalière de Paris (Paris, 1716), 2:139–40; for warning see Nemeitz, Séjour de Paris, 82.
43. For an example, see Isambert, Jourdan and Décusy, Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises depuis l’an 420 jusqu'à la révolution de 1789 (Paris, 1822–23), 20:584, Ordinance of February 8, 1713.
44. Quoted in Vane!, Une Grande Ville, 167.
45. Journal de Guienne, October 9, 1784.
46. Affiches, Annonces . . . de Toulouse, April 30, 1788.
47. The functions of the gens de livrée are well analyzed in Maza, “Domestic Service,” passim. Much of my description is derived from hers.
48. For complaints about the lack of skill of French coachmen, see John Moore, A View of Society and Manners in France, Switzerland, and Germany (Boston, 1792), 232; for an example of an accident, see Anne Robert Jacques Turgot, Lettres de Turgot à la duchesse d'Enville (1764–74 et 1777–80), ed. Joseph Ruivet et al. (Louvain and Leiden, 1976), 52.
51. Avis à la livrée, 5–6.
52. Laurette de Malboissière, Lettres d'une jeune fille, 182.
53. This phrase, and much of the description which follows, comes from Girouard, English Country House, 126–28, 144.
54. The function of the cabinet is perhaps best conveyed in the memoirs of the seventeenth-century Quietist, Mme. de la Mothe Guyon. Trapped in an arranged marriage and forced to live in a household in which her husband, his relatives and friends, and even the servants despised and mistreated her, she treasured the time spent in the room she referred to as “my dear cabinet.” It was the only place where she could be truly alone. (La Vie de Mme. J. M. B. de la Mothe Guion, écrite par elle-même [Cologne, 1720], 1:108.)
55. Jean-François de Bastide, *Dictionnaire des moeurs* (La Haye [?], 1773), 8.

56. For English vaux, see Hecht, *The Domestic Servant Class*, 158–68. For contemporary opinion that vaux were much less prevalent in France, see Abbé Le Blanc, *Lettres de M. L’Abbé Le Blanc* (Amsterdam, 1751), 153–59; and Vicomte de Grondy, “Un Voyageur français en Angleterre en 1764: Élie de Beaumont,” *Revue Britannique* 71, no. 11 (November 1895), 98.

57. Charles-Louis, Baron de Pollnitz, *Memoirs: Being the Observations He Made in His Late Travels, from Prussia through Germany, Italy, France . . .* (London, 1737), 2:244–45.

58. For an example of such laws see BN Manuscrits FF 21800, Collection Delamare: Serviteurs et manufacturiers, ordinance of the Paris Parlement, August 28, 1737; for an example of domestic manuals, see [Anon.], *Devoirs généraux des domestiques de l’un et de l’autre sexe, envers Dieu, et leurs maitres et maitresses . . .* (Paris, 1713), 132–33. Account books of noble households indicate that the bribing of the gens de livrée was widespread. Those of the Prince de Lambesc, for example, show that he distributed money to the suisses of the Appartements du Roi and the Ministre de Guerre whenever he went to Versailles. (AN T 4912, Papiers du Prince de Lambesc.)


60. AN Y 14518, Commissaires de police, St. Germain (Paris), 1722; AN Y 14543, Commissaires de police, St. Germain, 1753.

61. AN Y 14518, Commissaires de police, St. Germain, 1721.


64. The Collection Delamare (BN Manuscrits FF 26468) contains royal edicts forbidding servants to carry arms promulgated in 1609, 1629, 1665, 1670, 1671, 1676, 1678, 1679, 1680, 1682, 1685, 1687, 1689, and 1695.

65. There was also a specialized group of servants who cared for the children of the household; they are discussed separately in chapter 7.

66. For example, in Toulouse in 1695 the household of a président of the Parlement contained eleven domestics, but only one of them was a servante. (ADHG C 1082, Rolle de la capitation de Toulouse, capitoulat de St. Pierre.)


70. These are printed as endpapers in Giroud, *English Country House*.


72. This conclusion is based on the almost total silence in domestic manuals about the subordination of lower to upper servants.

73. For the prevalence of corporal punishment in Old Regime households see below, chapter 4.

74. The best evidence of the proportion of Parisian servants who “lived out” comes from Daniel Roche’s analysis of inventaires après décès. Fifty-one percent of the servants who died intestate in Paris from 1695 to 1715 and 47 percent of those who died intestate from 1775 to 1790 lived apart from their masters. (Roche, *Le Peuple de Paris*, 107). This source exaggerates the number of servants living on their own, for it is drawn mostly from the elderly, many of whom had left service and therefore their masters’ households. Nevertheless the proportion of servants who “lived out” in Paris was probably quite high. For married couples with their own apartments, see
below, chapter 3. An example of a household where lackeys were given money for room and board rather than being housed by their master is that of the Prince de Lambesc; see AN T 491, Papiers du Prince de Lambesc; Etat de la maison de S. A. Monseigneur Le Prince de Lambesc, janvier 1777. For the servants who hired themselves out to foreign visitors see Karamzine, Voyage en France, 286; and Nemeitz, Séjour de Paris, 85–87.

75. M. de St. Amans noted in his livre de raison that his male servants all slept in a room “next to the stables facing the tower.” (BN Manuscrits, N A 6580, Livre de raison de famille St. Amans.)

76. ADHG 3E 10802, Fonds Roc, 1788; 3E 1182, Fonds Saurine, 1787.

77. ADG 3E 20393, Fonds Gatellet, 1789; ADHG 3E 10936, Fonds Rieux, 1729; ADHG 1285, Fonds Brios, 1788–89.

78. The living conditions of nineteenth-century bonnes are described in McBride, Domestic Revolution, 51–55; and Anne Martin-Fugier, La Place des bonnes: La Domesticité féminine à Paris, n 1900 (Paris, 1979), 115–36.

79. For the organization and functioning of the hôtel in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries see Orest Ranum, Paris in the Age of Absolutism (New York, 1968), 151–55.

80. AN T 208, Comptes du maréchal et maréchale de Mirepoix, 1749–77.

81. Daniel Roche’s analysis of the estate inventories of Parisians who died intestate shows that servants were much more likely to own fine furniture than the rest of the lower classes. (Le Peuple de Paris, 131–57.)

82. For such arguments see Fleury, Les Devoirs, 235.

83. AN T 208, Comptes, du maréchal et maréchale de Mirepoix, 1749–77.

84. Hester Lynch Piozzi, Observations and Reflections Made in the Course of a Journey through France, Italy and Germany, ed. Herbert Barrows (Ann Arbor, 1967), 37.

85. [Meusnier], Nouveau traité de la civilité, 1:47, 209.


89. AD BdR XXH I E 45, Déclarations de grossesse, 1774–75; XH I E 44, Déclarations de grossesse, 1772–73; XH I E 43, Déclarations de grossesse, 1770–71.

90. ADG 12B 287, Procédures et informations de Jurat, 1746.

91. Journal de Mme. Cradock, 8.


94. AN T 254, Papiers de Pierre Farcy, valet-de-chambre de Mme. la Comtesse de Balbi.

95. Mlle. Avrillon, Mémoires, 74, 78.


97. AN T 254, Papiers de Pierre Farcy.

98. Viollet de Wagnon, L’Auteur laquais, 1.


100. The best description of the recreations of farm servants is Hélias, The Horse of Pride, 287–88. This deals with the nineteenth century, but there is no reason to suspect that servants’ recreations differed greatly in that period from those of earlier centuries.

101. For fairs and their attraction for servants, see Robert M. Isherwood, “Entertainment in

102. Fanny Cradock gave her servants time off to see Blanchard make his flight from the Champs de Mars in March 1784. (*Journal de Mme. Cradock*, 10)

103. For such imitation and the psychology behind it see below, chapter 4.

104. Picard was, of course, fired for his insolence. (Mme. de Sévigné, *Lettres*, 1:340–41).

105. AD G 12B 276, Procédures et informations de la Jurade, 1741.

106. For an extensive discussion of servants' family origins see the next chapter.


109. Of course not all people who signed as witnesses were necessarily close acquaintances of the affianced couple; occasionally notaries used chance passers-by. But it is safe to assume that most witnesses to marriages were in fact acquaintances of the bride and groom.

110. ADHG 3E 1184, Fonds Saurin, 1789; 3E 14132, Fonds Savy, 1727.

111. Quoted in George Sussman, "Three Histories of Infant Nursing in Eighteenth-Century France" (paper, Berkshire Conference on Women's History, Northampton, Mass., August 1979), 25. This has since been published in George O. Sussman, *Selling Mothers' Milk* (Urbana, 1982). My citations are to the original paper.

112. The following remarks are based on the first Duc's memoirs, *Journal inédit du Duc de Croy*.


115. Both the new rooms for entertainment and the new traffic patterns are visible in plans like that of the Maison Epinnes, in the faubourg St. Honoré, published in Krafft and Ransonette, *Plans, coupes, élévations*, plate 28.


117. Gallet, *Stately Mansions*, 118, discusses the many changes which contributed to the increasing comfort of the private areas of the household.

118. Nowhere was the English influence more striking—and the French nobility's new-found passion for informal but luxurious comfort more visible—than in clothing. For both men and women a drastic change in styles occurred in the 1780s as *habits à la française* gave way to those *à l'anglais*. For women the simple straight-lined *robe à l'anglaise* in cotton or muslin replaced the elaborately panniered *robe à la française* of taffeta or brocade, and men abandoned the embrodered waistcoats and satin breeches of their formal court dress (known as the *habit habillé* or *habit français*) for the sober English broadcloth frockcoat. (See Paul M. Ettesvold, *The Eighteenth-Century Woman: Catalogue of an Exhibition at the Costume Institute, Metropolitan Museum of Art* [New York, 1982]; and Philip Mansel, "Monarchy, Uniform and the Rise of the Frac, 1760–1830," *Past and Present* 96 [August, 1982], 103–32.)

119. Mme. Vigée-Lebrun, *Souvenirs*, 112. Mme. Lebrun probably was Calonne's mistress despite these disclaimers.

120. See below, chapter 8.


123. [Jean-Charles Bailleul], *Moyens de former un bon domestique, ouvrage ou l'on traite de la manièere de faire le service de l'intérieur d'une maison; avec des règles de conduite à observer pour bien remplir ses devoirs envers ses maîtres* (Paris, 1812).

124. Ibid., 59, 66–67.
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**Chapter 5**
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Chapter 6
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3. AD BdR XXH E 34, Déclarations de grossesse, 1747–57.
4. The amorous proclivities of these two gentlemen will be discussed below in some detail.
10. Richard, Du Louage des services domestiques, 27; Fournel, Traité de la séduction, 132.
11. Samuel Richardson, Pamela, or Virtue Rewarded (New York: Norton edition, 1958), 16. I owe this interpretation of this quotation, and indeed the arguments of this whole paragraph, to


As well as she what is necessary
To sleep below or above
In the big bed...

Great deflowerer (delouser) of nurses
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Women who have hot asses
I cure (plow) with cold ice.
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on and encourage his sexuality to an unusual degree. (For an example, see the review by Etienne van de Wall in the Journal of Interdisciplinary History 2, no. 2 [Autumn 1971], 361–62.) But the evidence of memoirs suggests that Louis's experiences were fairly commonplace.
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