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Abstract

This thesis investigates the development of bureaucracy and the emergence of "bourgeois" identities in the aftermath of the French Revolution. It begins by studying administrative manuals and organisation plans, arguing that post-revolutionary administration attempted to advise and educate, as well as command, the citizens of France. Consequently, the architects who converted ex-aristocratic hôtels into Ministries between 1792 and 1796 prioritised communication with the public. Demand for new corridors and the proliferation of antechambers during the Empire, however, revealed the employees' unease about the new transparency of administrative service. Moreover, working in a chain of correspondence and not as individual authors, administrators had to find alternatives to citing production when soliciting promotions or fighting to keep their job.

Personnel files from the ministries of Interior and Foreign Affairs divulge the successes and failures of the Ministry clerks' strategies of self-promotion. Disputes during the Revolution led to bitter denunciation; competing claims for authorial credit caused friction between officemates. In 1807, the Ministries attempted to regularise promotions and rewards by mandating uniform états de services for all employees. Merit was no longer defined in terms of production, but counted in years of service. In a similar fashion, the employees' authority as authors outside the office could only be established by accumulating "honour" in emulative societies or by means of a rhetoric of paternity, established in formal documentation.

During the Restoration, mystificateurs lambasted the administrator's legitimacy. Drawing on their spoof manuals, caricaturists and vaudevillists then fleshed out a wholly negative "bureaucratic type". When Balzac adopted this "type" in the 1830s, he made it a means to condemn the "petty bourgeoisie", a buffer between his bourgeois reader and the "dangerous" classes. Quite simply, the "bureaucrat" could be bought. From Balzac to Marx to Weber, he embodied the worst traits of the "bourgeois" century.
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Introduction:

Bureaucrats and Bourgeois Types

Under the absolute monarchy, under the first revolution, under Napoleon, bureaucracy was only the means of preparing the class rule of the bourgeoisie. Under the Restoration, under Louis Philippe, under the parliamentary republic, it was the instrument of the ruling class, however much it strove for power of its own.

Karl Marx - *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.¹

In his radical masterpiece on the revolution of 1848, Marx made the claim that bureaucracy in the early nineteenth century was a simple instrument of bourgeois rule. All revolutions since the French Revolution of 1789 had tended to increase its power: by 1848, it was a prize to be fought for, a weapon against factions defeated and challengers to come. "Bureaucracy" was a parasite, enmeshing the body of French society and choking its pores; it was also a factory, its labour divided and centralised, its work particularised and severed from the interests of society.² According to Marx, the administration blindly obeyed the dictates of the faction in power. It was an instrument of the class rule of the bourgeoisie.

Condemning the bourgeoisie, who had betrayed the proletariat in the June Days, Marx caricatured their "Revolution" with tremendous rhetorical power. Their dependence on the political symbols of 1789 and 1793-1795 glorified no new struggle, but merely parodied a revolution that had already happened. Marx's social charge - that the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie allowed themselves to be swindled by Louis Napoleon - was encapsulated in the

² Ibid., pp. 185, 186.
moment when the ministry of "mere clerks and copyists", appointed by Louis Bonaparte in 1848, became a puppet in the battle between the bourgeois Party of Order and Bonaparte's lumpenproletariat (card-sharks, vagabonds, brothel-keepers, and literary hacks). Here, the need to demonstrate the absurdity of the 1848 revolution as a social revolution — and to confirm it instead as a play of phantoms and fears — prompted Marx to instrumentalise "bureaucrats". Their part in the 1848 Revolution was that of the club in a Punch-and-Judy show: "marionettes" and "dummies", the bureaucrats belonged to the cold depersonalised "machine of state", whose members were bought and corrupted as easily as Louis Napoleon's lumpenproletariat followers in the Society of December 10. Individual bureaucrats, ordinary clerks (who had played small but significant roles in the Revolutions of 1789 to 1799) were airbrushed from the Revolution of 1848. As a corps, they had been fooled by Louis Napoleon, the "chief of the Society of December 10... a casual adventurer from abroad, raised up as leader by a drunken soldiery, which he has bought with liquor and sausage...".

Marx's conviction that the "state bureaucracy" was an instrument in the hands of the ruling class has become one of the truisms of our time. Yet, by portraying a "ministry of copyists and clerks", Marx, like the orators of 1848 who took the Tricolour and the Marseillaise as symbols of the Second Republic, was using the language of dead Revolution. In criticising bureaucracy, Marx was also clothing his cause in a rhetoric which had emerged from the first French Revolution. For writers in 1789, the idea of a "bureaucracy" had been used to condemn royal abuses of power; it remained largely true to its initial meaning when coined in 1759 by the physiocrat economist de Gournay, who punned on Montesquieu's

---

3 Ibid., p. 161.
4 Ibid., p. 186.
5 This was still in line with the meaning of "bureaucracy" in Jacques Peuchet's Traité de la Police et de la municipalité, a contribution to the Encyclopédie Methodique (Paris, 1792), written in July 1789. The charge made by the words "bureaucrat" and "bureaucracy" had changed focus by the time they appeared in the Supplement to the Dictionnaire de l'Académie in 1798, however. From the 1800s, these words featured regularly in dictionaries: Anne-Marie Bijaoui-Baron, La Bureaucratie: Naissance d'un Thème et d'un vocabulaire dans la littérature française [Doctorat d'Etat des Lettres et Sciences Humaines, Université de Paris IV, 1981], p. 20.
Spirit of the Laws to declare that "the true spirit of the laws in France is 'bureaucracy'... a fourth or fifth form of government". 6 After 1792, however, a corollary, the "bureaucrat", first appeared as an ironic description of the New-Regime administrator, self-important and abusing his power over the public. While De Gournay had used the term "bureaucracy" to criticise official barriers to laissez-faire trade in the most sweeping fashion, the Revolutionary notion of "bureaucracy" focussed on the ordinary administrator. "Bureaucracy" from 1792 was a means to turn attention on individuals rather than on the "spirit" of Old-Regime laws.

From the moment when public administration passed definitively from the control of the King to the surveillance of the Legislative Assembly and Convention, "bureaucracy" was condemned for the existence of "bureaucrats", and not as an institutional culture or corporate disease. Saint-Just declaimed in October 1793 against the 20,000 fools who drew blood from the Republic and drowned it under a world of paper.® Leuliette in L'Orateur plébéien, ou la Défenseur de la République declared in Ventôse Year IV (1796) that the race of scribes and clerks has only multiplied since the Revolution, and plays the part that religious communities used to. The offices, like cloisters, have become the refuge of those who know nothing and want to do even less, whose principal talent is in trimming their pens, and criticising the government... which feeds them.®

However, even by turning blame on the bureaucrat, politicians were unable to escape the charge of presiding over a bureaucracy. In 1796, when the Néologiste française ou Vocabulaire portatif des mots les plus nouveaux de la langue française described "bureaucracy" as an influential "class of citizens" (no longer as a form of government), it turned the "malicious term employed by certain deputies to ridicule the administrators of finance" into a condemnation of

---

7 Kawa, Les Ronds-de-Cuir en Révolution, pp. 16, 55-56.
the politicians themselves. The Néologiste expanded the word "bureaucratic" so it referred to all those who depended on the offices for their power, including the members of the Directory. With a piquant irony, it noted that the commis had often more intelligence and sense than the minister at the head of his government department.⁹

"Bureaucracy" as a wholly pejorative depiction of administration was therefore a political construction, forged between 1793 and 1795. In the recriminatory aftermath of the Hundred-Days interregnum and throughout the Restoration, "bureaucracy" would further develop in both opposition and royalist journals as a metaphor for high political corruption. The emergence of the "bureaucrat" as a "bourgeois type" during the 1820s and 1830s (most famously, but not exclusively, in the work of Jacques-Gilbert Ymbert, Henry Monnier, and Honoré de Balzac) has been well covered by experts in French literature. A thèse d'État by Anne-Marie Bijaoui-Baron traces the evolution of the bureaucratic social type from the Revolution, through the Restoration and into the July Monarchy¹⁰, while Judith Wechsler's A Human comedy and Paul Louis' Les Types Sociaux chez Balzac et Zola, are two excellent examples of literary critiques of the physiognomic and realist description of the bourgeoisie.¹¹ In this thesis, however, I am bound to ask different questions, to try to understand why this vocabulary was changing, and not merely to catalogue or quantify the change. A foreword to Wechsler's A Human Comedy, by Richard Sennett, suggests one reason for the popularity of bureaucratic satire in the 1820s:

> The uncertainty and intimate knowledge of disorder in the lives of the Parisians, as in those in Berlin and London who flocked in great numbers to the mime theatres and sought out the caricatures and 'pen portraits' of the popular press, made them willing to believe in a code system which froze personality into fixed and static forms. Sometimes the artists of gesture are called 'illusionists', but I think this demeans them. They were artists of a

---

⁹ Bijaoui-Baron, La Bureaucratie, p. 19.
¹⁰ Ibid.
necessary illusion — a stranger’s mask can be a reliable guide to
his soul — for people in need of it.\textsuperscript{12}

A study of the emergence of the "bureaucratic type" shows that Marx owed a
debt, not only to Revolutionary rhetoric, but also to illusion. His bureaucrats
belonged not in a Ministry but in an 1820s vaudeville. His condemnation of both
bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie was derived from Restoration spoof manuals
and codes, written by literary \textit{mystificateurs} to trick administrators into acting like
bureaucrats, and from their theatrical counterparts, as the playwright took the
\textit{mystification} on stage to convince the audience that all bureaucrats could be
surveyed and satisfactorily condemned. Both sorts of \textit{mystification} depended on
constructing fake biographies for the author or maintaining his anonymity: they
sidestepped their own role as denouncers by "tricking" their characters into self-
revelation. The commercial success of vaudevilles and \textit{mystifications} in the
1820s demonstrates how the public (including administrators) preferred the
coherent narratives of the swindler to the unfathomable realities of office life. By
the July Monarchy, "bureaucracy" had become a social critique of the post-
revolutionary regime. "Bureaucrats" had become a motive force in society, a
"class of citizens" recognisable by their ineptitude and their capacity for deceit,
made "real" on a register concocted by writers like Henry Monnier and Honoré de
Balzac.

The illusions created by bureaucratic satire not only convinced Marx in the 1840s
and 1850s, but also informed Max Weber’s later account of the process of
bureaucratisation (since the Bismarckian administration he had first-hand
experience of was a product of "realist" notions of bureaucracy).\textsuperscript{13} Like Marx,
Weber described bureaucracy as a "machine of government", a technocracy with
which the state could exert an ever increasing control over the affairs of its
citizens. He imagined a corporate bureaucracy superior to its non-centralised,

\textsuperscript{12} Judith Wechsler, \textit{A Human Comedy}, p. 9.
non-professional patrimonial and prebendal predecessors, defined by its hierarchy and regulations: the separation of public office from private ownership, the use of documentary records, and the salaried employment of full-time experts with full-time tenure. Marx believed that class history explains the rise of the bureaucracy as an instrument of the class rule of the bourgeoisie; Weber also accounted for the emergence of bureaucracy by examining the effects of the rise of Capital. He posited four major historical developments which "caused" bureaucratisation: the emergence of a money economy, the qualitative development of administrative tasks in large states, the expansion in the range of administrative duties and the perceivable technical superiority of bureaucratic organisation. However, he collapsed the first three into the last: the universal process of bureaucratisation was, in his final analysis, the product of society's desire for efficiency. Centralisation of administration occurred as experts gathered effectively in one place to pool their expertise and to establish regular action and authority under the rule of law. This also, was Marx's view of "bureaucracy": the most efficient means to organise productive relationships in society.

Following Weber's model - largely unchallenged by Marxists - historians of French administration have more often than not accepted that bureaucracy occurred "naturally". They have chronologised the insipid development of administration, from the eighteenth-century Fermes Générales to the mushrooming ministries of the mid-nineteenth century.14 Research on

---

14 Works on French administration are legion and it is only possible to provide a sample. The fermes générales have long been seen as the most "bureaucratic" of eighteenth-century administrations: see George T. Matthews, The Royal General Farms in Eighteenth-Century France (New York: Columbia U.P., 1958), and Vida Azimi, Un modèle administratif de l'ancien régime: les commis de la ferme générale et de la régie générale des aides (Paris: CNRS, 1987). Harold T. Parker, The Bureau of Commerce in 1781 and its policies in respect to French Industry (Durham NC: Carolina Academic Press, 1979) is another model of Tocquevillian orthodoxy. Several other monographs which largely remain outside the Tocquevillian paradigm (while not challenging it) also deserve mention: R.M. Rampelberg, Le Ministre de la Maison du Roi 1783-1788, Baron de Breteuil (Paris: Économica, 1975); Édith Bernadin, Jean-Marie Roland et le Ministère de l'intérieur (1792-1793) (Paris: Société des Études Robespierristes, 1984); Jean-Pierre Samoyault, Les Bureaux du Secrétariat d'État des Affaires Étrangères sous Louis XV (Paris: A. Pedone, 1971). Works on Revolutionary
Revolutionary administration allies itself with the Tocquevillian argument that the French Revolution was less a point of rupture than the realisation of a process of state consolidation. "Naturalistic" metaphors abound in these accounts: seeds of bureaucracy, long dormant, germinate; seedlings extend their heads above the morass of Old-Regime administration; roots drain the land and turn swamp into profitable loam (or conversely suck it dry). Eighteenth-century bureaucratic organisations, like the Royal General Farms, are examined as blossoms of modernity in a desert of traditional, localised and moribund elites. They are the precursors of the nineteenth-century administrative system — identified as such by the mechanics of their centralised control and lack of individual initiative. The articulation and standardisation of training and promotion structures in military organisation and the pressures of eighteenth-century wars on taxation, have also added to this myth of a "natural" bureaucratisation. As these studies largely believe that bureaucracy developed independently of political change, the history administration taking the Tocquevillian line include: J.F. Bosher, *French Finances 1770-1795: From Business to Bureaucracy* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1970); Clive Church, *Revolution and Red Tape: the French ministerial bureaucracy, 1770-1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981). For a fine example of an in-depth study of Revolutionary and Imperial bureaux using the Tocquevillean thesis: Harold T. Parker, "Two administrative bureaus under the Directory and Napoleon", *French Historical Studies*, 4:2 (Fall 1965), pp. 150-169. Jacques Godechot, *Les Institutions de la France pendant la Révolution et l'Empire*, third edition (Paris: P.U.F., 1985), is an essential reference work, as is Frédéric Masson, *Le Département des Affaires Étrangères pendant la Révolution, 1787-1804* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1977). Masson's work, a reprint of the 1877 Paris edition, gives enormous detail about life inside the offices, but is largely coloured by his anti-Republican politics.

Alexis de Tocqueville, *The Ancien Régime and the French Revolution* (trans. Stuart Gilbert), fifth edition (Manchester: Fontana, 1976), esp. pp. 49-51. Another "natural" metaphor is used by Clive Church in *Revolution and Red Tape*, p. 110: "If the revolutionary government was the mother of the new bureaucracy, then the Thermidorians were perhaps the father of it, standing somewhat ineffectually by as the period of labour comes to an end. It was left to the Directory to play the midwife and to cut the umbilical cord which bound the bureaucracy to its mother, enabling it to grow up as a force in its own right."

For example, George Matthews, in *The Royal General Farms*, p. 239, contrasts the success of the tax farmers with the "failure of the great families of 'feudal' origin". Matthews sees the tax farmers as the first capitalists.

of administration has remained outside the wider historiographical debate between Marxists and revisionists.

Nevertheless, the idea that "bureaucracy" occurs solely as a by-product of "progress" has been particularly useful for revisionist historians of the French Revolution who wish to downplay the significance of discourse outside the political realm, and, in particular, to disprove any fundamental change in the form of bureaucratic organisation for reasons of social change. François Furet, for example, argues that part of the origins of the French Revolution lay in the decision of a traditionalist nobility to crush pre-Revolutionary public accountability and administrative reform. The "crisis" of 1789 might never have happened had the "reforms" of Turgot or Necker not led to an "aristocratic revolt" in 1788. Arguing that the reforms carried through by the Revolution had already been promoted in the 1770s, revisionist historians consider the introduction of a new "Revolutionary" philosophy of administration as political window-dressing, relegating administrative history to monographs or to the biographies of haut fonctionnaires. Historians of Napoleonic bureaucracy have tended to confirm their suspicion that any changes made by the Revolution were transitory. Building on the idea that the Empire "ended" the uncertainty of Revolution, Jean Tulard and Guy Thuillier describe the years between 1800 and 1850 as a "golden age" of administration, the moment of the creation of "modern administrative institutions" and a time of unprecedented prestige for the administrators themselves.

20 Robert Catherine et Guy Thuillier, *Introduction à une philosophie de l'administration* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1969), p. 23, notes that, although a new philosophy of administration was introduced by the Revolution, "for the principal protagonists – politicians and administrators – the general interest is generally an alibi...".
Marxists, on the other hand, have had little interest in administration, treating it as nothing more than an instrument of state repression. In recent years, however, historians of the eighteenth century have laid the basis of a challenge to both Revisionist and old Marxist orthodoxies, by placing "bureaucratisation" more generally within histories of the rise of the "public sphere". This "public sphere", famously described by the social theorist, Jürgen Habermas, emerged with the possibility of open, rational debate and discussion between private individuals outside the institutions of the absolutist state. Habermas links its development to the rise of capitalism, and the emergence of new media and forums in which information could be traded. Colin Jones, looking at how medical advertising challenged claims of the Royal Society of Medicine to be the sole authority capable of "making" doctors, suggests the possibility of looking at eighteenth-century professionalisation as a debate between rival conceptions of how legal, medical and administrative service might be made more effective.

In Jones' abstract, the eighteenth century saw the emergence of a new civic professionalism, arising from the experience of de facto commercialisation and market consciousness in a range of industries and services. The idea of a

---


"public" divided legal and administrative reformers in two – between those who looked to maintain the system of corporate privilege by making it more efficient, and those who developed another rationality of administration by examining the needs of society and the "Nation". The latter was triumphant in the key debates of 1789 and 1790 on the dismantling of Old-Regime structures, its emphasis on publicity as a means of regeneration embraced by the members of the National Assembly. After all, if Revolutionary pamphleteers saw the servants of the King as the embodiment of privilege and tax farmers as insolent despots with neither social utility nor public benefit, they also lauded administrators like Jacques Necker, for their attempts to treat the French people as citizens as well as subjects. "Publicity", rather than "centralisation", was therefore the central organising principle behind reforms in a range of service industries and administrations during the Revolution.

The move in emphasis from "bureaucracy" to the "bureaucrat" in critiques of administration in the 1790s, moreover, demonstrates how this "publicity" impacted primarily on individuals within the Revolutionary state. During the 1790s, legislators and administrators developed new institutional practices to expose charlatans and quacks who masqueraded as doctors, speculators who pretended to be industrial entrepreneurs, and literary down-and-outs who drew their salaries, but gave none of their ink, to the Ministries. During the Consulate and Empire they continued to develop codes of practice, through which they hoped to make the difference between competent and incompetent citizens legible to the general public. Problems arising from the Revolution's institutionalisation of the "public sphere", however, impacted most severely on the administrator himself: while others might still find a way to cite the fruit of their labour as proof of their merit, his reports were the result of collaboration, rather than individual effort. Debates on responsibility for the "failures" of "bureaucracy" revolved, for that reason, around questions of authorship and authority, of the ownership of intellectual production. Office politics also returned again and again to such questions of authorial legitimacy – as clerks squabbled

over bonuses and promotions, and over the privileges and procedures of day-to-day office life.

Catherine Kawa's recent study of clerks in the Ministry of the Interior between 1792 and 1799, showing the uncomfortable distance between Weber's theoretical ideal type and the prosopographical reality, between the logic of rationalisation and centralisation and the realities of administrative organisation, between what should have happened and what actually occurred during the French Revolution, has opened up the possibility of a new history of civic professionalism in Revolutionary administration. Other quantitative surveys of employee turnover have also demonstrated how Ministers and fonctionnaires tried to alter the forms of administration irrevocably by purging Old-Regime personnel and reshuffling offices in annual reorganisations of their departments. Moreover, the history of science during the Revolution shows administrations and administrators embracing new programmes of fact-gathering and statistical analysis, attempting to make the Nation legible to the state.

---

26 Enough has been written on the instability of ministerial employment for me to forego an in-depth investigation of the effects of Revolutionary "reorganisation" of administration. For an overview, see Kawa, Les Ronds-de-Cuir en Révolution, pp. 91-94, and her "La rotation du personnel du ministère de l'Intérieur pendant la Révolution", in Actes des 113e et 114e Congrès nationaux des Sociétés savantes, Strasbourg 1988 - Paris 1989 (Paris: C.T.H.S., 1989), pp. 27-38. Frédéric Masson, in his Le Département des Affaires Étrangères, also outlines the movement of "republican" personnel into the Ministry to displace those who had served under the Old Regime. Other studies include Serge Chassagne, "Les bureaux centraux: le personnel et les mécanismes administratifs", in La statistique en France à l'époque napoleonienn [Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, seminaire de Louis Bergeron: journée d'étude, 14 février 1980] (Brussels: Centre Guillaume Jacquemyns, 1981). Chassagne points to the instability of the Ministry of the Interior between its creation in 1790 and the Restoration, and alleges that it never had the same composition for three consecutive years. However, the états Chassagne uses show only those employees who were paid for their work. During this period, it was usual for employees to work for free for short periods while the Ministry located funds to pay their wages. The number of dismissals was not, therefore, as extreme as Chassagne makes out, although the instability he recognises is unarguable.
of these two historiographies, the way is made for a new appraisal of the history of Revolutionary administration, which not only allows it to occur within a wider set of social and political changes, but which embraces details of life inside the bureaux, looking at the social changes wrought on and by administrators themselves, rather than merely at the use of administration as an "instrument" of state oppression.

For a "civic-professional" administrator, serving the public implied a listening process by which the interests of the people could be communicated through a chain of officials and translated into state action in the "common interest". The state, therefore, did not see itself as isolated from society, remaking it according to fixed laws and arbitrary categories, but responding to the voices of the People: the administrator's duty was to serve the Nation rather than to rule it. The "common interest", which administrators commonly cited, centred on the prosperity and "progress" of the nation, by instruction rather than coercion. Some administrations were clearly more repressive than others but one can too often ignore the positive instructions issuing from their Parisian headquarters, by looking at high politics and not actual bureau practice. While this study does not look directly at the Ministry of War, but instead concentrates on the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, I would argue that one should not ignore the clerks who administered funds, equipment, personnel and welfare (or researched maps for the use of the Revolutionary and Imperial armies), in favour of those who drafted orders for the artillery and cavalry. Socially and politically, as Clive Church comments, "there was all the difference in the world between the clerks called into the Ministry [of War] during the late Empire and the new elite with their titles, places in the Imperial household, councils, and orders, and their emphatic prefectoral or military authority".

---

29 For example, Howard Brown's *War, Revolution and the Bureaucratic State: Politics and Army Administration in France, 1791-1799* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) which focuses on the papers of high functionaries rather than the work of personnel engaged in the day-to-day administrative tasks.
30 Church, *Revolution and Red Tape*, p. 279.
I chose to concentrate on the Ministries of the Interior and Foreign Affairs, as they communicated "to" the Nation and "for" the Nation. They have also, historically, been seen as the most "proletarian" and the most "aristocratic" in terms of personnel, making any similarities I could find the more striking. As my study progressed, I cast my net wider, looking at material from the Ministry of Police and, of course, the Ministries of Public Works, Public Instruction, Commerce and Agriculture, all of which came under the umbrella of the Ministry of Interior at different stages, shared personnel and were organised in a similar fashion. Likewise, while my study of the physical order of the office centred on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' hôtel Gallifet and the Ministry of the Interior's hôtel Conti (where the wealth of anecdotal material related to the first and the building plans available for the latter meant that they became the centrepieces of chapter two), I also investigated plans and building devis for the Ministry of Commerce and Public Works, the Ministry of Public Instruction, the Ministry of Police and the Ministry of War.

As with my study of administrative organisation, my study of administrative personnel concentrated on personnel files for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Interior. The movement of Interior personnel to the other Ministries, including Police, Commerce and Agriculture, then broadened my study. However, in order to investigate the specificity of interaction between personnel inside the Ministry, I needed to focus on a tight selection of employees who worked together rather than taking a "random" sample or trying to investigate all the employees in the

---

31 The Ministry of Religions (1804), the Administration of the University (1808), the Ministry of Public Instruction, and the Ministry of Manufactures and Commerce (1811) were all extracted from the Ministry of Interior under Napoleon. Also during the Empire, some Division Chiefs also acquired greater autonomy as Directors-General, for example for Ponts et Chaussées. Yet the administration of religions, becoming a Direction Générale in July 1804, maintained the same staffing levels. When becoming a Ministry in 1808, it expanded from four to eight bureaux, but never with more than 113 employees during the period. Forty percent of the employees served for the whole fourteen years of the administration's existence: Church, Revolution and Red Tape, p. 269. Throughout the period, the core of the Ministry consisted of a secrétariat-général (including bureaux for ministerial accounts, the archives and Registry), a division for corresponding with local administrations, one for Agriculture and Food Supply, and one for Welfare.
Ministry between a fixed number of years.\textsuperscript{32} Despite the claims of some analysts, regular "reorganisations" and budgetary constraints, which led to the paring down of all "non-essential" personnel on occasion, did not prevent a core group of employees from surviving from the Directory (or even the Old Regime), and maintaining their place through the Empire and into the Restoration (some even survived to the July Monarchy).\textsuperscript{33} Although some disappeared from the payroll periodically, this did not mean that they left the office. Dismissal did not mean expulsion, and the employee often continued to work without pay, presenting his entitlement to reinstatement on the basis of that sacrifice.\textsuperscript{34}

In the Ministry of Interior, I concentrated on about a hundred employees who worked together between the years 1800 and 1807. I took the bureaux of Commerce, Agriculture, Arts and Manufactures (which loosely formed a single Division, Ministry or Directorate throughout the period), as an example of active administration, engaging with the public directly. I then added the personnel of offices in the First Division whose responsibility was to draw up instructions for

\textsuperscript{32} William Reddy's approach in The Invisible Code: Honor and Sentiment in Post-Revolutionary France, 1814-1848 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), was to investigate all employees between 1815 and 1848 in seven cartons of personnel files. Catherine's Kawa's methodology in Les Ronds-des-Cuir en Révolution was, on the other hand, to draw up a database of information on every employee in the Ministry of the Interior between 1792 and 1799, the scale of which allowed her to afford only a cursory look at the more intricate relationships between employees. In the course of my study, I called up 53 separate cartons of personnel dossiers, in which I looked at 153 files. While the majority of these were from the divisions I had selected, I tackled a further two cartons (A.N. f/1bl/278/1 & 278/2) in a systematic fashion (and worked my way completely through the \textit{mélange} in A.N. f/1bl/11-14), to ensure that what held true for my co-workers held true more generally, and -- as my work progressed -- added people of specific interests (the sons of employees, colleagues named in other files, mainly from the Restoration period).

\textsuperscript{33} See Note 26.

\textsuperscript{34} See, for example, a letter from Edme-Michel Delétang and his colleague, LeRoy, to the Minister of the Interior in Year VI, A.N. f/1bl/264/2 [Delétang, Edme Michel]. Delétang had been removed from the payroll on the 15 Vendémiaire, but was promised a return to his position as \textit{sous-chef} on two separate occasions. The second order for his reintegration, in Messidor, had been drawn up, but, before the minister, Letourneux, could sign the order, he was replaced by François de Neufchatéau. Delétang (and his colleague, LeRoy, who was in the same position), therefore asked permission to continue working for free in the \textit{bureaux de secours}, using their request as a means to solicit the favour of the new Minister.
local and regional administrators, and to ensure that they worked in concert. Finally, I included personnel from the Registry and the Archives, two bureaux belonging to the Sécrétariat, a Division engaged in self-reflection and self-discipline. In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, I chose a similar spread: the "political" divisions, engaged in organising diplomatic correspondence, the bureau of commercial relations and the archives. While I also investigated some employees outside this net – for example, Gauthier La Chapelle, whose refusal to pay his son's tuition made its way into the Gazette des Tribunaux in April 1826 – the focus of this study remained based on my initial selection, or on those they came in contact with. The priceless information in records left behind by Division Chiefs and Secretary Generals (in particular, Fauchat and De Lescarnènè in the Ministry of Interior) and by Bureau Chiefs (like Lansel, in charge of Agriculture), also complemented my study of the tensions generated by gulf between the ideals of organisational memoirs and the shortcomings of office practice from the beginning of the Consulate to the middle of the July Monarchy.

To build a more complete picture of the administrators' interactions outside their offices, I scoured the Minutier Central for documents related to my sample, and found, not only procurations and loan agreements, but also inventaires après décès, marriage contracts and testaments. Having used the vagaries of ministerial organisation to compile my list of administrators, the selection of notarial documents I uncovered was quite diverse. They ranged from the 1770s up to the 1840s. Other sources – cadastral plans (located via employee address lists), Legion of Honour dossiers, society records and bulletins – were also chosen on the basis of my list. My study of civil society centred on the Société pour l'Encouragement de l'Industrie Nationale and the Société de Géographie, due to the fact that these were societies where the employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Interior mingled. I also found manuscript records for the Society of Geography to be easily available in the Cartes et Plans section of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

[^35]: I drew up my lists of personnel from payroll états between 1800 and 1807 in A.N. f/1bl/6, f/1bl/15, f/1bl/55 and f/1bl/531, and (for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) in A.A.E. Compabilité (Volumes), vol. XVIII.

[^36]: Gazette des Tribunaux, Journal de Jurisprudence et des Débats Judiciaires, 142 (12 April 1826).
Using such sources, I asked how real administrators negotiated the new demands made of them by post-revolutionary Ministries. After investigating the institutionalisation of epistemological theories of knowledge during the Revolution and Empire in organisational memoirs and administrative manuals, I used the employees' requests for a range of Ministerial favours to consider how they reacted to the pressure of becoming part of a chain of correspondence (rather than individual producers in their own right). By compiling a database of each employee and linking them to one another in the context of specific events and institutions, I examined how administrators used codes of practice and emulative rhetoric to regulate interpersonal competition both in their offices and in civil society. However, I had to turn to literary, rather than archival investigation, to answer how an administration overturned by zealous Revolutionaries in 1792 and 1793 turned into the site of "living caricatures" and "commonplaces of bureaucratic satire" described by the modern-day historians of nineteenth-century administration who take Balzac as their authority.  

To explain how the possibility of codifying virtue was usurped by satirists during the 1820s, I compiled a list of both theatrical and literary sources, of which only a few have featured significantly in this thesis for reasons of brevity. As individual authorship emerged as a problem of literary production in the period, I undertook an in-depth investigation of two of the most prolific writers of bureaucratic satire in the period – Ymbert and Monnier – looking at how they constructed "fake"

---

37 The history of nineteenth-century administration is dominated by Guy Thuillier, an ex-administrator turned historian. His primary works include *La Vie Quotidienne dans les Ministères au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Hachette, 1976); *Bureaucratie et bureaucrates en France au XIXe siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 1980); *La bureaucratie en France aux XIXe et XXe siècles* (Paris: Économica, 1987). Thuillier's work is highly problematic due to his dependence on literary, rather than archival, material. In "Problèmes de l'histoire de l'Administration", *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, 38:2 (1972), p. 132, he and Jean Tulard go so far as to argue that the history of administration should model itself on Jacques-Gilbert Ymbert's *Moeurs administratives*, 2 vols (Paris: Ladvocat, 1825), a satirical work from the 1820s. More recently, William Reddy's intervention in the field – discussing the accumulation of honours in the Ministry of Interior in *The Invisible Code* – has been a breath of fresh air. Nevertheless, Reddy also tends to move uncritically between representation and reality, and his unspecific chronology reveals an ambiguity about the development of office structures in the period.
autobiographies to mask their role as denouncers. Similarly, when investigating "realist" portrayals of the bureaucrat, the work of Balzac was the most obvious point of concentration. Although I might equally have written on Flaubert's *Bouvard et Pécuchet* or Stendhal's *Lucien Leuwen*, Balzac's representations of employee incompetence and sloth had a more direct effect on administrative reform programmes in the 1830s and 1840s, and is more frequently quoted by contemporary and current-day critics of "bureaucracy".

In this thesis, I set out to investigate administration through its administrators: if sometimes there seems to be a contradictory logic behind events happening in neighbouring buildings, this is because real people do not always realise when history has "passed them by". In writing this thesis I encountered a series of competing "rationales" which an administrator could use to explain his place in society and defend his position in the office, all of which rose to the surface at particular times, but did not always disappear when an alternative means of self-representation emerged. For example, in 1808, rival claims to have authored a report on the School of Arts and Trades in Chalons-sur-Marne continued to be made in the Bureau of Arts and Manufactures even after an alternative means of gauging individual merit, the *état de services*, was in the process of replacing the clerks' need to present themselves as individual producers. After 1815, a rift between the representation and the reality of office life meant that while Ministry officials were enthusing over the birth of an emulative institution in the rooms of the Society of Geography, the power of emulation as a means of policing honourable conduct was being undermined in Scribe and Ymbert's *L'Intérieur d'un bureau*. Only Balzac's emergence as an authority on administration in the late 1830s and 1840s, informing institutional reform with his condemnation of office workers, succeeded in imposing the "bureaucratic type" on ordinary administrators.38

I begin this project by investigating the "spirit" of Revolutionary civic-professional administration in Chapter One, to distance my reader from Balzac's caricatured depiction of administrations full of mindless automatons, and to show how another philosophy of administration was thought possible during the Revolution (although this civic professionalism had begun to be questioned as early as the Directory). Discovering how administration was reshaped as a communications network, spanning the Nation, I argue that it engaged with civil society, and took on the positive roles of instruction and advice as well as repressive powers. In attempting to enshrine an epistemological model of scientific analysis in the offices, however, the clerks of the New Regime succeeded only in overseeing the emergence of mounds of "lost" documents and cartons of papers pending. I look, in particular, at the archives, where the task of cataloguing and making old papers useful ended in a big "spring clean" in 1807. The principles of revolutionary organisation were unworkable in the contemporary context. Rather than abandoning the principles of the Revolutionary, however, politicians tended to scapegoat their subordinates — "reorganising" their clerks in the interests of economy and better service.

In Chapter Two, I investigate the organisation of ministerial offices in relation to space and time during the Revolution. Audience Hours allowed the public access to the administration, but protected the work of clerks from unnecessary interruptions and undue influence. Attempts to divide Old-Regime aristocratic mansions into offices also looked to open the offices to outsiders while protecting them from random intruders. However, the division of office space failed to create the "ideal" publicity demanded by some, although making definite advances towards providing a legible geography of administration for solicitors. Office hours became a means to discipline and judge clerks. Anxious about public scrutiny and the pressure of working in close proximity to other people in the first unified Ministry buildings, clerks began to demand corridors and antechambers to mark the boundaries between office space and public "waiting" rooms. Moreover, they began to separate their home life from their office life, to conceal their private conduct from the eyes of the Minister.

Chapter Three investigates the proliferation of solicitation and denunciation in these conditions, looking, in particular, at the disputes over authorship, which wracked Ministerial bureaux in the early years of the nineteenth century. The impossibility of distinguishing a good commis from a fraudulent flatterer had been uncovered by Louis Picard when he turned stage actors into bureaucrats in the popular comedy, Médiocre et Rampant. While Picard's actors revealed their true intentions to the audience, his characters found it impossible to penetrate one another's physiognomy and uncover either honesty or deception. While physiognomic codes sold well in the bookstores of the Empire, only in the most extreme conditions could they be used to uncover which employee was hard working and which was médiocre et rampant. The ambiguity of physiognomy in the office was compounded by the Minister's inability to judge his employees on the basis of their individual ability. There were no independent producers in the office: no one person produced a memoir. Rather, it was the creation of a series of administrators working in collaboration. Therefore, clerks had no means of proving themselves useful and exact, or showing off the product of their pens.

[^39]: I use the term "solicitor" throughout this thesis to signify a person who solicits a position, bonus, or promotion. At no point do I use the word to signify a member of the legal profession.
This vacuum of proof led to the creation, in 1807, of a new means of codifying "virtue": uniform *états de services* drawn up for every employee, from Secretary-General to *garçon de bureau*, on which merit could be accumulated as years of service.

Administrators also sought to prove their "virtue" in "civil society", where a similar system of "accumulated honour" emerged, underpinning *sociétés savantes* and societies of emulation. In Chapter Four, I describe how, demonstrating new inventions or contributing to the "progress" of geography, Ministry employees looked to establish their credentials as individual producers outside, if not inside, their place of work. The rhetoric of emulation provided a safe means for them to do so, without fear of authorial dispute, by downplaying competition between individual inventors and authors. Members of *sociétés savantes* were rarely fêted as modern geniuses, but asked instead to emulate and "surpass" the great men of the past, whose honour had already been summed up. The Legion of Honour confirmed this system with strict formulae of reception, which translated accumulated honour into a Cross, but made no mention of why it was awarded.

"Accumulated honour" and *ancienneté* could therefore be used as proof of entitlement to the esteem of ones colleagues and collaborators across a range of nineteenth-century urban-professional institutions. Unlike property, however, honour could neither be bought nor sold: it was not exchangeable. Chapter Five describes how the problem of transmitting "accumulated honour" to one's heirs was solved in a process analogous to the codification of inheritance under Napoleon's *Civil Code*. The *Civil Code* manufactured paternity, "uncloaking" the secrets of fatherhood, and allowing property to be transferred from father to son under the guarantee of documentary proof. In civil society, a rhetoric of paternity similarly created paternity with paperwork, by inserting written notice of the employee's role as a *bon père* in necrologies and *état de services* alike.

Chapter Six argues that the compromises enshrined in post-revolutionary administration, civil society, and in the emergence of paternity as a socially constructed fact, were thrown into turmoil by the events of 1815 and 1816. However, although questions about the value of oaths of loyalty during the
Hundred Days undermined the fragile peace in the offices, the Division chiefs immediately closed ranks to prevent a political purge of the offices. While the consensus forged by ancieneté and emulation won the day inside the offices, clerks dismissed for a range of less glamorous different causes hyped high politics as the "reason" for their destitution, to rail against their former employers in the press and in the theatre. They built up a "bureaucratic type" with which to accuse their former employers and to pour scorn on their former colleagues. To avoid the appearance of being denouncers themselves, they masked their intentions by becoming mystificateurs: they hid themselves behind their sang froid and ton léger, and wrote spoof manuals of instruction to encourage their victims to incriminate themselves. Their "codes" instructed unknowing clerks how to become bureaucrats; their manuals offered a wholly pejorative means of understanding life in Restoration and July Monarchy offices.

The "types" sketched by Henry Monnier in particular, became subsumed in Balzac's novels about administrators, discussed in Chapter Seven. Balzac used his talent for irony not only to castigate the clerks, but to criticise the mystificateurs as denouncers: he condemned both the bureaucrats and their tormentors for their greed, and alleged that their denunciations were proof that the world was driven by money, masquerading behind protestations of honour. Balzac condemned Henry Monnier when he used him as model for Bixiou, a character in Les Employés. He also condemned Monnier when he described Théodore De la Peyrade in Les Petits Bourgeois, showing how both petty-bourgeois culture and its counter-culture, la bohème, were submerged in the same mire. Balzac's characters were made real by a public desperate to

---

40 Studies of the petits bourgeois, among whom Balzac placed ministerial "employees" when writing his novel of that title concentrate on the period after 1870, when historians believe they can discern in shopkeeper protest and the creation of a ligue syndicale in 1888, a class defined by their grande peur – a collective fear of slipping out of their social place: see Philip Nord, Paris Shopkeepers and the Politics of Resentment (Princeton NJ: Princeton U P., 1986); Arno J. Mayer, "The Lower Middle Class as a Historical Problem", Journal of Modern History, 47:3 (1975), pp. 409-437. Geoffrey Crossick and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt's The Petite Bourgeoisie in Europe, 1780-1914 (London & NY: Routledge, 1995) not only ignores clerks altogether, but also largely skips the forty or fifty years between the 1790s and the late 1840s. The first lacuna is unnecessary as a parallel literature on syndicalism in administration -does exist,
understand post-revolutionary society, to have its mystification revealed to them in the plot of a serialised novel. His typification of bureaucratic and bourgeois types, although built on caricature and not reality, became the grounds for reform in 1840s. Moreover, Balzac is still important for historians today, as he was for Marx and Engels, as the supreme "authority" on nineteenth-century administration.

especially with the publication of Judith Wishnia's *The Proletarianizing of the Fonctionnaires: Civil Service Workers and the Labor Movement under the Third Republic* (Baton Rouge & London: Louisiana State U.P., 1990). Wishnia also ignores the period pre-1870 and never explains what class civil service workers belonged to before they proletarianised themselves in the 1890s. She also avoids any comparison between syndicalism in the employ of the state and syndicalism among épiciers. The time has therefore come for historians to reread Nicos Poulantzas' *Les Classes Sociales dans le Capitalisme Aujourd'hui* (Paris: Seuil, 1974), which spearheaded the recognition of clerks by sociologists and political theorists as members of a "new petty-bourgeoisie". Poulantzas argues that, the very fact of their exclusion from the institutionalised relationship of capital and labour has produced economic similarities between the "non-productive salaried clerk" and the "small independent producer". This negative definition makes the petty bourgeoisie, like the peasantry Marx described in "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon", pp. 187-188, a class in themselves but not a class for themselves.
Chapter One

A Revolution in Administration.

On a typical day in the Ministry of the Interior, a courier arrived in the courtyard of the hôtel Conti, hot and sticky from his three-day ride from an outlying province. He was determined to hand his packet to the Minister personally, for the prefect had assured him that it was urgent and very important. Instead, the uniformed usher showed him to a vestibule, and told him to wait. Some hours later, the Secretary-General authorised his Secretariat to take receipt of the courier's burden. They signed it into the register, and began to number, date, and classify its contents for distribution to the appropriate Divisions.\(^1\) The Ministry swallowed the packet; the courier was dismissed. He trudged out of the Secretary General's antechamber, watched curiously by both administrators and petitioners as he crossed the cobbledstones of the yard.\(^2\)

Having taken receipt of the correspondence, the Secretary General took responsibility for the matters he deemed important enough for the Minister's personal or immediate attention. The bulk of the prefect's missal made its way to

---

\(^1\) This narrative has been constructed primarily from a memorandum on the organisation of the Ministry of the Interior, dated 29 Ventôse Year X, in Archives Nationales (A.N.), f/1a/634. I have also incorporated details from a number of other organisational memoirs in A.N. f/1a/1. Although the numbers of those employed fluctuated during the Revolution, peaking at the 345 clerks employed in the Ministry of the Interior after its reformation in Year IV, there were never more than 250 employees working in the Ministry of the Interior between 1799 and 1818: A.N. f/1bi/531. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs operated along similar lines, but was complicated by the special measures surrounding secret despatches ["Organisation des bureaux des Relations Extérieures, 22 frimaire an 4," Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (A.A.E.), Organisation et Règlements du Ministère, vol. I (1547-1806), part 2 [PER L, Volumes no. 3 bis]. Because less than 100 people worked in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at any one time [A.A.E., Compatabilité (Volumes), vol. XVIII], there were no Division Chiefs – Bureau Chiefs dealt directly with the minister. The Ministry of Police was modelled directly on the Ministry of the Interior [A.N. f/7/3006].

\(^2\) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs kept three couriers of its own who could be depended on to handle diplomatic material. The Ministry of Interior used local couriers or those sent to them from the départements.
the Division chiefs, who, like the Secretary General, cherry-picked the few files they thought most significant, and divided it once more for re-distribution to the bureaux chiefs. Each time the file was dismembered, a clerk recorded the destination of each piece. All in all, it took over a day for the package's various reports to reach the Ministry's bureaux.³

In the Bureau of Agriculture, work was under way on a memoir on farming in the départements, aggregating information from reports on the fortunes of the year's harvest, the number of sheep and the land devoted to them. One rédacteur, compiling a notice on pasturage and the dangers of eating alfalfa, had called for information from the prefect a month earlier. When sections of the courier's letter arrived, they were indexed by a commis d'ordre, and divided among the members of the bureau. The report on alfalfa made its way to the rédacteur's desk. Although he had requesting it specifically, he placed it to one side: it could only be useful after he had received replies from the other prefectures, the deliberations of the Agricultural Society, and the opinions of his correspondents.⁴ The other rédacteurs also flipped through their respective papers while the commis d'ordre noted the prefect's queries in his work sheet. Using one column to suggest what action the ministry should take, he left another empty to register the bureau's eventual reply. In time, the rédacteur's report built into a portfolio, accompanied by a quick analysis on a single sheet of paper. Both register and portfolio were later sent with the Division chief to elicit the minister's approval in their biweekly meeting (if the matter was more urgent, the Division chief would have to send it through the Secretary General).⁵ The prescribed forms of office practice made the minister's burden manageable. He could treat the business of

³ See A.N. f/1a/634, on the delays involved in moving paper between offices.
⁴ Such a request was answered in "Observations sur la nature des pasturages de l'Arrondissement de Pontarlier, département du Doubs," 21 July 1813, A.N. f/10/252. Although the bureaux responsible for Manufactures and Commerce had become a separate ministry in 1811, the bureaux related to Agriculture and Food Stuff remained a separate division of the Ministry of Interior, with Nicolas Fauchat as Division Chief. Silvestre, the perpetual secretary of the Society of Agriculture, continued to head the bureau of agriculture itself. The close relationship between the Parisian Agricultural Society and the Bureau of Agriculture is described in "Société d'Agriculture," A.N. f/10/211. Several correspondents' reports can also be found in A.N. f/10/252.
⁵ "Ordre du travail du Ministre avec les Chefs de Division", A.N. f/1a/1.
twenty to thirty bureaux with some degree of comprehension. Once the Minister had marked them "approved", the reports returned to the bureaux where expéditionnaires copied them in a firm and legible hand to be sent to the Secretariat for dispatch.

In a single room, the Bureau of Agriculture dismantled and remade dossiers. It pillaged cartons for auxiliary knowledge. Documents were moved from box to box, leaving an impossible trail of destruction. Scraps of paper containing vital information vanished behind heavy writing desks or between the dusty cartons piled to one side. Though the commis d'ordre and the bureau chief both battled valiantly against the paper drift, and kept the official register in minute detail, they still found it impossible to make sense of the clutter and disorder. Ignoring this chaos, the members of the bureau worked all the more furiously, copying out answers, drawing up summaries of the prefects' correspondence for presentation to the minister, comparing and contrasting yields with those of other years and other regions, plucking details of technological advances to be shared with the "Nation". They passed in and out of the office as they wished, to drop in next door to borrow a document, to discuss problems, or simply to ask help with their workload. If the prefect had mixed information on pasturage into a report on abattoirs sent to the Bureau of Commerce, rules or no rules, the rédacteur would have to make his own way there to retrieve it. The process of analysis in the

---

6 For example, A. Didot and Lefebvre, in a letter to the Minister of Police, Pluviôse Year V [A.N. f/7/3006], describe the punishing schedule of a commis d'ordre. Both claimed to work from nine in the morning until six in the evening without a moment's rest, staying late on the evenings military service had interrupted their ordinary day's work.

7 Note on Mardlez, Bourgogne and Gebert, A.N. f/10/225. The difficulty of getting information from other bureaux through "official" channels is described in A.N. f/1a/634.

8 Prefects were increasingly provided with blank templates and forms so that their information could be easily absorbed into the communication channels in the ministry; for example, "Envoi au Manuel des Administrateurs," A.N. f/1a/57. For a criticism of prefects' correspondence, see A.N. f/1a/634. Ambassadors were equally sloppy in their correspondence with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which also attempted to order and regulate their correspondence: "Pour servir de Règle à la correspondance des Employés, vendémiaire an IV", A.A.E. Organisation et Règlements du Ministère, vol. I, part 2. Administrative manuals also provided models for administrators to copy: Claude-Joseph Lalouette's Éléments de l'administration pratique (Paris: J. Gratiot, 1812) sought to teach commis the
ministry was a messy one: breaking down the original packet into small pieces to be compared and incorporated in reports was a far from simple task.

The hierarchy of correspondence, from Secretary General to Division Chief to Bureau Chief to commis d'ordre to rédacteur to expéditionnaire, and back again, eventually to reach the Minister for his signature, remained a characteristic of ministerial organisation throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. The role of the Secretary General and Division Chiefs emerged in 1792. In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Charles LeBrun appointed Rouhière as Secretary General of his Department, and replaced his premier commis with Division Chiefs. Jean-Marie Roland also appointed the Ministry of Interior's first Secretary General in 1792, establishing a communications hierarchy like that described above. Before this reform, a letter took eight days to circulate between the offices of the five premier commis offices, each responsible for a different geographic area. Roland appointed Luc-Antoine Donin de Champagneux as Chief of a new "First Division", to overlook and co-ordinate all the Ministry's contacts with the 83 départements. The organisation of central administration principles and the rules of practical administration, by outlining the various regulation governing the way information was to be compiled. Rémy Fleurigeon, Code Administratif, ou recueil par ordre alphabétique de matières de toutes les Lois nouvelles et anciennes, relatives aux fonctions administratives et de police,... jusqu'au premier avril 1809 ..., 6 volumes (Paris: de Valade, 1809) also provided sample forms and procedures for the local administrators to follow. On the rules restricting the movement of clerks between offices inside the Ministry, see Chapter Two.

Church, Revolution and Red Tape, p. 60, claims that the Ministry of Justice in 1792 was the first to appoint a Secretary-General. This would indicate that Louis-Jérôme Gohier, appointed by Dominique-Joseph Garat, was the first to preside over this form of Ministry organisation: Almanach National de France (1793) (Paris: Testu, 1793), p. 125. That this system remained in place into the second half of the nineteenth century is testified by the fact that it is the mode of organisation described in Balzac's Les Employés, written in 1836 and that discussed in Jules Delbousquet's reform project, De l'organisation des administrations centrales des divers ministères: des droits et des devoirs des employés (Paris: Charles Hingray, 1843).

Ibid., p. 152.

Bernadin, Jean-Marie Roland et le Ministère de l'Intérieur, p. 205. See also, Almanach National (1793), pp. 128-131.

Bernadin, Jean-Marie Roland et le Ministère de l'Intérieur, pp. 205-206. This reorganisation was also the moment of a large-scale purge of old-regime personnel, which Roland found hindering his reform efforts. He replaced forty
into Divisions based on function, and not geographic domain, remained in force from then on. The abolition of the ministries by the Convention in 12 Germinal Year II, and their replacement by Executive Commissions, did not mean that civic-professional structures were abandoned, as the Commissions appointed their own Director Generals to distribute work among the bureaux. Neither did Lucien Bonaparte’s decision to reorganise the Ministry of Interior on the 18 Germinal Year VIII (April 1800), abolishing the Divisions and replacing their Chiefs with four rapporteurs, mark a radical break. The Ministry of Interior at this time employed just over sixty employees, which made the distribution of correspondence less complex and allowed the Minister to deal directly with bureau chiefs. Lucien’s reorganisation also maintained the Secretary General as the linchpin of a hierarchy of correspondence.

The rédacteur who received the report on pasturage in the Bureau of Agriculture and laid it aside (where it risked being forgotten in the paper drift) therefore was in a typical position for a Ministerial employee during the Revolution, Empire and Restoration. One day after another, delivery times and the sheer mass of detail counterbalanced the very usefulness of a hierarchy of correspondence: the telegraph had not yet been invented; the postal system was still rudimentary; reports passed sluggishly on the "conveyor-belt" from Secretariat to bureau. Yet, if the minutely organised breakdown of correspondence through the administrative hierarchy looked good on paper but proved unwieldy in practice,

clerks for "political" reasons, including all the premier commis except Antoine-François LeTellier (pp. 207-208).
13 A report from the Section de l’Intérieur of the Conseil d’État to the Minister of the Interior in 1812, A.N. f/1bl7, dossier 5 [1812], noted that a division of ministerial bureaux into Divisions based on the classification of its duties was standard practice (although the exact nature of that classification varied according to the manner in which each minister envisaged his brief).
14 See the detailed discussion in Church, Revolution and Red Tape, pp. 87-93. Church notes that the Commission des Rélations Extérieures changed little from the organisation laid down in 1792. When the Minister of Interior was re-established, its organisation into Divisions and the appointment of a Secretary General was reinforced in a law of the 10 Vendémiaire Year IV.
15 Ministerial order, 18 Germinal Year VIII, A.N. f/1a/1. Lucien’s Ministry of the Interior was not very different from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which employed a similar number of employees. When Chaptal, after replacing Lucien in January 1801 (Pluviôse Year IX), restored the payroll to about 160 employees, he rescinded the changes.
efficiency was not its primary purpose. Moreover, administrators abandoned the rules as they saw fit, by asking help from the bureau next door, or by supplementing the prefect's letter with the views of private correspondents or societies. In fact, the hierarchy, so carefully detailed in organisational documents, tended to be highly malleable in practice. There was leeway in the offices, and there needed to be, if the administrators were to get their job done. In practice, Division Chiefs encouraged this "useful latitude", although constantly pressured by their Minister and their political masters to keep a tighter reign on the offices.

The "Spirit" of Administration

As the rédacteurs of the Bureau d'Agriculture knew, the "useful latitude" afforded to Ministry bureaux during the Revolution in no way contradicted the idea of an administrative body constituted as an information-gathering network. Cooperation with civil society was natural for administrators, many of whom, less than ten years previously, had themselves devoted their primary attention to amateur science and unofficial intellectual debate. While the National Assembly had "regularised" the administrative information network with the creation of a uniform administrative unit—the département—to link municipal and district administration to the conseil général, directoire du département and procureur syndic (the King's representative) to the Parisian central bureaux, un-elected savants continued to have influence as Ministry of the Interior correspondents during the early years of the Revolution. During the ministry of François de Neufchâteau, emphasis was also put on practical application, and correspondents were sought on the basis of real experience and local knowledge. In the offices themselves, emphasis was placed on initiation into

---

16 For a detailed discussion of this process, see Godechot, Les Institutions de la France sous la Révolution et l'Empire, pp. 91-105.
17 Although much has been made of the role of the "Old Boys from Egypt"—the intellectuals and experts in the technical arts who had been with Napoleon in North Africa—who appeared after 18 Brumaire in high-ranking administrative roles under the Consulate and Empire (for example, Bergeron, France under Napoleon, pp. 53-4), the work of these men also depended on collaboration rather than "individual genius". The success of the Revolutionary armies, which
the "spirit" of administration, based not on expertise but on the co-ordination of employees. The ministries did not hire "experts" to staff the offices: instead they sought to use the structures of administration to routinise the way in which information was analysed. They talked of a "spirit of administration" – a vibrant community of interest reaching outside the state to engage citizens, and incorporating everyone's interest under the umbrella of the Nation. Their science therefore depended on reproducibility and not individual expertise: they moved away from the office as a cabinet de curiositës and turned it into a laboratory, engaging in a project in which ordinary clerks collected the opinions and the experiences of correspondents and colleagues across the entirety of France.\textsuperscript{18}

In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Talleyrand set out the idea of administration as a chain of duties and responsibilities in a report to Napoleon in Year VIII proposing the establishment of a regular system of promotion and salary in the offices. That report stressed that a "spirit" gave life to the administration, energised it and set it in motion:

In a well-governed state there is a spirit proper to each branch of administration. This spirit spawns unity, uniformity and certain energy in the direction of affairs. It perpetuates a tradition of duty, sentiment and observation. It attaches the body [of administration], and the individuals that belong to it, to the government, through emulation and the consideration they hope to enjoy.\textsuperscript{19}

The Ministry's employees had to be moulded into administrators: not mindless automatons, but participants in a chain of responsibility, faithful to their

\textsuperscript{18} Of course, many of the same "scholars" and "scientists" served in the New Regime as had in the Old Regime. Nevertheless, while savants, not ordinary commis, were responsible for re-organising the Ministry of Foreign Affairs archives under Caillard, a "bibliophile", in 1799, they had a hard time getting access to the depot ten years later under D'Hauterive, an "administrator": Armand Baschet, Histoire du Dépôt des Archives des Affaires Etrangères (Paris: Plon, 1875), pp. 427-8, 441-2.

\textsuperscript{19} "Rapport au Premier Consul de la République par le Minister des Relations Extérieures (Germinal an VIII)", A.A.E., Mémoires et Documents: France, 518.
colleagues, to their offices, and to the Ministry. Administrative "spirit" was built on esteem and affection between individuals; on emulation, attachment and tutelage between chiefs and their subordinates; and generally on the relationships of fidelity and respect between all employees of the Government. While this report was a means of flattering the new first Consul, emphasising how, in his hands, government action and the "general interest" could be unified and co-ordinated, it nevertheless emphasised not individual genius but bases of information gathered by chains of responsible administrators. For Talleyrand in 1800, the only way for an administrator to love the Republic was to attach himself to his position within the hierarchy and to complete his functions in collaboration with the rest of the administrative body.

The strength of French administration therefore did not lie in the recruitment of "whizz kids" or experts: entry to the offices was increasingly through an unpaid and uncertain "apprenticeship" as a sumuméraire. The sumuméraire had several years to prove his worth, while moving from office to office to gain a "general idea" of administration. An office chief with a post to confer would deem competence for a certain branch of administration less important than knowledge of the practices of administration as a whole. While Montalivet, Minister of the Interior in 1812, tried to limit the sumuméraïat to young men of means, to favour the well off, who, armed with private fortunes, could work for several years without indemnities or bonuses, most sumuméraires continued to be nominated from within the offices, as fathers took their sons to the office to learn the trade. In fact, unique abilities or financial clout counted for less than the possession of a clear writing hand (for expéditionnaires) or a precise prose style (for rédacteurs).

---

20 Ibid.
22 Talleyrand's plan for uniform promotion was never made reality. He did succeed, however, in setting up a disciplinary system in which individual administrators were judged by their peers. This encouraged employees to regulate themselves, to recognise their reciprocal ties and strengthen them in the process of punishing transgressions. Through sitting on disciplinary committees, they would generate a reciprocal respect for their duties and for rules of conduct that united them. For an example of such a Commission in action, see Chapter Three.
23 Thuillier, La Vie Quotidienne dans les Ministères, pp.110-111.
In the Bureau of Agriculture, promotion depended more on neat script than on a singular knowledge of artificial pastures. Expertise may have been a by-product, but it certainly did not structure a process of "bureaucratisation".

One of several administrative guides to appear in the beginning of the nineteenth century, Rémy Fleurigeon’s *Code Administratif*, a manual for local and national authorities, explained the priority placed on a "general idea" of administration. Fleurigeon described an administration as a communications network, responding to the needs of the public and establishing harmony between their interests. He argued that one of the most essential duties of an administrator was to listen attentively to complaints and petitions, and not to limit his correspondence to any one class of citizens. Knowledge of politics, military tactics, or finance, he told his reader, were secondary to "virtue" in negotiating the "labyrinth of administration". A good administrator learned by experience, studying the morals and usages of those he came into regular contact with, learning when to persuade a citizen to co-operate with the state and when to command his obedience. A bureau chief in charge of corresponding with 37 départements, Fleurigeon was transferring the benefit of his own experience when drawing up the Code: he was in a unique position to perceive the new

---

24 For this reason, handwriting was taught in special schools: see, for example, Alfred-Louis-Auguste Franklin, *Dictionnaire historique des arts, métiers et professions exercés dans Paris depuis le treizième siècle* (Paris: H. Welter, 1906), pp. 287. The emphasis on handwriting as a requirement of entry into the Ministries was one of the traits of administration satirised by Henry Monnier in the 1820s. Although the introduction of lithographic presses into Ministries began in the late 1810s when the Count de Lasteyrie, as Vice-President of the Society for the Encouragement of National Industry and owner of one of the two lithographic presses in Paris, demonstrated the use of lithography to reproduce circulars to Decazes (the then Minister of the Interior), the process only began to become widespread in 1828, when the Prefectures of Seine and Seine-et-Oise lithographed its list of electors and the Ministry of Interior offered free technical instruction to anyone nominated by the départements. Only two prefects nominated representatives to learn the art of lithography, however, and, in 1829, the electoral roll was again produced by an old-fashioned printing press: Alphonse Chevalier & Langlumé *Traité Complet de la Lithographie ou Manuel de la Lithographie* (Paris: Mme Huzard, 1838), pp. 14, 16, 124-125, 132. It is also interesting to note how the birth of the "facsimile" copy threatened the counterfeiting of ministerial orders and the mystification of administrative action: pp. 124-125; on the technique of facsimile production, pp. 129-132.

25 Ibid., p. 9.
order regulating administrators' routines and responsibilities, scattered though they were across the country. He described the duties of administrators authoritatively, to ensure that correspondence could make it from one end of the country to the other. Paper could pass from one office to the next, from one administration to another, never with a clear view of its final destination, but secure in the use of prescribed routes and forms.

As Fleurigeon recreated the "labyrinth" of administration in his account of the laws and regulations governing each administrative position, the paper chain also became fixed in the habitual relationships of the administrators "in the field". There was no need for the local mayor to know the minister for them to work together. Books like the Code Administratif, with an A-Z index and a prescribed set of cross-references, made that relationship seem real. Having researched his responsibilities, studied the situations where he was expected to collaborate with other authorities, the local mayor knew his place in the professional "corps". The Code Administratif therefore described a division of labour. By presenting each administrative role in a neatly isolated package, the Code was a means to prevent conflict between subordinate authorities, by delineating roles and functions in precise terms. Fleurigeon hoped, not only to educate administrators in their own duties, but to provide the means for them to understand the other "wheels" of the administrative machine. It was not the speed of paper through the labyrinth, but the routes it took, that structured the way in which he advised administrators to proceed. Fleurigeon's Code Administratif, bringing together descriptions of every administrative role in the country in one reference work, created the first comprehensive account of the New-Regime administration in a process of factual aggregation.

"Administrative science", more generally, was also aggregative in its use of a rigorous experiential method to investigate arbitrary theories and hypothetical systems. In the Bureau of Agriculture, the prefect’s report on pasturage would be combined with reports from all over France. Not only would the rédacteur determine whether alfalfa was dangerous when ingested by beasts, he would also analyse the methods known to produce the best pastures, and would transmit the principles of grazing to the départements, with notes on how individual cases might differ due to climate or topography. The organisation of central administration was built to facilitate such investigations: complex reports were broken down into simple facts as they progressed through the hierarchy. In the bureaux, rédacteurs noted and compared. Meticulously, they concocted new manuals and codes by compiling snippets of information from here and there. The ministry’s distance from the beast, they believed, liberated the Bureau of Agriculture and allowed it to make objective, educated judgements. With each report, rédacteurs developed new areas of interest and justified new calls for information. Their science of administration could eliminate the bucolic ignorance of the provinces, and replace it with information-gathering and experimental deduction.

The object of "administrative science", in its analysis of sheep or alfalfa, was to add to the prosperity of the "Nation". The Ministries hoped, by assembling codes of practice, to bring individual productive efforts into concert. The Bureau of Agriculture collected knowledge of the particular social relationships and practices that determined the way that sheep were reared, so to master the art of animal husbandry. As Bonnin, the keenest proponent of administrative science, explained, administration investigated the "natural order", which it perceived in its analysis of the practices of administrés, and used its findings to reorient those practices (both social and material) in the communal interest. The "natural order", "discovered" by administrators, would – when made

29 The various positions in the ministry hierarchy – rédacteur, expéditionnaire, commis d’ordre – derived from their various functions in the movement of correspondence, and not their perceived position in a hierarchy of status.
generally applicable – increase National prosperity and guarantee the public's trust and esteem. In Bonnin's theory, administration interfered in production, in consumption and in exchange, as constituting public relationships, but could not enter the realm of personal contracts, of inheritance and ownership. Administration was symbiotic rather than parasitic: its opinion and the citizens' experiences informed one another, for the benefit of both. For that reason, according to Bonnin, a "scientific administration" would have little trouble instituting such reciprocity in the communes, arrondissements, and départements of France. Each individual member of the Nation would realise that he was linked, in the immense chain of dependencies and responsibilities forged by administrative laws, to the other members of the Nation.

The Ministry of the Interior's report on pasturage attempted to put theories like Bonnin's into practice. Its report would be transmitted to the prefect, sent to mayors and carried about the countryside in the prefect's annual tour. The prefect would interrogate mayors and "enlightened" citizens on local production and the means by which it could be augmented. He would then compare the methods used against the knowledge aggregated by the central bureaux, and provoke changes by indicating the improvements that could be introduced in the breeding of animals, the organisation of cultivation, and the planting of woodlands. He would demonstrate the advantages of artificial pastures, grazing sheep, and ending the practice of leaving fields fallow. Although routinely faced by "prejudices", administrators were instructed to keep faith that the interests of the individual and society would, by public instruction, be combined to their mutual advantage. The riches of the nation would be augmented by the employment of modern practices. It was not enough to impose improvements from above. Due consideration had to be accorded to the "honourable

31 Ibid., p. xiv.
32 Ibid., p. xv.
33 Ibid., pp. vii-viii. Bonnin explicitly contrasts administrative science with the creation of a bureaucratic and arbitrary authority.
34 Ibid., p. xxvii. Another interesting depiction of this "chain" is to be found in "Cercle figuratif de l'administration de la République francaise," A.A.E., Mémoires et Documents, France, 1414.
35 Bonnin, Principes d'Administration Publique, vol. II, pp. 210-211.
profession" of cultivator.\textsuperscript{36} The administrator was urged to talk to him as a father and friend, and not as a master, to convince him that the discoveries of administrative science were to his benefit as well as to the benefit of society at large.\textsuperscript{37}

In aligning the individual's interest with those of the rest of society, administration saw no boundary between the state and the public sphere. Administration existed in the union of citizens: it represented their common interests without recourse to political opinion or election. Sometimes it provided them with sickles and scythes.\textsuperscript{38} More often it shared the fruits of industrial and agricultural progress, of enlightenment and communication, whether it be the movement from a medieval fallow to artificial pasture, or from a jumble of different measurements across France to a rationalised metric system. The administrator encountered the cultivator as a fellow professional, sharing a common conviction about the need for progress. Thus the Ministry was confident that the report on pasturage would not lie in a dusty filing cabinet, forgotten. Equal in the administrative process was the act of transmitting their findings to the people. The interests of the individual were naturally linked to the interest of the nation in the recognition and common enjoyment of the benefits of scientific progress.

\textbf{The New Administrative Body}

To imagine an administration simultaneously as a "friend", looking over the farmer's shoulder and giving sage advice, and as a wise manager, marshalling the efforts of both administrators and citizens and keep them in constant rapport\textsuperscript{39}, reformers had to objectify administration as a "moral individual", its decision-making based on the agglomerated opinion of the people but also more than the sum of its parts. To talk of "administrative law", aligning the citizens with

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Ibid., p. 211.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Ibid., p. 217.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Several remained left over in the offices of the Bureau of Agriculture, and were inventoried during one of its moves, A.N. f/10/225.
\end{itemize}
the common interest and bringing them into harmony with the rest of society, and of "administrative instruction", feeding the Nation with the fruits of enlightenment benefiting of both the individual and society at large\(^{39}\), they had to first imagine an administrative body. The idea of "naturalness" was central to the New-Regime administration's legitimacy; "administrative science" therefore intersected with the latest medical theories. At the same time that Revolutionary administration was being reformed, a group of "medical revolutionaries" – Pierre-Jean-Georges Cabanis, foremost among them – popularised an understanding of bodily functions like reproduction, digestion, or decision-making as the cooperation of one organ with another, in the unity and harmony of the organic body.\(^{40}\) They called on all branches of science to unite their efforts, to accomplish a "great regeneration", moving outside of their laboratories with this aim in mind.\(^{41}\) Drawing from these theories, New-Regime scientists of society could imagine administration as a vital combination of active cells, communicating to form a coherent unit. They could imagine that internal composition, as well as opposition to external threats, shaped the Nation's experiences.\(^{42}\) They could imagine an administration that worked naturally as a whole, without devaluing the work of the smallest or remotest of its parts.

---

\(^{39}\) Administrative "law" regulated ordinary administrators as it did citizens: a Ministry of Police memorandum in Year VI advised Ministry employees to use the imperative in regulating the action of subordinate authorities, A.N. f/7/3007.


\(^{43}\) Howard Brown in his *War, Revolution and the Bureaucratic State: Politics and Army Administration in France, 1791-1799* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) argues that Revolutionary "bureaucracy" used national defence and military glory to compensate for low levels of legitimacy (pp. 11). That Brown's studies focus on the Ministry of War (and, currently, on police) no doubt contributes to his seeing administration was a primarily repressive force. Brown's administration is
Dissecting the nation in the administrative "operating theatre", they depended on epistemology as well as anatomy. In particular, the works of John Locke and Etienne Bonnot de Condillac provided their inspiration. Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding* (1689) had seen the human mind at birth as a *tabula rasa*, a blank slate. It was only through the process of perception, through the dissection of complex impressions into simple ideas that this slate was filled. Human memory was thus formed in the accumulation of "ideas of reflection": sensation provided both the material and the principles by which the mind was formed. In France, Condillac had radicalised the Lockean *tabula rasa* by asserting that man depended absolutely on language. He could not become conscious of other bodies without words, the "arbitrary sign", to objectify them. Thus, man's command over his imagination, through his command over words, separated him from the beast. Language linked man to his society. Sharing a lexicon allowed communities to pool their experience and to widen their understanding.

also explicitly *politicised* and his study focuses on the decisions of high functionaries rather than the work of personnel engaged in the day-to-day administrative tasks. I do not deny that these aspects of administration exist; however, my study of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (another administration engaging "outside" the body politic) suggest that even this administration concerned itself with promoting internal "progress" as much as external "competition". During the years of war, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, for instance, engaged in studies of industrial and commercial techniques, as France was isolated from the world of "high" diplomacy.

---


46 Ibid., pp. 119-120.

47 Ibid., pp. 117-118.


49 Ibid., pp. 56-58.

50 For this reason, projects to purify and perfect language were rife in the 1790s: see Sophia Rosenfeld, *A Revolution in Language* (Stanford: Stanford U.P., 2001), pp. 123-128. Suggestions were also made on to fix linguistic expression (pp. 123-127), including a report by Talleyrand in 1791: *Rapport sur l'instruction publique fait au nom du Comité du Constitution à l'Assemblé nationale, les 10, 11 et 19 septembre 1791* (Paris; Imp. Nat., 1791).
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To regenerate the Nation, reformers ordered the purging of Old-Regime administration – that suspect functionaries be replaced by proven revolutionaries – to remove the influence of royal form and procedure, and of antique systems of classification. Under the first Brissotin ministry, Dumouriez tore into the heart of the Old-Regime Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The employees who survived swore oaths to the Constitution and to popular government. A year later, under the new Republic, even those oaths were no longer sufficient. New laws compelled ministry employees to approach their commune for certificates attesting their civic virtue. By the end of the Terror, the ministries had eliminated many of their most experienced personnel to ensure the virtue of their offices. The only administrative experience that counted was to have loved the Republic; the only proof of merit was a certificate of civic devotion. With each successive reorganisation, a fresh set of faces and minds entered the bureaux, onto which the science of administration could be stamped irrevocably. The new administrators were taught a new lexicon and a new set of rules with which to govern the nation. They were taught new styles of address – citoyen replaced monsieur – and given a new calendar. Most importantly, clarity and precision were made the watchwords of the administrative profession.

In Condillac's formulation, precise communication was the glue of society: it was imperative that words maintained a constant relationship to one another. Likewise, for the administrative scientists, it was crucial that administrators could be sure of the precise meaning of each missive, of the reliability its content, of the "purity" of the principles with which the simple facts had been identified and

51 Masson in his Le Département des Affaires Etrangères lists a great number of those dispossessed. The "reform" hit the higher echelons especially hard. See also Church Revolution and Red Tape, pp. 241-2.
52 For examples, see Masson, Le Département des Affaires Etrangères, pp. 87, 140-1.
53 Ministerial Order, 18 Pluviôse Year IV, A.N. f/13/504. For the Department of Foreign Affairs, see Masson, Le Département des Affaires Etrangères, pp. 146-7.
classified. The communication of sensation along the nerves in the living body depended on the combined action of all its parts, their uniformity and a chain of regularised responses and reactions.⁵⁶ Administrative science looked to ensure a similar harmony between the action of individuals, of intermediary state organs and, consequently, of the entire social body. It clearly defined the functions and duties involved at each juncture of the administrative process. It organised administrative molecules into state organs and shaped them in relationship with one another. The administrative body, like the human body, existed to relay information: the ministry clerk, to compile reports from the aggregate of the nation's experiences, received information from all over France, broke it into manageable chunks, and then remade it through the process of comparison. A hierarchy of communication, stretching from local commune to central bureau, became the spine of the newborn nation.

That is why, on entering the bureaux, the sumuménaire was not made to study a particular field or develop a particular expertise. He was instead initiated into his "profession". His training made certain that his information could be depended on to travel freely through the hands of a succession of fellow administrators and that it could be trusted for accuracy and clarity of expression. In short, he was initiated into a chain of responsibilities that he could not escape. As he gathered experience, he gained a wider appreciation of the part played by his colleagues, his dependence on them, and their dependence on his precision. He became more exact in his rapports as he strove to emulate his colleagues and to gain their respect. In theory, each move towards greater precision benefited the administration as a whole, and the more the administrator integrated himself in the movement of paper the higher he climbed in the ministry hierarchy.

On the other hand, established scientists were called on to regenerate administration in the early days of the ministries. Cabanis, for instance, collaborated with Dominique-Joseph Garat, a Commissioner for Public

Instruction, in his attempt to organise medical education. Another Commissioner involved in that project was Antoine-François Fourcroy (chair of chemistry in the Jardin des Plantes), who had previously served on the Commission for Arms and Powder, alongside other famous scientists like Berthollet, Pelletier, Monge, and Chaptal. He was made a Councillor of State in 1800 and Director-General of Public Instruction in 1802. Jean-Antoine-Claude Chaptal (chemist and physician) also prospered under Napoleon, becoming Minister of the Interior in 1800, and afterwards a member of the Senate. His predecessor as Minister, Lucien Bonaparte, had frequented Cabanis' "Ideologue" circle in Auteuil. Throughout the 1790s and into the Empire, medical and administrative scientists combined as fellow "professionals" to imagine the social body as a chain of action and reaction, design and function, alignment and order.

The appointment of scientific personnel under Napoleon as First Consul, indeed, cemented the reform of the Ministry of Interior by regularising the channels of communication and establishing a new "tradition" of administrative action. Joseph-Marie DeGérando played a crucial role in this process, standing at a key vantage point in the chain of correspondence into and out of the central bureaux of the Ministry of Interior. In Year VIII he had been made a bureau chief and member of the Consultative Bureau for Arts and Manufactures. Thereafter promoted to secretary-general of the Ministry of the Interior (a function he fulfilled between 1804 and 1810), he oversaw the organisation of both the central

59 Ibid., pp. 42-45, 743-746.
60 Staum, Cabanis, p. 287.
61 Sieyès, Roederer, and even Talleyrand have been named as "Ideologues", believers in the application of natural principles to society and politics: Keith Michael Baker, Condorcet: From Natural Philosophy to Social Mathematics
bureaux and local administrations across France. DeGérando was — and is — however, more famous as an epistemologist than as an administrator.\textsuperscript{62}

DeGérando participated in the 1799 debate on the influence of signs on the formation of ideas in the second class of the National Institute, and produced a four-volume work on that same subject a year later. He also dabbled in anthropological investigation but, by and large, continued with his linguistic research, producing two reports for the Institute on a rigidly classified universal language. De Gérando's major triumph, however, was \textit{De la Génération des connaissances humaines} (1802), winning a prize in the Academy of Berlin, and centring on the idea that "the secret of the future is in the past".\textsuperscript{63} DeGérando, with that statement, departed from an epistemology based rigidly on a \textit{tabula rasa}. He broke with the tradition in which the individual philosopher regarded himself as a lone subject, to talk instead of the constant rule of "our" reason.\textsuperscript{64} His work traced the chain of ideas through their historical effect on one another, on separate tables offered to the reader for comparison. He offered a view of man as a species, with an accumulated societal knowledge and understanding.\textsuperscript{65}

Developments in epistemology, in this case, lagged behind those in administration. DeGérando's own entry into the bureaux in Year VIII already testified to the increased worth attributed to accumulated knowledge in the ministries. "Shadow" consultative bureaux had been set up in centres of

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
particular complexity and importance for the public good. In particular, they emerged alongside the bureaux of agriculture, the manufacturing arts and commerce. Employees of these consultative bureaux were chosen on the basis of proven experience, whether in terms of a lifetime working in the field, or on the evidence of a long administrative career. The consultative bureaux existed only to advise, to unite the experiences of Government Inspectors, Bureau Chiefs and rédacteurs in the one room. They took no part in the day-to-day movement of correspondence. Rather, they were a well of knowledge to be mined by the regular bureaux, a collective memory of administrative action. Increasingly then, the administrators looked to the past to discern the principles that governed the interaction of administration with citizens or the political relations of governments. By amassing archives and writing codes — rather than inviting the public to correspond — they built a repository of principles of administrative action and manuals by which they could understand themselves as an "administration".

Archives and Codes

The Ministry archives had been ignored, left to rot in corridors and attics, in the early years of the Revolution. Dumouriez, during his "reform" of administration in 1792 had dismissed many of the Old-Regime personnel, replacing "royalists" with proven "patriots". The only bureau left unaffected by his purge in 1792 was the archives, isolated from his offices in Paris both geographically, having remained in Versailles, and functionally, by its role to conserve the past, rather than serve the present. Dumouriez viewed ministry archives — not as a useful

66 "Copie de l'Organisation des Bureaux de la Quatrième Division de l'Intérieur (brumaire an V)," A.N. f/1a/1.
67 See, for example, the papers pertaining to Vitry and Bardel, A.N. f/1bl/11-14. Both were members of the "Bureau Consulatif du Commerce" in Year X (A.N. f/1bl/15). Vitry had served in the central administration since Year IV. He had previously been a perpetual secretary of the Agricultural Society and sole administrator of the dépôt de mendicité in Lyon. Bardel, also a member of the "Bureau Consulatif des Arts et Manufactures" retained his position as a Government Inspector while belonging to the bureau consultatif.
68 Letter, members of the bureau consultatif d'agriculture, commerce et arts, to Lansel, 28 Messidor Year VII, A.N. f/10/225.
part of everyday administration – but as repositories of Old-Regime codes of practice. He therefore did not dismiss the archives' personnel, but simply "forgot" them: Old-Regime diplomacy reproduced the character flaws of Kings, and the National Interest could not be derived from accounts of royal intrigue and double dealing. He did not even condescend to destroy the documents of an already dispossessed regime.

Garat, on the other hand, when Minister of the Interior in 1793, was willing not only to forget, but also to destroy these documents, declaring that he

saw nothing to conserve except the account-books of the Nation.

All these old papers, written in gothic script, are just feudal titles, subjecting the weak to the strong, political rules that offend reason, humanity and justice. One could do no better than replace them with [the principles of] the 'Declaration of the Rights of Man'.

Account books, drawing up the balance of current expenditure and revenue, or presenting a balanced view of a contemporary problem were seen as a means to replace the weight of the past as a means of reckoning. Accumulated modes of distinction were to be replaced by zero-sum reckoning: standardised values would replace traditional judgements and notions of merit. Garat authorised the army to plunder administrative archives for funnels to pour gunpowder. Only out of context could Old-Regime documents serve a Revolutionary purpose.

However, while Garat may not have seen the need for anything but account books, others disagreed. The abbé Grégoire declared in October 1792 that "in the Archives, a larger collection of works indicating the changes in public spirit

---

69 It stayed behind when the other offices moved from Versailles to Paris in 1789: Masson, Le Département des Affaires Étrangères, pp. 159-160.
71 Letter, Commission of Arms and Powder to the Commission of Public Works, A.N. f/13/504.
and the passage from the Old Regime to the new is to be found." Arguing that past practices could not simply be forgotten, but should inform those of the present, the Abbé Grégoire foreshadowed his famous speech on vandalism in 31 August 1794, when he proclaimed the need to use the debris of the Old Regime to instruct the public. In that speech he argued that the art and sculpture of France's monarchical past (seized from 

emigré aristocrats and proscribed religious orders) should be collected and transformed into "useful" exhibits, displayed chronologically, whose value could be judged in relation to their own time. Grégoire's speech, the inspiration for the transformation of the Louvre from a royal palace into a national museum, therefore called for the classification of exhibits by date, to prevent the danger of retrogression. Although the time was not right in October 1792 – a month after the declaration of the Republic and a month before the beginning of the debate on Louis XVI's execution – his comments can be seen as the basis of moves after the Terror to mediate "principles" with "experience". Used to investigate "changes in public spirit", the "passage from the Old Regime to the new", the documents used for gunpowder funnels in 1793 could, in 1795, be restored to administrative service. In the aftermath of the Terror, the National Convention interrogated the lengths to which Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety had pushed Liberty and Equality. Examining the archives, they agreed that administration should once more learn from the past, that the documents of the Old Regime should again be made useful.

A rekindled sense of the importance of the administration's collective store of experience underpinned the new emphasis placed on archives in the late 1790s. Cartons of old documents were collected, (re)catalogued and (re)classified to make them useful. The archival depots of the eighteenth century had lain for the

most part unused and untouched, remote from the day-to-day work of the bureau. Under the Directory and the Consulate, however, they were brought into the centre of the administrative process. In 1795, an order mandating the move of the Commission for Foreign Affairs from the rue Cérutti to the rue du Bac, directed that its archives should be brought from Versailles to Paris. They were a "monument, very important to conserve for history". The Thermidorian Committee of Public Safety planned to restore the utility of the Ministry's collection of diplomatic documents and foreign treaties, by commissioning a new bureau to draw up an "Analytical Extract and Historical Summary", indicating the general bases for political and commercial interest between France and the rest of the world. In Versailles, archivists would look at all negotiations between 1648 and 1748; in Paris, an analyst would investigate commercial and political relations between 1748 and 1788. Before Old-Regime documents could be useful, therefore, they had first to be organised according to the forms of the New Regime. In particular, administrators had to treat the archives historically, in order to use them without fear of becoming "tainted" by royalism. Their records were lodged inside a new ministry building in Paris between September 1798 and April 1799: placed across the courtyard from the ministry offices and reorganised to respond to their requests, Old-Regime papers could be used more regularly.

In the Ministry of Interior, Abeille, an employee in the Bureau of Commerce asked for and received permission in 1797 to produce a detailed history of France's commercial relations since the seventeenth century, using documents

---

74 The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, exceptionally, had used its archives to teach students at an ill-fated school of administration between 1712 and 1719: Thuillier, *La bureaucratie en France*, pp. 20-37.
76 Ibid.
77 Ministerial Order setting up the bureau d'analyse, 18 Frimaire Year III, A.A.E. *Organisation et Règlements du Ministère*, vol. I, part 2. This series also contains regulations on how the bureau d'analyse should proceed with its work.
lying around his office. A central archive, created in 1802, built on this initiative, bringing other documents out of hiding and restoring awareness among personnel of the rich source of information represented by Old-Regime memoirs. Rescuing a large assortment of material from the antechambers, corridors and attics of the Ministry, the central archive began its life by filling 18,000 to 20,000 cartons. The archive's Division Chief lamented the exposure of the records to the indifference of employees and the voracity of rats. Nevertheless, he confidently proclaimed that they would become a truly useful source of knowledge as soon as his office could draw up a set of full and complete indexes. His employees set about cataloguing their archive dossier by dossier.

After separating the papers relating to local administration from those dealing with hospices, those related to agriculture from those addressing issues of public instruction — his employees ranged the papers chronologically, organising their comparative utility by date. They combined Old-Regime documents with new, focused by the categories of service to the Nation, and ranked according to proximity to the present. The combination of documents from the Old Regime and the New was completed by requiring all divisions of the ministry to send redundant cartons and dossiers to the archives bureau at the end of each year, layering the accumulation of documents in regular chronological brackets. Much like Garat's account books, this system allowed the archivists to put the concerns of different regions side by side, and to draw up the advantages and disadvantages of a particular administrative decision (for example, the archives could investigate the balance of commerce in the various regions of France, to decide which industries should receive state "encouragement"). Reclassification of the archives also allowed the ministries to compare old results with new, to

79 Abeille, a employee of the Bureau of Commerce in 1797, requested permission to produce a detailed history of France's commercial transactions since Colbert. He was the only one left in the bureau with a personal recollection of that history and he believed that his knowledge should be preserved for the future: A.N. f/10/225.
80 Ministerial Order, 22 Pluviôse Year X, A.N. f/1a/634; "Organisation du 29 ventôse an X", A.N. f/1a/634.
81 "Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Intérieur par Scipion Mourguès le 17 thermidor an XI", A.N. f/1a/590-2.
plan "progress" into the future. In line with the epistemological basis of administrative science, new recruits were assigned to the archives to learn by "experience and habit"\textsuperscript{83}; restored to its role as the administration's memory, experience and habit would be fashioned by archivists.\textsuperscript{84}

When the Ministry of Interior drew on the records of Louis XIV to draw up a Commercial Code in 1803, it took a step that would have seemed ludicrous nine years earlier. The archivists willingly combined writing their report with sorting and cataloguing the papers found abandoned in an attic two years previously.\textsuperscript{85} However, when the archives produced a report for a Rural Code in 1805—a mere two years later—Carré d'Harronville, the archives chief, complained about the lack of pre-prepared indexes: this, he claimed, had made the work of aggregating relevant information incredibly difficult.\textsuperscript{86} In 1803, there was no question of refusing to answer the requests of colleagues while indexing the documents they were asking for. After all, by combining cataloguing with analysis, the archivist could learn to prioritise the sorts of information for which he was most regularly asked. In 1805, this system had broken down. When Carré d'Harronville complained that the Code had taken time and resources away from the ongoing process of classification, his resentment signalled the existence of a more fundamental problem.

Part of this problem was the scale of investigation necessary to establish a Codes: all but the Code Civil involved vast statistical surveys as well as major archival investigation.\textsuperscript{87} This was especially true of the Rural Code, which looked

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid..
\textsuperscript{83} Letter, Talleyrand to Bourjot, 19 May 1807, A.A.E. Personnel: première série, vol. 44 [Bourjot baron de].
\textsuperscript{84} "Rapport présenté au Minister de l'Intérieur, 17 thermidor an XI", A.N. f/1a/590-2; see Jean Baillou, Les Affaires Etrangères et Le Corps Diplomatique Français (Paris: CNRS, 1984), vol. 1, pp. 379 for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
\textsuperscript{85} "Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Intérieur par Scipion Mourguès le 17 thermidor an XI", A.N. f/1a/590-2.
\textsuperscript{86} "Rapport au Ministre par Carré d'Haronville le 14 pluviôse an XIII", A.N. f/1a/634.
\textsuperscript{87} For an overview of various statistical projects undertaken by the Ministry of the Interior under Napoleon, see Stuart Wolff, "Contributions à l'histoire des origines de la statistique", pp. 45-116. Wolff is positive about the use of statistics in the period, although allowing that one can not always be confident of their accuracy.
to formalise the rights of property owners and the duties of the state towards encouraging agriculture and protecting the "general interest". It was supposed to be a manual for farmers, uniting principles and practical rules, and a means of instructing proprietors and cultivators. Its aims were no different to those of the bureau d'agriculture more generally, but the Bureau of Agriculture usually solved one problem at a time, and not all at once. The story of the Rural Code was therefore one of fits and starts. In 1802, the Ministry of Interior had sent a series of questions to the provinces, but had not followed up this initial information-gathering exercise.®® An Imperial decree signed at Bayonne in May 1808 reinitiated the attempt of which Carré d'Harronville was part, ordering the creation of consultative commissions in the départements to draw up answers to questions set out by the Ministry of Interior's Commission of Agriculture.®®

These questions, running to 26 chapters and 273 articles, were not only sent to the archives and consultative commissions, but also found their way to sociétés savantes, members of the legislature, mayors and the director of the Agricultural college at Alfort, who all responded with their opinions.®® Cretet, the then Minister of the Interior, commissioned Charles-Joseph de Verneilh-Purisaseau, an ex-prefect, to compile their deliberations. Verneilh-Purisaseau's work continued into 1814, with reports still coming in from new departments conquered by Napoleon (soon to be re-conquered by the Allies). The project then languished again, despite several attempts to revive it in the Restoration Chamber of Deputies. The attempt to create fixed rules to "harmonise" agriculture throughout France (and in its heyday, most of the rest of Europe) therefore floundered on the amount of information provided. Codes (like Fleurigeon's Code Administratif) could give the appearance of administrative stability; the failure of the Rural Code, however, reveals the myth underpinning

®® The idea of a rural Code had already been debated in 1790 and mandated by laws of the 28 September and the 6 October 1791, with no appreciable results.
®® Marmottan, "Un projet de Code Rural sous le Premier Empire", pp. 10-15. The opinions collected and published filled two volumes of the four-volume set of
the legendary statistical prowess of the Napoleonic state, and the impossibility of adequately underpinning social stability with scientific fact.®

Similarly, if Revolutionary and Napoleonic archivists believed that each dossier could be organised to serve up its treasures, contemporary estimates – 18,000 to 20,000 boxes in the Ministry of Interior alone – testify to the difficulty of the task before them. The task effectively demanded a superhuman effort and a gargantuan space (the Ministry of Foreign Affairs annexed a separate building for its archives in 1798, arguing that the floorboards of the former locale were not strong enough to support the weight of so many cartons). As the archivists found more and more paper in the attics and offices, and received deposits from their colleagues, they were forced to find more space, or to make room in the depot they already used.® While complaining that the other bureaux were not living up to their responsibilities and sending annual deposits of documents, they simultaneously admitted to being relieved that these deposits were not forthcoming, as they had nowhere to put them.® Carré d'Harronville's resentment in 1805 was the first crack in the Revolution's archives project. In Spring of 1806, the project splintered: the archivists made the decision to sacrifice "redundant" documents to make space in their storerooms, and to better their chances of keeping the archives up to date. In order to keep useful papers from the attics, "conservation" (rather than reclassification) became the order of the day.

The abundance of material gathered tended not to clarify the principles of administrative action – to be useful – but merely to give the archivists headaches. They had continually to explain themselves:

This work is without doubt long and painful. In spite of the intelligence, the zeal and the assiduity of my collaborators which I


® Scott, *Seeing Like a State*, pp. 36-37, discusses the failure of the *Code Rural* but accounts for its failure primarily in terms of politics rather than practice.

®® "Rapport par De Lavédrine à Son Excellence, août 1807", A.N. f/1a/590.

®®® A constant complaint also made, for instance, in "Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Intérieur par Scipion Mouruges le 17 thermidor an XI", A.N. f/1a/590-2.

®®®® "Rapport par De Lavédrine à Son Excellence, août 1807", A.N. f/1a/590.
make it my duty to pay justice to, it is very difficult for us to make any haste in our preparations... 95

As it had under Garat, the Ministry of Interior set out to destroy documents of no contemporary value. This time around, however, the archivists betrayed none of Garat's blind conviction, for the definition of what it was to be "of the present" had changed utterly. If, at the outset, they believed that there could be little trouble in destroying documents relating to small debts or various projects that had been dismissed stillborn – as they set about their task, it occurred to them that even these documents could potentially be useful. As they considered the value of their documents in the present – interrogating the integrity of memory – they agonised over deciding what they could safely throw away, pondering their legacy to the administrators of the future. Documents could be destroyed, information forever lost, that could be of use again as administration and society developed. The changing interests of citizens could never be predicted and the archivists realised that they could never be sure what request would be next to come through the door.

Chronically short of space, however, they had little choice. Niceties, though debated, were abandoned. Instead of utility, they eventually used politics to rationalise their choice. While some documents – like the compte décadaires – were destroyed because the archivists thought that they had been sufficiently replaced by the work of the bureau of statistics, other documents – demands for places, denunciations and solicitations, details of purges and reorganisations, questions on the competence of different authorities during the Revolution – were all disposed of en masse, not because of their utility but because of their chronology. In one fell swoop, the Ministry of the Interior rejected its revolutionary heritage. Some archivists had second thoughts and wanted to preserve monuments to revolutionary persons and events, but they were overruled by their superiors who, echoing Garat in 1793, ordered them not to reawaken hateful memories of the past, in the interest of the regeneration of France. As a result, the archives destroyed a multitude of papers documenting the spirit of the revolution – accounts of addresses to popular societies and of public ceremonies, circulars to the people and records of revolutionary oaths – all

95 "Rapport – 5e Division (Archives)", A.N. f/1a/590.
judged to have no reference to their present. A whole slew of revolutionary history disappeared as the archivists emptied cartons to make way for a new batch of papers from the bureaux, to make the archives lean and able to respond to administrative requests.

Cumulative knowledge had therefore swamped the archives, as reports engulfed the other central bureaux. Paperwork had been stymied in a flood of statistics and scientific detail. Delays grew longer and longer. The archives became celebrated for the reply "we are in the process of classification". Though the other offices could not so easily be singled out for blame, the central ministry's relationship with its subordinate agencies became increasingly tense. The administration's harmony fell victim to the proliferation of useful knowledge. As the administration became better at working like a body (as communication speeds improved and as people began to accept administration intruding in their lives) the harmony became even more precarious. Delays lengthened as the administration's empirical process gathered more and more facts into the offices and onto desks. Papers continued to be lost behind cartons and desks, prefects continued to send the wrong information on the wrong form, and the commis d'ordre continued to scratch his head as he tried to make sense of the chaos before him. Desperately, bureau chiefs re-organised desks and routines, established roll calls and surprise inspections. Nothing worked. The science of administration held within itself the seeds of its own demise.

However, contemporaries did not explain the breakdown of administration by its logic or its mode of fact gathering and analysis. A division chief, waiting two weeks for a report he expected in two days, could not see the piles of paper engulfing the poor rédacteur. The public could not imagine the difficulties in bringing together facts from eighty odd départements and producing from them a clear, precise exposé. Though administrators were no longer purged in the

96 Ibid.
98 For example, in 1805, the Ministry of Interior received 64,000 letters: it responded to 35,000 and produced 921 initiatives for local administrators to
name of creating a *tabula rasa*, they were "re-organised" for failing to "live up to their responsibilities," for bringing disorder to the administrative process. Offices were made and remade as they were deemed to have failed or to be superfluous. A climate of fear and distrust overshadowed the bureaux. The eve of each reorganisation saw a new batch of memoirs arrive in the Minister's office. Each held a history of an individual administrator's career, deposited to prove his rights to advancement. In the same way, however, that administrative memory was paralysed by a glut of information, the abundance of protestations of loyalty and zeal devalued their message. Instead, administrators concentrated on proving their responsibility outside of the office, as a good citizen, or through connections in the world of good society.

Though the science of administration could not achieve its aims, it continued to endeavour to do so. No one administrator stood outside the body to diagnose its sclerosis. Each was trapped within his own ambit, limited to his own relationships and responsibilities. The enlightened conviction that a common professionalism could structure a new France became mired in a morass of detail. The cold reality of the everyday chilled the ardour of the administrator who concerned himself more with avoiding the denunciation of his fellows than with recognising his common mission to regenerate the Nation. Harmony became less important than results; results became less important than survival. The French administration simply knew too much. Its organisation, modelled on a conception of natural order, collapsed under the weight of its task. The science of administration, based on empirical reasoning, depended on the flow of information from citizen to prefect to central bureau. Once this flow had been interrupted, Ministers looked for scapegoats: administrative reorganisations were ill-disguised purges, not for "political" reasons, but for reasons of economy and the "good of service".

---

promote in the *départements*, all with a staff of 200 odd clerks: Thuillier, *La Vie Quotidienne dans les Ministères*, p. 80.
Chapter Two

Time and Space:
The Bricks and Mortar of Revolutionary Administration.

Ministerial Scrutiny

After a procession of market women unceremoniously marched the King to the capital on the 5th and 6th October 1789, a new chapter began in the history of a political Revolution. No less momentous was that date for a revolution in administrative practice: as Louis relocated his court from Versailles to the Tuileries, his Ministers relocated both their residences and their offices to the faubourg Saint Germain. Across the river from the Tuileries, Montmorin, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, leased two buildings for his offices between the rue de Bourbon and the rue de l'Université (close to his own mansion on the rue Plumet).¹ Packing his offices into these two buildings (united by knocking down a separating wall and a section of one building), Montmorin concentrated his administration in a way that had been impossible when his Royal Master resided in the Chateau de Versailles. By chance, if not by choice, the Ministry found itself remade spatially by the events of the French Revolution. The very fact of moving to Paris combined the offices in a single place, their employees united — if not by politics or esprit de corps² — by the common experience of journeying through the faubourg and through the Ministry gates. By walking to work (and entering the Ministry by the main gate, not the servant's entrance), the employee turned from court lackey into servant of the state.

In Old-Regime Versailles, the bureaux politiques of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs occupied a place of relative prominence, installed in an aile

¹ "Rapport approuvé par le Roi le 28 janvier 1790", cited in Masson, Le Département des Affaires Étrangères, pp. 67-68. The rue de Bourbon was renamed the rue de Lille between 1792 and 1815, and again (permanently) in 1830.
² As proven by Catherine Kawa in her excellent Les Ronds-de-Cuir en Révolution.
forming the cour des ministres from where the clerk could communicate directly with the apartment of the secretary of state by means of an interior stair. The bureaux politiques packed up lock, stock and barrel to follow the King on his grands tours of the realm, moving into leased premises close to the various Royal residences. The other offices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however – including those of private secretaries and accounting clerks – moved periodically from one locale to another in the town of Versailles. Under Vergennes, they had been installed in the hôtel du Marquis de l'Hôpital, rue Saint-François, rented for 3600 livres a year. The archives, on the other hand, occupied a definite locale – the hôtel du dépôt, adjacent to the hôtel de la Guerre, purpose-built in 1761 to house the redundant papers of the Departments of Foreign Affairs, Marine and War. This supposedly fire-proofed hôtel du dépôt foreshadowed later Old-Regime projects of "useful splendour": it was decked out in Beauvais tapestries and specially commissioned paintings, and run with a showy militaristic efficiency which impressed state visitors but militated against the possibility of any real work getting done. After Vergennes refused to pay the Department of Foreign Affairs’ share of this unnecessary expense in 1778, the archives were supposed to be moved to the hôtel du Grand Maître or the hôtel d'Orléans. In the end,

3 Masson, Le Département des Affaires Etrangères, pp. 13, 18-19. The lease on the hôtel du Marquis de l'Hôpital ended in 1778, and it is not certain where the Ministry moved to next. Nevertheless, it is clear that administrations were placed in whatever building was found vacant: see also, Natascha Coquery, "Patrimoine privé, patrimoine public: la conversion de l'hôtel aristocratique parisien en bureaux au XVIIIe siècle", in L'esprit des lieux: La patrimoine de la cité [sous la direction de Daniel J. Grange et Dominique Poulot] (Presse Universitaires de Grenoble, 1997) pp. 379. Coquery confirms, in "L'émergence des quartiers administratifs de l'Ouest Parisien à la fin du XVIIIe siècle", in Annie Fourcaut (ed.), La Ville Divisée: les ségrégations urbaines en question, France XVIIe-XXe siècles, (Grâne: Créaphis, 1996), p. 236, that – with the exception of offices situated in the Château in Versailles – hôtels de fonction were rare. This is not to say that offices were not situated within buildings in Paris: in such cases, however, private ownership and not public function decided their dispersal. See also, Vida Azimi, "Les Lieux de l'administration: geographie des bureaux sous l'ancien régime", Mémoires de la Société pour l'histoire du Droit et des Institutions des anciens pays bourguignons, comtois et romands, 43e fascicule (1986), pp. 77-103.

4 Horace Walpole was one such “tourist”, attracted not by the documents by the largesse of the decorations. The regime under which the archives were run was "brief, under the pretext of order, entering into a detail of administration that made life difficult, even impossible, for employees": Masson, Le Département des Affaires Etrangères, pp. 17, 46.
however, they remained fixed in the hôtel du dépôt, due to the projected costs of transportation.\(^5\) The Ministry therefore operated with personnel scattered across the city, occupying a wing of the Minister's personal residence, a vacant mansion, and a tourist attraction.\(^6\) The move to Paris was part of this tradition of mobility: the bureaux followed their King to the banks of the Seine. After Montmorin's dismissal, they moved again to the rue d'Artois, where De Lessart established both his offices and a Ministerial apartment.\(^7\)

The move to Paris did, however, give impetus to the unification of the bureaux and the emergence of a building identifiable as a Ministry, increasing the visibility of both Ministers and their employees.\(^8\) The luxury of apartments and offices, the movements of personnel, the effective management of the economy came under

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 18.
\(^6\) The bureaux of the Secretary of State for the Maison du Roi, which René-Marie Rampelberg describes as a precursor to the Ministry of the Interior in Le Ministre de la Maison du Roi, was similarly spread between a number of different locations, with bureaux both in Paris and in Versailles. The main offices were located in a pavilion in the Château de Versailles, where the Baron de Breteuil kept an apartment. The Parisian offices were situated in Breteuil's hôtel on the rue du Dauphin and in the Louvre (p. 24).
\(^7\) Masson, Le Département des Affaires Etrangères, pp. 141 (note). In 1792, the rue d'Artois was renamed the rue Cérutti. It returned to its former appellation in 1814; however, after the July Revolution of 1830, it was renamed again — the rue Lafitte. The building in which the Ministry used to exist is today no. 4.
\(^8\) The final decades of the eighteenth century had already seen a tentative move towards emergence of specific administrative hôtels: Natascha Coquery, "L'Emergence des quartiers administratifs", pp. 233-243. Coquery locates a movement to "rationalise" administration in certain Parisian hôtels in the last decades of the eighteenth century. She argues that in the second half of the eighteenth century, hôtels were increasingly identified by function rather than personality. However, her key example, the hôtel des fermes générales on the rue de Grenelle, was only one of a half dozen buildings in the Parisian area which housed offices of the Fermes in the period leading up to the Revolution: for example, from the 1760s, the collection of tobacco duties was organised from the hôtel de Longueville. Another reading of Coquery's evidence is possible: the choice of "luxurious" buildings for corporate headquarters (which she notes) indicates that these were sites of aristocratic display rather than of public service. The elegant offices of the noblesse de robe might even be seen as a challenge to the structures of absolutist power (in the creation of alternative centres for the theatrical display of power), rather than part of a process of absolutist-state rationalisation. Therefore, while attempts were certainly being made in the eighteenth century to simplify administration, the full "bureaucratisation" of the faubourg Saint Germain and the emergence of "public" administrations, would have to wait for the Revolution.
scrutiny. Under the Old Regime, Ministry finances were constructed out of a tangle of royal pensions, secret funds, treasury payments and diplomats' personal fortunes. After the National Assembly claimed for itself the right to review the Nation's finances, this tangled web came under intense inspection. Soon after the King's déménagement in 1789, the Constituent Assembly had voted a one-million livre cut in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' budget, forcing Montmorin to use secret funds to subvent the cost of moving. These secret funds therefore came to light: deputies of the comité des finances forced Montmorin to open the Ministry's account books and to regularise the payment of his employees.® Thereafter they demanded regular ministry budgets, detailing the cost of wages and expenses, and including the amount spent on maintaining and leasing the Ministry buildings. In Versailles, such information about the management of government bureaux had been protected by the etiquette of Court life and the obscurity of a distended organisation, scattered across the city; in urban Paris, ministries — and their employees — were the object of a more intense scrutiny. After forcing open the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' ledgers in 1790, the Assembly next sought to penetrate the Ministry doors, appointing commissaires to poke in its papers after Louis XVI's flight to Varennes in June 1791. Even before the King's apprehension, the Assembly sealed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' offices. The King's return further discredited his Ministry, which had issued the Royal Family's false travelling documents. The Assembly therefore sent a deputation to scrutinise its registers, searching for duplicity in the passports office.® While a Parisian mob gathered outside Montmorin's hôtel

® Masson, Le Département des Affaires Étrangères, pp. 72-73.
© The guard placed around the Ministry forced Montmorin to write to the Legislative Assembly for a laissez-passer to attend their debates: Madival, M.J., & Laurent, M.E. (founding eds.), Archives Parlementaires de 1787 à 1869, (Paris: P. Dupont / CNRS, 1867 - ), vol. XXVII, p. 365 [21 June 1791]. He appeared before the Assembly on the 24 June to answer questions about Louis XVI's faked travelling documents. Camus (who would later take charge of the National Archives) proposed that four commissioners be nominated from their ranks to investigate the passport office registers, to which Montmorin acquiesced. These four commissioners were Camus himself, Gourdan, Roederer and Muguet: see Archives Parlementaires, vol. XXVII, pp. 484-486. The Assembly subsequently found Montmorin's conduct in the affair irreproachable.
calling for his dismissal, Montmorin was forced to stand by as the Assembly's commissioners invaded his bureaux.\textsuperscript{11}

After Varennes, a series of Legislative edicts imposed the oath of allegiance on Ministry employees, mandated salary ceilings, and required the publication of a list of all those receiving state salaries at home and abroad. The organic law of May 1791 had already outlined the minister's duty to appear before the Assembly. The new law on the "responsibility" of Ministers in December 1791 required all ministries to present an \textit{état} of their actions to the Assembly every fifteen days. As the Assembly's \textit{comité diplomatique} investigated the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, several Assembly committees, including the Committee on Agriculture and Commerce, inspected the work of the new Ministry of the Interior.\textsuperscript{12} On the 10 August 1792 (after the overthrow of Louis XVI), the Assembly decided that it should nominate ministers itself, and that they should co-ordinate the National administration in a \textit{Conseil exécutif}. The Committee of Public Safety, established initially to co-ordinate with this council of ministers to ensure a more effective administration of the war effort, but proceeded to erode its powers, establishing its own right to supervise the activities of ministers and taking on the work of an administrative "nerve centre". With Billaud-Varennes' law on the composition of a "revolutionary government", passed on the 14 Frimaire Year II (4 December 1793), Ministers were held to report to the Committee of Public Safety (both individually and as representatives of the \textit{Conseil exécutif}) every ten days.\textsuperscript{13} Later, on the 1 April 1794 (12 Germinal Year

\textsuperscript{11} Masson, \textit{Le Département des Affaires Etrangères}, pp. 99. A similar event had accompanied the downfall of the Minister for War, comte de Brienne (brother of Archbishop Loménie de Brienne), in 1787: a Parisian mob set the \textit{hôtel de Brienne} on fire on the night of the 24 August 1787, after having already burned an effigy of the War Minister (and his colleague, the "Keeper of the Seals", Lamoignon) on the Pont-Neuf. The \textit{hôtel} was surrounded on all sides by troops who fired into the crowd. See Léon Roger, "L'Hôtel du Ministre de la Guerre, dit Hôtel de Loménie de Brienne - 14, rue Saint-Dominique (ancien 90)", \textit{Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire d'Archéologie des VIIe et XVe arrondissements de Paris}, 2 (December 1906), p. 14. The 1848 Revolution also began with a march on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on the boulevard des Capucines.


\textsuperscript{13} Archives Parlementaires, vol. LXXX, pp. 365-369.
Il), the Ministries were abolished outright and replaced by twelve executive commissions. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was therefore replaced by a one-man Commission des Rélations Extérieures, run in turn by Conventionnels Goujon, Hermann, Buchot, Miot and Cochin between 24 April 1794 and the 4 November 1795.\(^\text{14}\)

As this revolution in ministerial scrutiny progressed, Ministers were increasingly driven to downplay their own importance, to display themselves as good servants of the Nation and not as political figures in their own right. Lebrun-Tondu, Minister of Foreign Affairs from August 1792 to June 1793 took the opportunity to complain about the ostentation of the Ministerial apartments before an eager Convention, criticising his predecessor DeLessart for moving the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from the rue Bourbon to the rue Cérutti. Lebrun, speaking before the Convention on the 2 November 1792 complained that:

\begin{quote}
the transfer of the bureaux of the Department of Foreign Affairs ... to the rue Cérutti cost the Ministry 46,668 livres, for which the workers are pressing for payment... My Department cannot take responsibility for paying this cost. I would have been as well lodged in the old locale, as I am now, surrounded by the ornate panelling of the hôtel on the rue Cérutti. A Republican Minister has no need for a magnificent - and expensive - hôtel when serving the people. It is ridiculous that the Nation should pay for a Ministerial fantasy - these beautiful apartments rented by De
\end{quote}

\(^{14}\) The rapid pace of ministerial change during the French Revolution also bolstered the long-term extrication of administration from the dominance of aristocratic and ministerial personalities. While the final years of the old regime also saw a high degree of ministerial instability - in particular in the office of the Contrôle Générale - the rapid changeover of ministerial personnel during the Revolution was unprecedented both in scope and breadth. From 16 July 1789 to the 10 August 1792, each Department had had between 4 and 8 different Ministers. During the period between August 1792 and April 1794, the average durability of a Minister or Commissioner was four months for the Marine and Contributions, two and a half months for Justice and Foreign Affairs, and only one and a half months for War and the Ministry of the Interior. Under the Directory, Ministers of Police and War enjoyed an average of five and eight month's power respectively. The Ministers of Justice and Interior served on average for nine and a half months, the Minister of Marine for twelve: Catherine Kawa, Les Ronds-de-Cuir en Révolution, p. 66.
Lessart. Such expense is all for show: such luxury is not to my
taste and the Nation should not have to pay for it.\textsuperscript{15}

Lebrun's Spartan rhetoric appealed to a Nation in debt, bankrupted by a
European military campaign.\textsuperscript{16} The cost of moving to the \textit{rue Cérutti} had been
extortionate (and authorised only by the King and not the Legislature). The
Convention's \textit{comité des finances} decided that this cost should be charged to
the heirs of DeLessart (who was killed while en route from Orléans to Paris for
trial as a "suspect"). Meanwhile, however, the rent on the Ministry building
continued to be met, by a government short of cash, and looking to abandon
luxury for goods of basic necessity.\textsuperscript{17} The Convention therefore sought a new
locale for the Ministry, one combining cost effectiveness with privacy.
Paradoxically, in doing so they returned to one of the great aristocratic houses in
the \textit{faubourg Saint Germain}, the quarter where Montmorin had initially placed the
bureaux in 1789.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[15] \textit{Archives Parlementaires}, vol. LIII, p. 116.
\item[16] Desfourgues, Minister of Foreign Affairs between June 1793 to April 1794, was
unsatisfied with the \textit{hôtel} for a different reason. He complained to the Minister of
Interior in July 1793 about the ease with which the low wall at the back of the
mansion allowed interlopers to enter the Ministry on the \textit{rue Cérutti} unchecked.
He had to bolster the company of horsed \textit{gendarmes} he used as dispatch riders
with a post of war-wounded servicemen, in order to guard the offices: see
Masson, \textit{Le Département des Affaires Etrangères}, p. 323
\item[17] Montmorin's rent in the \textit{faubourg Saint-Germain} had only been 13,000 livres a
year. The rent for the Ministry on the \textit{rue Cérutti} was set at 25,000 livres per year
for a period of three, six or nine years. De Lessart guaranteed this rent
personally, a fact that the Convention used to its advantage: ibid., pp. 68, 141.
\item[18] The Ministry of Foreign Affairs remained in the \textit{hôtel Gallifet}, rue du Bac, until
1821. After the peace in 1804, Napoleon planned to up its prestige by moving it
to a quadrangle between the quai de Bonaparte (d'Orsay), and the rues de
Bellechasse, de Lille and de Poitiers (facing the Jardin des Tuileries). This
quadrangle was, in addition, initially meant to house three other ministries: the
Ministry of Police, the office of the Secretary of State and the Ministry of Foreign
Affairs of the Kingdom of Italy. An Imperial Decree of the 9 February 1810,
however, destined it solely for the use of France's Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
The first stone was laid by Champagny on the 4 April 1810, but the building was
not completed until 1838, by which time the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had
moved to the boulevard des Capucines. The new building instead housed the
July Monarchy's \textit{Conseil d'État} and \textit{Cour des Comptes}: L. Lanzac de Laborie,
discussion of the proposed Ministry building on the quai d'Orsay, see Michel-
Jean Bertrand, \textit{Géographie de l'Administration: l'impact du pouvoir exécutif dans
les capitales nationales} (Paris: M.-Th. Génin, 1974), pp. 79-87. Bertrand,
however, is not always factually reliable.
\end{footnotes}
Fig. 1. Sites of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the Revolution and Empire. [map from 1811, available at http://www.columbia.edu/cu/arthistory/courses/parismaps/]

1. Montmorin's Ministry, between the rue de Lille and the rue de l'Université (1789).
3. The hôtel de Gallifet, rue de Bac (1795).
4. Projected Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1810), quai de Bonaparte, abandoned in 1814.
Montmorin's decision had been based on proximity to his own hôtel on the rue Plumet and the prestige of the new aristocratic quarters in the western suburbs of Paris — in particular, the faubourgs Saint Germain and Saint-Honoré. Unlike Montmorin, the Committee of Public Safety's decision to move its offices to an aristocratic hôtel was not a display of monumentalism or powerful splendour, but, instead, of public bankruptcy. The Republic had taken possession of a large number of "country" mansions after the Assembly voted to confiscate the property of émigrés, and now looked to profit from them. Some were sold as biens nationaux, but others were adapted to house the burgeoning number of National agents. On the 2 Ventôse Year II (20 February 1794), the Committee of Public Safety decreed that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should be installed in the maison Gallifet on the rue du Bac. This house — once the property of the émigré Marquis de Gallifet — had already been issued for sale in a state lottery, but it was taken back by Committee of Public Safety, who compensated the purchaser with a property near the Palais Royal. Owning so many houses in the former aristocratic faubourg of Saint-Germain (and desirous to sell them), the preoccupation of the Committee of Public Safety was to "reanimate this quarter of Paris and to add to the value of the superb buildings that the nation possesses there". However, as Lebrun-Tondu surely would have agreed, the 1780s-fashionable neo-classical arc-de-triomphe entrance mattered less than the conversion of the building into suitable office space. Re-animation did not mean a return to the splendour of aristocratic dwellings, discussed in eighteenth-

19 The Committee of Public Safety initially ordered that the bureaux be moved on the 22 pluviôse (10 February 1794) to the maison Beaujon on the rue du faubourg Saint-Honoré (confiscated from the influential eighteenth-century financier of that name). This building is today a Conservatoire Municipal, no. 208, rue du Faubourg St. Honoré.
20 Masson, Le Département des Affaires Etrangères, p. 302. The hôtel Gallifet was connected via its stables to another confiscated émigré property, the hôtel Maurepas on the rue de Grenelle. Immediately after its confiscation it held the bureaux of the Commission de l'Instruction publique. These, however, moved with the rest of the new Ministry of Interior to the hôtel Conti in Year VI (1798). At the same time, the relocation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' archive to Paris was approved: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs seized the opportunity presented by this now-vacant building to house its archives, map depot, library, and the Chief of Archive's apartment: ibid., pp. 413-415; Henri Veyrier, La Faubourg Saint-Germain (Paris, 1987), pp. 236-7 [hôtel de Furstenberg].
century guidebooks, but the practical matter of repopulating an empty – and potentially dangerous – quarter.

Defining an Open Administration.

Successive Revolutionary governments turned to mandating audience hours to regulate the meeting of their employees with the citizens of the Nation. They ordered Ministers and fonctionnaires to open their doors regularly to the public, welcoming petitioners into their offices and encouraging the open airing of grievances. At the same time, they took measures designed to give employees elbowroom, and to control the leakage of both information and personnel. Therefore, on the 26 Ventôse Year II (16 March 1793), the Committee of Public Safety ordered the gardiens of the various bureaux to forbid anyone not part of the administration to enter their Ministries, except on the direct order of their superiors. It commanded that salles de communication be opened between the hours of one and three o'clock, in which the public could wait for an audience with the Division chiefs. These hours were to be advertised on a poster outside the hôtel, on the door of the porter's lodge and in the corridors of the bureaux. On the back of the Committee of Public Safety's order, the Commission des Travaux Publics ordered its division chiefs to post their names, their divisions, and the nature of the affairs they dealt with on the exterior door of their salle de communication with the public.

Therefore, when the plaque, engraved with the words "Ministère de l'Intérieur", marking the front door of the Ministry's hôtel Penthièvre on the rue Neuve-des-Petits-Champs, was removed in April 1794 (when the Convention replaced the Ministry with its executive commissions) the Committee of Public Safety charged Citizen Hubert, an architect, to place new plaques on the relevant buildings.

---

22 Order signed by Dupin, Commissioner of Public Works, 21 Thermidor Year II, A.N. t/13/504. The same order was enforced in the Commission for External Relations: Masson, Le Département des Affaires Etrangères, pp. 301-302
immediately – including one inscribed "Commission des Revenus Publics" on the hôtel Penthièvre.\textsuperscript{23} The Commission des Subsistances (set up in October 1793), which had hitherto operated out of vacant rooms in the Ministry of Interior building, moved to the adjacent hôtel Toulouse, where in November 1794 the Committee of Public Safety ordered it to "replace the luxurious furniture which currently decorates the apartments with furniture that better suits the simplicity of Republican morals".\textsuperscript{24} Established in its own locale, the Commission established regular hours of audience, and invited those on public business to present their case to the relevant Division Chief. Its plaque, like the official inscriptions on doors of the bureau chiefs, formed both an invitation and injunction to the outsider, encapsulating the bureaux' balance between willing transparency and necessary isolation.

While this system may have made perfect sense in theory, it was difficult to enforce in practice. The regular transgression of office boundaries was castigated in edicts restating hours of audience throughout the Revolutionary period. Pre-empting the Committee of Public Safety order of the same month (ordering that visitors should be admitted by authorisation of a Division Chief), the Commission des Subsistances lashed out against petitioners, who interrupted the work of both bureau chiefs and employees when entering the bureaux. Tissot, the secrétaire général of the Comité des Subsistances had already chided Moreau, the Director of the Subsistances Végétales, on the 12 pluviose (31 January 1794):

The Commission wishes that no one should enter the bureaux except at two o'clock, and only for public business. Yet, I meet at every hour, on the staircases and in the bureaux, a procession of citizens coming and going. This disorder is detrimental to the well

\textsuperscript{23} Letter, Minister of Interior to the Minister of Finances, 13 Frimaire Year IV, and reply, Minister of Finances to the Minister of the Interior, 15 Frimaire Year IV, A.N. f/13/207. This correspondence discusses the whereabouts of a marble plaque engraved with the words "Ministère de l'intérieur" which was taken down during the Convention. The Minister of Finances' letter refers to an order emanating from the Committee of Public Safety charging Citizen Hubert, architect, to change the inscription on the various state buildings, replacing it, one presumes, with the name of the relevant Commission (e.g. commission des revenus nationaux).
being of the house, to our work and the processing of business, to justice and the impartiality of decision-making. I also perceive that certain employees leave work before the set hours of audience, and go, with an officious air, to aid solicitations in their own divisions, or maybe in others. This state of affairs is contrary to the good [of the Nation] and to justice, and we have to banish it. Away from us these little temptations! We are patriots: let us carefully avoid everything that might return us to the morals of the Old Regime.  

Nevertheless, an order of 14 Germinal (3 April 1794) urged a "sentiment of reciprocity", noting the need in "popular administration" for "affability and charm, a tone of fraternity in all the bureaux, as the imprint of justice and public interest in all its operations." The public was not to be turned away, but welcomed with fraternal concern. In this order — less than three months after Moreau's reprimand, and one month after the Commission's order on office hours and the Committee of Public Safety's order on limiting the access of solicitors — the Commission des Subsistances showed its concern about the growing perception of an unwelcoming administration, shielded by rude porters and intolerant garçons de bureaux.

While the poor enforcement of orders laying down access rights and hours of audience continued into the Directory, it is clear that some employees clearly preferred a productive solitude to the constant interruption of the public. Complaining of "crowds in the offices", Moriceau, a Ministry of Foreign Affairs employee in Brumaire Year IV, outlined a "severe reform" of the rules governing the admission of the public to the offices. Moriceau requested that the "curious and importunate" be banished to assure the tranquillity of employees "who love their work". The rule restricting public hours of audience to between two and four o'clock, should therefore be observed, as should the restriction of outsiders to "une salle destinée à recevoir". Moriceau suggested that all those who entered the building should be required to present an entry card at the Ministry door,

25 Ibid., pp. xlv-xlvi.
26 Ibid., p. xlvii.
delivered by the Secretariat and registered with their name and number. In each division, garçons de bureaux should be instructed firmly to forbid entry to those who should not be there. In the vestibule, they should take turns to stand guard, determining the subject and object of each enquiry, and delivering the petitioner to the appropriate "salle d'audience". In that way, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs could prevent the betrayal of secrets of state, and protect its work from interlopers' random glances.  

If some unscrupulous clerks made a profit by selling access to administrative "secrets", they were hardly representative of administrators as a whole. Despite the support for the official line among employees like Moriceau, however, illicit entry continued to be a problem in the offices. The Directory continued to complain of the haemorrhaging of information in Year VI, reaffirming their order on the 9 Nivôse (29 December 1797). They warned that confidential government reports were being given out on demand, sold to swindlers and interested petitioners. In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Talleyrand reissued the Directory's injunction to his Chiefs of Division, stating that the time set down for public and private audiences should be sufficient to please those who wished to pursue their cases with him. Otherwise, "the work of the bureaux should always

---

27 Moriceau, "Observation sur le régime intérieur du Département des Relations Extérieures", 21 Brumaire Year IV, A.A.E. Organisation et Règlements du Ministère, vol. I, part 2. The Minister seemingly took Moriceau's advice on board, sending a circular to his bureaux four days later, stipulating the hours between one and three for his own hours of audience, and extending those of his bureaux to between one and four. In addition, he forbade any entry at all to the offices responsible for the correspondence of the bureaux politiques: Ministerial Order, 25 Brumaire Year IV, A.A.E. Organisation et Règlements du Ministère, vol. I, part 2.

28 "Copie de la lettre Écrite par le Directoire Exécutif au Ministre des Relations Extérieures", A.A.E. Organisation et Règlements du Ministère, vol. I, part 2; another copy of this letter is to be found in A.N. f/13/504. I have only found one documented example of where information was "sold" by an employee, which suggests that such deceit existed but was not widespread: Laforêt, a Ministry of Interior employee in 1812, responsible for delivering the Ministry's opinion and payment to entrepreneurs, furnishers and other administrative accountants, was stripped of his access to the public. The reason given for his demotion was that he had treated the public as his "clientele": he was furthermore suspected for taking a five percent cut of Ministry commissions: "Notes sommaires sur les Employés de la 4e Division, 30 août 1812 (Organisation du 1 septembre 1812)", A.N. f/1bl/10/2.
remain secret". In the Ministry of Police, annual orders made much the same point: in Fructidor Year VI, the Ministry warned against the leaking of confidential documents; in Vendémiaire Year VII, it ordered that employees should not move about from bureau to bureau; in Pluviôse Year VII, it cautioned against letting outsiders into the Ministry building. In the Ministry of Interior, Chaptal ordered that it was forbidden that Bureau Chiefs or any other employees, whatever their qualifications, give out any information about their work. His order specified that Division Chiefs should indicate the hours and the days when those who wished to see them were to be admitted, and that porters should not admit anyone outside of those hours.

As order followed order during the Revolution, the tension between hiding internal communications while opening up files to answer the public's queries structured the Ministry as a communications artefact. Institutionalising structures of accessibility, Revolutionary regimes and their employees nevertheless created boundaries between "inside" and "outside", between "open" and "closed", to regulate the flow of information into and out of the Ministry doors. The state which engaged with its administrators as "a father and a friend" looked very much like a corporate monolith when viewed outside the hours of audience. As they shaped the landscape of administrative time, administrators also shaped the internal geography of administrative space. As they did so, they looked to clarify the internal divisions (allowing "signposts" to point the way clearly to particular

---

30 These orders are contained in A.N. f/7/3007.
31 For examples of employees who were victims of such regulations, see the dismissal of the Ministry of Interior bureau chiefs, Dumouchel and Lallemand, in Year IX, for letting strangers into the office: A.N. f/1bl/11-14. Their dismissals were for contravention of a direct ministerial order, rather than for any leakage of specific. Both employees were eventually both forgiven and reinstated. See also, documents related to Malon, a garçon de bureau, who lost his job in the Ministry of Interior under Montalivet. Malon was not dismissed for actual theft (it could not be proven) but for having allowed theft to occur in the bureaux for which he was responsible. His dismissal included an injunction to other garçons de bureaux to be vigilant (they were "personally responsible" for thefts in their offices), and to porters to prevent anyone leaving the Ministry at night, carrying a package, to leave without a laissez passer: A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Malon].
32 Ministerial Order, A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an IX: Arrêtes].
bureaux), to make administrative space legible to the public without disturbing the work of the bureaux. They debated means of movement within the Ministry, and access points to its various divisions. Converting aristocratic hôtels into administrative departments, potential redevelopment was constricted. Yet, initially at least, Ministers entertained other more radical plans, striking a different balance between transparency and the privacy of administrative work.

The Ministry as a Communications Artefact

In 1796, the marble Ministry of Interior plaque that had once hung on the rue neuve-des-Petits-Champs was resurrected, presumably to be placed at the entrance of the hôtel Conti-Brissac on the rue de Grenelle. This mansion had belonged to Louis-Hercule-Timoléon de Cossé, duc de Brissac, governor of Paris in 1772, and a victim of the September massacres. It was, in fact, composed of two separate buildings: the grand hôtel, built by Jacques de Coigneux in 1645-6, and the petit hôtel added by the duc de Villars almost a century later in 1710. Seized by the state, these hôtels were both given over to the Commission des approvisionnements (the Commission for Trade and Food Supply) in Year III (1795). The commissioners immediately employed the architect Roucelle to convert the old aristocratic mansions into usable office space, demolishing walls, constructing chimneys, building shelves, breaking new doors and windows. The principle of utility triumphed over any other considerations: Roucelle was given a free hand to gut the old building completely. By combining some old sheds and a kitchen, he formed the bureau de la Vérification du Commerce. By cutting some rooms down to size and

---

35 Letter, Commission of Public Works to Commission des Approvisionnements, 5 Prairial Year III, A.N. f/13/1207.
knocking walls to enlarge others, Roucelle carved usable office space out of the luxurious surroundings.\textsuperscript{36}

The conversion of decadent aristocratic mansion into a moral administrative department provoked a great deal of discussion – and expense – for the New-Regime offices. The bureaux did not simply move into old stables: archive cartons did not nestle among old hay, and employees were nudged only in extreme circumstances into cramped alcoves. Benezech appointed the architect, Bertrand Poyet, to oversee both construction and repairs in the hôtel Conti in Year IV.\textsuperscript{37} Poyet was also responsible for ministry offices on the rue Dominique, rue de Bac, and the rue de l'Université. In Year V, Benezech's successor, François de Neufchâteau, asked Poyet to draw up a plan to reunite his bureaux in the hôtel Conti-Grenelle, and to create a permanent home for the Ministry. Poyet made his estimation of both necessary works and cost to the Minister on the 3 Brumaire Year VI (24 October 1797).\textsuperscript{38} During the following months, the question of how to facilitate communication – both between bureaux and with the public – was debated fiercely. Poyet's plan was sent to the bureaux des bâtiments civils, to verify his estimates. There, an anonymous critic had his own opinion on how utility and transparency could best be combined.

Poyet's plan divided the hôtel Conti among the Divisions and bureaux as they existed in Year VI, presenting his various designations on a colour-coded plan.\textsuperscript{39} The First Division (correspondance avec les autorités constituées) occupied the First Floor on the grand cour, and the right aisle of the adjacent corps de logis. Employees and the public should enter by the stairway on the right. Poyet placed the Second Division (hôpitaux civils) on all three floors surrounding the small courtyard. The Third Division (travaux publics) occupied the whole ground

\textsuperscript{36} "Devis d'ouvrages à faire dans la maison Conty en ventôse an 3ème", A.N. f/13/1207.
\textsuperscript{37} By a decision of 30 Frimaire Year IV (20 December 1796): see also, letter, Chief of the Third Division to Poyet, A.N. f/13/1207.
\textsuperscript{38} Report, Poyet to the Minister of the Interior, 17 Frimaire Year VI, A.N. f/13/1207.
\textsuperscript{39} A.N. N III Seine 1114. Plans 10, 11 and 12 (referred to as an "état ancien") correspond to a division of rooms decided in 1819. However, on plan 10, the
floor on the grand cour. Its entrance was through the vestibule, opposite the porter's lodge. The Fourth Division (agriculture, commerce et arts utiles) took the building facing the small courtyard, and a part of the Stables attached to it. The Fifth Division (Instruction publique) overlooked the garden, on the left when entering the second court. The Cadastre was placed in what was hitherto a large grain store. The Sixth Division (subsistances Générales) occupied the first floor of the left aisle of the grand cour. Visitors entered this division by the stairs on the left of the porter, who would point the way to whichever bureau the visitor wanted to consult.

Poyet's plan was cautious. He proceeded by consulting the various bureau chiefs, asking them where they wished to be placed. The majority of his work was to be in the structural conversion of stables and grain stores into usable offices. Hence, in locating the Division for Public Education, he had asked its Chief, Guinguenet, if he had any qualms about working out of converted stables. Poyet assured Guinguenet that these were "infinitely more handsome and commodious" than the other offices available. When the anonymous critic in the bureaux des bâtiments civils suggested that such quarters were not adequate for the prestigious offices placed there, Poyet replied that he had made the best of a bad lot, and no functional division could ever satisfy everyone. Redevelopment was constricted by architectural realities: yet, by reclassifying old stables as new offices, the aristocratic mansion could be made useful for a New Regime.

Poyet's plan for the Ministry involved only minor changes to the location of bureaux already ensconced in the hôtel Conti and hence a minimum of fuss. He stretched the third division of the Ministry along the ground floor of the grand cour, as that much space was necessary to accommodate its large number of employees. Nevertheless, Poyet's critics pointed out that, in not being more numbers from 1796 remain only slightly effaced. The key is available in A.N. f/13/1207.

40 "Réponse à l'examen fait des plans de Division des Bureaux du Ministère de l'Intérieur dans la Maison Conty", A.N. f/13/1207.
42 "Réponse à l'examen fait des plans de Division des Bureaux du Ministère de l'Intérieur dans la Maison Conty", A.N. f/13/1207.
radical, he had failed to recognise the links between the bureaux, and that this lack of foresight would create practical difficulties both for utility and public access. The surveyor of the bureau des bâtiments civils argued it was necessary to unite the various bureaux to the others of the same Division, to establish their connection spatially as well as intellectually, and, most importantly, to "accommodate the public and to accelerate ministry service". For instance, the bureau de comptabilité, situated at the left-hand side of the grand cour, was isolated from its records. In addition, the bureau central de règlement (where building contractors presented their bills and received their payments), on the right hand side of the second court, was cut off both from the bureaux des bâtiments civils and the Comptabilité archives. The simple task of checking a bill against an estimate forced employees to cross two courtyards. This delay of service was inexcusable in the mind of a bâtiments civils surveyor.

In this case, Poyet had consulted Bergeron, the chief of the bureau de comptabilité, who had told him the separation of the records from his offices did not matter, and that this state of affairs – already existing – did not occasion any major nuisance. He also had decided that moving the archives across the courtyard to the floor above the comptabilité would have been both costly and time consuming and that, the ill-lit, small rooms, in which they were currently kept, were unfit for anything other than storage. Poyet therefore argued that, if he were to remake the offices entirely, it would occasion a major setback to administrative activity: better that he respect existing location of the divisions than turn the bureaux upside down in search of an ideal distribution; better he accept the realities of architecture, rather than converting storage space into offices and offices into storage space. He could not make a total break with the past: Poyet, like archivists in the same period, wanted to reclassify the residue of

43 Fig. 2 [A.N. N III Seine 1114 (10)].
44 "Examen fait des plans et de devis descriptif des travaux à faire pour l'établissement des bureaux de l'Administration de l'Intérieur dans la Maison Conty, rue de Grenelle", A.N. f/13/1207.
45 "Réponse à l'examen fait des plans de Division des Bureaux du Ministère de l'Intérieur dans la Maison Conty", A.N. f/13/1207. Poyet belived the only other option would be to allocate their ill-lit rooms to the offices of the Plan de Paris, where employees engaged in cartography and draughtsmanship, or the bureau central de règlement, where clerks pored over small figures in their ledgers.
Fig. 2. [A.N. N III Seine 1114 (10): Hôtel de Conti, rue de Grenelle [no. 101], état ancien].
the Old-Regime, not to demolish it blindly. For Poyet, then, this was a battle between practicality and vision, between materialism and utopianism. Poyet's critic proposed a radical alternative: reuniting all "connected" bureaux on the first floor, and breaking through the walls of the ground floor to allow for the necessary movement between offices. This covered walkway would protect both guests and employees from inclement weather and unfortunate equestrian accidents. At intervals, a stairwell would lead to each division, indicated by a sign indicating the name of the Division and the assignment of tasks among its bureaux. While Poyet's plan proposed a single entry point for each Division, his critic outdid him by suggesting that the public should not have to cross the courtyard or search across the immense building for a particular office. Combining both functionality and publicity, Poyet's critic claimed that — "with a little expense" — a remodelled ministry would become the model of efficient — and legible — practice. The critic's covered walkway resembled nothing less than one of the Arcades built in Paris during the Restoration, famous for public display of shopkeepers' wares and their prioritisation of consumers' comfort. While arcades led to commercial establishments, in the Ministry, the critic's continuous gallery would connected the Nation to its servants. The critic's plan therefore treated public service as a consumer industry, the office clerk as a sales-clerk. Displayed with the "goods" he was "selling", the plan allowed the administrator no place to conceal himself — no private quarters.

This critic's plan was certainly impractical both in terms of money and space: converting the entire ground floor of the hôtel Conti into an extended gallery deprived the Ministry of a great many rooms and the number of staircases already existing was certainly sufficient, if not always best situated. Poyet was not alone in thinking his own plan the best of a bad world: Mouchelet, the Inspector-General of the Conseil des Bâtiments Civils, agreed, judging a perfect distribution of bureaux impossible. Indeed, by the time Poyet's scheme was put

into action, several details had already changed. Some offices belonging to the Fifth Division had been transferred to the Third, and the dépôt du plan de Paris had been moved from the ground floor to the third (the original ground-floor premises were too humid). Justification for Poyet's accuser's emphasis on the awkwardness of the distribution of the Bureau de Comptabilité also belatedly occurred in 1821. After complaining for many years about the division of his bureaux on two sides of the grand cour of the hôtel Conti, Rosman, Bergeron's successor as chief of Division and Maître des Requêtes, reunited his offices (asking the Ministry architect, de Joly, to re-designate some of the rooms formerly assigned to the concierge while the Ministry awaited his appointment). Rather than proving the worth of Poyet's critic's critique, however, these changes only show that the classification of ministry responsibilities was too fluid to ever be properly encapsulated in physical geography. The constant readjustments made to the distribution of correspondence between the Division meant that offices were routinely being remade, personnel transferred and office-space reallocated.

The critic's plan to create street galleries in the old aristocratic mansion never took shape, even though the principle of publicity was something he held in common with Poyet. Both men believed firmly in the need to signpost administrative offices for public convenience. Both plans subjected employees to constant public inquiry and inspection. Poyet's plan, more so than his critic's, involved the movement of personnel through other offices, on their way to deliver paperwork. It facilitated courtyard rendezvous where employees could gossip about their superiors. While a continuous gallery would have channelled intra-ministerial communication, allowing clerks to get to their destination quickly and cleanly, Poyet's plan facilitated the indiscretion so despised by Republican ministers. By adapting old norms instead of pioneering a Revolutionary classification of space, he had allowed bricks and mortar to contribute to the

---

47 Building contracts were issued through the Administration Centrale du Département de la Seine in a public auction on the 23 Pluviôse Year VI: A.N. f/13/1207.
48 Report, Mouchelet, Inspecteur Générale de la 3e division du Conseil des Bâtiments Civils to the Minister of the Interior, 9 Nivôse Year IX, A.N. f/13/1207.
atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Neither truly public nor wholly private, the Revolutionary Ministry suffered from the worst of both scenarios. Poyet provided a means for outsiders to access the Ministry, but made it dependent on porters and posters, and routed them through unrelated offices. By providing only partial access to the offices, he drew attention to the fact that they were off bounds: the physical layout of the bureaux, neither truly transparent nor adequately isolated, therefore fuelled the claustrophobia of ministry life.

Scrutiny of Employees

François de Neufchâteau approved a plan to build a Ministry clock, set in four coloured blocks of marble and framed with a serpent (a symbol of immortality), on the third complementary day of Year VI (19 September 1798). The Ministry furnished Citoyen Robin, the Directory's clockmaker, with a mechanism of a "national clock", confiscated by the Republic and stored in its depots. This clock was a giant means of regulation, positioned on the front face of the main building, directly opposite the porter's lodge. It existed to regulate hours of audience: through this entry point, petitioners entered the Ministry. It also existed to regulate hours of attendance: the porter's lodge was also where employees entered each morning and the significance of the giant clock was no less for them. The Assemblée Générale des Architectes des Bâtiments Civiles, approving de Neufchâteau's plan, judged the clock of "a great utility for the regularity of bureau service [to the public]". They also thought, however, that it could be "even more useful, for the arrival and departure of employees can be fixed in a precise manner".

The Commission des Subsistances had, four years earlier, laid down its employees' office hours in a decree of the 6 Frimaire Year II (26 November 1793): work commenced at eight o'clock in the morning and finished at four in the evening. Every evening a quarter of the personnel, having finished work at two

---

49 Letter, de Joly (ministry architect) to the Director of Public Works, 19 April 1821, A.N. f/13/1212.
o'clock in the afternoon, returned to the office from six until ten o'clock at night; another quarter were ordered to come to work between eight and four on the décadi. Exceptionally, employees charged with registering correspondence worked every day from eight until two and from six until ten except on quintidis and décadis (when they worked during the morning only). These regulations made sure that employees were in their offices at times of peak demand and that a minimum level of service was available throughout the day. They also, however, were a standard against which the Commissioners could judge their employee's productivity: in such a fashion, the Commission lashed out on the 22 Ventôse Year II (12 March 1794) at the "laziness and inexactness" of employees who

insensible to the voice of duty and to fraternal invitation ...calculate the hours which they are forced to devote to their work, neglect the operations which have been confided in them, and ... come late to the bureaux, then leave before the prescribed hour, work slowly with an application unworthy of true Republicans. With this reprimand, the Commission des Subsistances reiterated its office hours and ordered bureau chiefs to take a roll call at eight-thirty every morning. Such regulations squeezed the employee's freedom to drop by another office to pick up a report or contact a colleague through "unofficial" channels. Rather than give up the latitude they needed to get their job done, the administrators wilfully ignored these regulations: they prioritised communication over control, the completion of their task over obedience to office discipline.

Therefore difficulty of enforcing office hours became — like the difficulty in keep the public to hours of audience — the subject of repeated orders during the Revolution and Empire. Cochon, Minister of Police between 14 Germinal Year IV and 25 Messidor Year V (2 April 1796 and 13 July 1797), reminded his employees of the article fixing employee hours, noting that there had been a relaxation in the official observance of this order. He warned his Division and Bureau Chiefs sternly that they were responsible for any infractions, if they did...
not report absences to the Minister. Cochon's successor as Commissioner, nevertheless, had to remind his Division Chiefs in an order dated 27 Prairial Year VI that, with the exception of décadis, all employees should be present at their offices at nine o'clock in the morning, and not leave until after four. He told them to enforce this order by walking through their offices at nine, and taking a list of absentees. The Division Chiefs, unlike their employees, were ordered to be in the Ministry at eight o'clock, but the discipline of office hours applied to them as it did to their subordinates.

A Directory order, signed on the 5 Vendémiaire Year VII, reminded Ministers of their responsibility to ensure the attendance of their employees between nine o'clock and four. Although the Minister of Police transmitted this order to the offices on the 11 Brumaire, he had to reiterate it to his employees in Thermidor Year VII. Six months earlier, the Ministry had already told its employees to sign feuilles de présence at the beginning and the end of the day. It had clearly not been successful. A similar story played out in the Ministry of the Interior. Lucien Bonaparte, in his reorganisation of Year VIII, repeated an injunction to attend the office between nine o'clock and four o'clock. Nevertheless, Chaptal in Ventôse Year XI had to repeat this injunction, ordering that a register be kept in each division, to be signed by employees when entering the office, so to ensure they arrived at nine o'clock in the morning. While it was proposed that this register would be turned over to the Secretary General each evening at two o'clock in the afternoon and returned to the offices at four (for Division Chiefs to record the time at which each employee left) there is no evidence of this practice being regularly observed.

---

52 Ibid., p. xlii.
53 Order, Cochon, Minister of Police, to Division and Bureau Chiefs, undated, A.N. f/7/3007.
54 Ministerial Order, 27 Prairial Year VI, A.N. f/7/3007.
56 Chevanne, Secretary-General, to the Chief of the Second Division, 18 Pluviôse Year VII, A.N. f/7/3006.
57 "Organisation des Bureaux du Ministère de l'Intérieur, 18 Germinal an VII", A.N. f/1a/1.
58 Ministerial Order, 11 Ventôse Year XI, A.N. f/1a/1 (114).
Time as a system of regulation also had obvious drawbacks. The rest of Paris did not work with the same routine as the offices (outsiders observed different hours as well as (in most cases) a different calendar). Visitors to the offices could be wholly innocent, but yet branded as interlopers and spies. Time discipline, indeed, was least effective as a means of judging the zeal of the administrators. It paid no attention to particular cases or, if it did, it marked them out from the crowd and made them the object of suspicion. Therefore, when Robert Denis Timoléon Gambier de Campy, a Bureau Chief in the Ministry of the Interior, complained to the Minister, it was not because he did not want to get up in the morning, but because he had been given special permission to come to his office at ten o'clock instead of nine. He argued that he was used to arriving at six o'clock in the morning, and that this dispensation was unnecessary. He also, however, complained that the Minister's generosity had contributed to an idea that he was incapable of doing his job. He claimed that his younger colleagues (desiring to replace him) were making a meal of helping him in his work, trying to make their Bureau Chief seem like a spent force. The Ministry office hours therefore were a threat to Gambier de Campy, not due to his laxity, but due to the fact that they told the Minister nothing about his work: the Bureau Chief could be an able administrator, yet dismissed for his "inability" to come to the office at nine.

Of course, sometimes there were good reasons that employees should be denied the right to come and go as they wished, if they neglected their duties. When Cretté, an employee of the Division of Arts and Manufactures, sought in a confidential letter to his Division chief a leave of absence and an exemption from office hours, his days in the employ of the Ministry were numbered. His reasons for requesting the exemption were hardly administrative: he needed to sort out a disputed inheritance, cure his stomach pains, and wanted to begin a career in commerce (after the declaration of peace with England) without risking his current position. While in 1798 a list of employees had described Cretté as "applied to his work, coming to the office ... when the work demands it" his

59 A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Gambier].
60 Letter, Cretté to Lansel, 1 Germinal an X, A.N. f/10/225.
61 Kawa, "Dictionnaire Biographique des Employés du Ministère de l'Intérieur".
Division Chief could no longer use that particular description at the next reorganisation. Cretté's secret letter reeked of his concern that he might lose his place because of his request, but he was right to be anxious: he disappeared from the register of employees the same year.62

More usually, the employees simply manipulated the precedent set by feuilles de présence to make fantastic claims about the hours they spent in "forced" labour: the registry clerk, Pihet, for example, recounted how he customarily spent six hours without a break perched over his registers.63 Manipulating perceptions of time to demonstrate how they were good employees, they obscured the fact that whether or not they obeyed the ring of the Ministry clock was no indicator of whether they were hardworking. Pihet's Chief, Loiselet, reiterated his subordinate's dedication to his work in January 1808, by reporting to the Minister how "when the ordinary work day does not suffice, he returns assiduously during the evenings so as not to fall behind".64 Time therefore became a language with which the employees could present their demands for promotion, for bonuses, or even just recognition of their hard work. Yet, because it was no indicator of the quality or quantity of the work itself (Loiselet presented a detailed account of Pihet's workload as well as noting his timekeeping), it could be a means of presenting a bad employee as good, or (as in Gambier de Campy's case) of presenting a good employee as bad.

As the employees ignored attendance sheets and manipulated the facts of their attendance to "prove" their industriousness, they also moulded space to protect themselves from arbitrary scrutiny and to control the ways in which they could be seen. The division between private and public space could be constructed by piling cartons to form a wall around one's desk. Therefore, walls could be designed by employees as they could be by ministerial architects. The period of the Directory and early Empire saw a succession of demands, presented to

---

62 The état des employés for the second division in A.N. f/1bl/6 [an X] notes that the Minister had accepted Cretté's "resignation".

63 Letter, Pihet to the Secretary General, undated, A.N. f/1bl/276/3 [Pihet, Jean François Eugène].

64 Letter, Loiselet, Chief of the Registry, to DeGérando, Secretary Général, A.N. f/1bl/272/7 [Loiselet, Edouard Ignace Joseph].
Division chiefs, for the creation of corridors, converting the sequenced rooms that characterised the layout of an aristocratic mansion into the enclosed cubicles of the modern office. While Poyet and his critic in the bureau des bâtiments civils had agreed on the need to build transparency into Ministry geography in Year VI, changes made to the hôtel Conti in subsequent years, prioritised privacy over publicity (or efficiency over public service).

One such demand saw Poyet returning to the bureaux of the Comptabilité, to carve a passageway between the two main courtyards from offices belonging to the bureau chiefs, Gillois and Petit. Gillois, the Chef du Service Courant, complained of being continually interrupted by the movement of personnel through his office from Petit's placed behind (Petit was, naturally, the Chef du Service Arrière). By knocking two doors and building a dividing wall, Poyet therefore gave both men peace and quiet. Moreover, by stopping the movement of personnel through their offices, he also reduced the expense of having office doors open in the winter. These corridors were not, however, the "street galleries" imagined by his former critic: they facilitated communication between offices only by keeping people out. Shutting in the heat, they also shut out the public: the stifling temperatures of offices, so often derided by satirists, was a symbol of an administration shutting its doors to outside scrutiny.

If the desire of employees for peace and quiet was responsible for proliferating corridors, it also was responsible for resuscitating antechambers, a feature of Old-Regime architecture "abandoned" by the Revolution. The eighteenth-century function of the antechamber had been to keep the vestibule breeze from penetrating the aristocrat's private office: the heat of a small stove stood sentry

---

65 Letter, Poyet to the Minister of the Interior, 25 Fructidor Year XIII, A.N. f/13/1210; report, JP Barbier-Neuville to Minister of the Interior, 20 Vendémiaire Year XIV, A.N. f/13/1210. Similarly, in 1808, the Chief of the Third Division asked that a corridor be built at the side of the bureaux des bâtiments civils et prisons. His clerks, bothered continually by interruptions by other employees, crossing through the building to and from the grand cour, decided that by knocking two doors and walling off a corridor -- for the price of 150fr -- their privacy would be ensured: "Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Intérieur par JP Barbier-Neuville, 5 avril 1808", A.N. f/13/1210.

66 See, for example, the reoccurrence of stoves in Henry Monnier's Moeurs Administratives (Paris: Delpech, 1828), in the Appendix.
against the outside air. Despite the practicality of this arrangement, the architecture of audience had been intertwined with the cupidity of the court: Louis-Sébastien Mercier had decried the "spirit of slavery, baseness and cupidity, hidden under an air of presumption and haughtiness" of administrative audiences in his *Tableau de Paris*. Therefore, while the Old-Regime antechamber survived in some New-Regime private apartments even during the period of the Convention, care was taken that public audience hours should not resemble those of the Old Regime. After the Committee of Public Safety's order in Year III (1793) setting up the *salle de communication* as a room through which petitioners could be channelled, the *Commission des Subsistances* took care that this room should not be one in which visitors sat for hours waiting for an audience, encountering only their own kind and the unpleasant obstruction of a uniformed *garçon de bureau*. Poyet's plan in Year VI identified only a single "*salle pour recevoir la public"* adjacent to the *cabinet* of the Fifth Division's Chief. By development rather than by design, the bureaux however conspired to reinstate the antechamber as a means to corral, rather than call in, petitioners.

The *salle de communication*, which under Republican governments had protected the work of the bureaux from outside distractions while opening their doors to the inquiries of citizens, had, by the Empire, transformed into a waiting room, a barrier against the prying eyes of journalists and the incessant demands of the Nation. In the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' *hôtel Maurepas*, the head of archives Ernest d'Hauterive was famously parsimonious with admission rights, writing that the public could judge the Ministry by results and not by access to its papers. Scipion Mourgues, Chief of Archives in the Ministry of Interior, similarly warned his Minister against allowing a writer from the *Journal de Statistique*

---

68 "Mémoire des Ouvrages de peinture faits dans la Maison occupée par le Ministre de la Police Générale, quay Voltaire ..., 22 Fructidor Year IV", A.N. f/13/320.
69 The first reference to antechambers I can find in an office building is in Year XI (1803): the Secretary General asks that a register of attendance be kept in "the antechamber that precedes the *cabinet du travail* of each Chief of Division": notice, Coulomb to Division Chiefs, Ventôse Year XI, A.N. t/1bl/10/1.
access to the offices. The Comte de Garden, a former plenipotentiary, would later report that, under Talleyrand in 1805, access through the hôtel Maurepas was restricted to personnel only, and that, at the door of the Ministry on the rue du Bac, the porter, Jory, met solicitors with the invariable reply – "The Minister is out" – to send them on their way. The same porter was tricked in 1815, by the Louise-Emilie de Beauharnais, husband of the treasonous Director of Posts and Messages during the Hundred Days, who told him that she was going to the apartment of the Ministry Treasurer, Bresson. She was still corralled in an antechamber, however, and only given an audience after the Minister's intervention. By the beginning of the Restoration, employees were giving solicitors a cold welcome: adventure stories of "penetrating" the inner sanctum of the offices proved not the existence of nepotism (in an administration which clearly did its best to shun unexpected interlopers), but only the myth-making of the manie des places.

The employee's dislike for petitioners was compounded by the improvised nature of some of the antechambers. When Casimir de Lacvivier, a sous-chef of the bureau des Gardes Nationales, made a request to the Ministry architect in January 1822, asking that he and his subordinates be given a new office, this was certainly the case. Lacvivier's complaint was that his office opened onto a small triangular room, which served both as an antechamber for the Chief of a different Division and an entry point for two other bureaux. The garçon de bureau stationed there continually distracted his employees, interrupting their work by encouraging them to leave their desks and gather around a small vent carrying heat from a neighbouring office. On top of that, petitioners also gathered in the small room, cramming their bodies into the tight ill-lit space, adding their odours to the smell of the antechamber stove. He told the architect

71 "Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Intérieur, 22 Thermidor Year X", A.N. f/1a/590-592.
73 I will return to this at the beginning of Chapter Six.
that, if he and his bureau were not moved, his office "as yet only purgatory, will become a sort of Hell".74

Lacvivier also disliked being so close to another Division. He asked that his bureau be moved into one of rooms previously occupied by the Comité de l'Intérieur, and adjacent to his own Division Chief, M. Allente. This not only would distance him from the fetid antechamber, but save him the journey from the third floor of his building, across the cobbles of the grande cour each time he answered his superior's summons (exposed him not only to snow, wind and rain, but also, presumably, the eyes of the entire Ministry). Yet Lacvivier wanted to put distance between himself and the antechamber, not to abolish it completely: it served a distinct purpose – to keep undesirables at a distance, and to allow those with legitimate business to enter. Again, the adaptation of Old-Regime rooms for New-Regime purposes served to enclose rather than expose the offices.

Therefore, if the move to Paris had subjected Ministers to scrutiny, the consolidation of the bureaux also made it possible to observe employees at the lowest level. Beset from the outside, and by the Minister's attempts at internal discipline, the clerk had to appear both hardworking and honest at all times, in case the Minister's random glance should alight on him. His office – a private space in which he worked as a productive individual – was simultaneously a public arena, where his credentials as a "good citizen" and "good employee" could be continually judged. The employee, therefore, to represent his virtue in the workplace, developed new strategies of display both inside and outside the office. Increasingly trapped in his own bureau by a network of corridors and antechambers – walled off from the "public" – he sought to find a means to create an appearance of individual responsibility. Yet time-keeping as a means of appearing a virtuous employee was arbitrary: too often, it could be misinterpreted – or manipulated by avaricious colleagues – and it made no real statement about an administrator's work. The employee therefore searched for other ways to present himself as a good administrator, when asking for promotion, for a raise or for any act of Ministerial benevolence.

74 A.N. f/1bl/272 [Lacvivier].
While the administrators sometimes very effectively isolated themselves from the public, there was little possibility of keeping secrets from one another, while sharing a six-by-seven foot office. The Ministry building swarmed with eyes from the beginning of the day, when the *hommes de peine* washed the Ministry from top to bottom - apartments, bureaux and courtyards - and brought the allotted firewood to the bureaux until the end of the evening, when the *garçons de bureau*, turned out the lanterns, made sure the stove was safe, and made his lonely way back to his small domestic quarters in the Ministry. When at eight o'clock the first employees arrived, Division Chiefs also emerged from their Ministry apartments. By nine o'clock a steady stream of administrators was passing through the front gate of the ex-aristocratic *hôtel*. Calling greetings to one another, and stopping for a quick chat before turning up the staircase, or into the main vestibule, they populated the main courtyard and called greetings to friends and acquaintances in high-up windows. The emergence of the Ministry as a building therefore contributed to a new *esprit de corps* among Ministry employees. To make these new conditions work, they had to learn to keep confidences, to avoid trivial competitions and rivalries. Nevertheless, the bricks and mortar of Ministry life also contributed to their petty jealousies: office politics scarred the New-Regime Ministries, whether "high" or "low". The employees had to learn how to prove themselves *bons commis* to the Minister; they had, simultaneously, to act like amiable collaborators for their colleagues, to know when to step back and let others go forward. They therefore needed a language of merit that was both individual and non-confrontational at once – they found it in *ancienneté* and a rhetoric of honourable emulation.
Chapter Three

Telling Tales: Solicitation, Denunciation and the Means of Success.

The actor as bureaucrat

In 1797, Louis Benoît Picard presented his first five-act play, Médiocre et Rampant ou les Moyens de Parvenir.1 Produced in the Théâtre Français (rue de Louvois) to high acclaim, he found himself fêted as the author of the best comedy that century.2 Yet, this most generous tribute was countered by a vicious epigram:

Mediocre and Crawling: the author paints himself.3

However deserved or undeserved this taunt, and from whatever political perspective, the publicity only served to further his career: Picard and his troupe moved their base from the rue de Louvois to the Odéon the next year. By 1807, he had swapped the stage of the theatre for that of the Institut National. Picard was forever dogged by allegations that his work had no substance; that, as actor turned playwright, he was an artistic parvenu. Even from the relative security of the Institut rostrum, he would never escape the epigrammatic thrust. Passed along the benches, childish rhymes poked fun at the playwright, his lucidity mocked and twisted to dishonour his presence amongst the "greatest minds" of France:

While Picard holds forth

---

1 The play title translates as "Mediocre and Crawling, or the Means of Success". It was first performed in Year V, but enjoyed a massive resurgence in popularity in the early 1800s, leading to the publication of a second edition of the script in 1802. Frederick Schiller also translated the play as Der Parasit, oder Die Kunst sein Glück zu Machen, and it played successfully in the Court Theatre in Weimar (run by Goethe for Duke Karl August) in October 1803. For a discussion of the reception of Der Parasit, see Schiller, Oncle et Neveu, comédie en 3 actes (Paris: Hachette, 1883), pp. 9-11.

2 See, for example, the review in Feuilleton de Littérature, Spectacles, Anecdotes, Modes et Avis Divers, [Supplément à la Quotidienne du 3 thermidor an V].

with such art and eloquence,
Everyone remarks in the séance:
if only I were deaf, or Picard mute.⁴

Picard should not have been surprised that the taste of popular praise was so thoroughly mingled with the bitterness of denunciation. The moral opinion of the crowd was certainly as vital for the dramatist as it was for the administrator: leading actors rose and fell with the unpopularity of a production or the clamour of the press. Solicitation and denunciation had also been the subject of Picard's Médiocre et Rampant, ou les Moyens de Parvenir, a play about life in a revolutionary ministry. Picard had set out to create an "accurate history" of the "fugitive nature of present-day morals". By turning his stage into an office, he sought to mine the prevalent social anxiety about rapid institutional and moral changes.⁵ By turning actors into bureaucrats, moreover, he manipulated the distrust of thespians which had, earlier in the Revolution, lead to their exclusion from active citizenship on account of their capacity for self-misrepresentation.⁶ In short, Picard investigated the problem of conspicuous virtue à la Molière, by creating an emblematic representation of an institutionalised public sphere which included both theatre and office.

⁴ Bibliothèque de l'Institut, Extrait de papiers Sylvestre Lacroix, membre de l'Académie des Sciences, MS 4796 (II) 3 [ Séance de l'Institut, du 6 mai 1807].
As he despaired that a dramatist could no longer forge his reputation on "purely literary merit", but only by following fashion, Picard realised that even the most astute and responsible of administrators also remained threatened by regular re-organisations, their uncertainty exacerbated by the minister's inability to judge their merit accurately and by the simplicity with which incompetence could remain undetected in the office hierarchy. Picard therefore pictured an office where a long-serving employee could be dismissed at a moment's notice to make way for the cousin of the Minister's valet. While he echoed the Revolutionary exhortation that, to preserve his place, a man had to be a good father, a good citizen and a good husband, he refused to allow his audience to take these categories at face value. In Médioce et Rampant, Picard showed that, in the flux of Revolution, an administrator had incessantly to prove that he was not an actor but a bon commis. Médioce et Rampant therefore operated within a paradox: it decried public opinion, while appealing to it; it exposed the impossibility of assessing character, while still condemning the villain of the piece, Dorival.

Presented in the aftermath of the Terror, Médioce et Rampant sought to demonstrate the ease with which a revolutionary ministry could be corrupted. During the Directory, "a Minister did not have the title of His Excellency": the minister in question, Ariste, therefore consorts freely and openly with subaltern employees in a situation inimical to any hope of a truly "virtuous" administration. The villain (Dorival), the hero (Firmin), and the vengeful ex-employee (Laroche) all address Ariste in friendly terms, despite his superiority in the office hierarchy. Picard's administrators work in an absence of defined boundaries: the audience are not given Firmin or Dorival's rank or informed as to which Ministry they belong. Moreover no Secretary General intercedes to establish their bureau's bon ordre. The play's charge is contained in the fact that Ariste, though...
virtuous, does not contribute to a sense of administrative order: he confuses his role as head of the ministry and as head of his family. He not only invites his employees to his private apartment for an intimate soirée, but looks for a husband for his daughter (Laure) among his subalterns, fixing on Dorival:

I am weighing him up for an honourable post,
But I must find a man above all reproach.
Let me test him. If, to confirm my suspicion,
Dorival proves worthy to take that commission –
If he pleases my daughter, quite happily
I will see him enter my family.\(^{11}\)

Ariste therefore wholly believes in the need for the administrator to be *bon époux, bon père, bon citoyen*: what is more, the truth of this formula of revolutionary virtue is so clear to the minister that he believes that, if Dorival is a good employee, he will surely make a good husband for Laure.

Such idealism is quickly manipulated by Dorival, whose art of flattery and deception bears instant fruit. An unrepentant charlatan, he profits from the minister's naïve belief in conspicuous virtue, acting the good employee with gusto. He has little trouble in appropriating a memoir compiled by Firmin on the reorganisation of the Ministry, passing it off as his own. Firmin is the second paragon of Revolutionary virtue in Picard's play: he is a modest and virtuous employee whose only ambition is to serve the Nation, and who prefers the obscurity of his office to the entertainments of the Minister's drawing room. Aware of Dorival's ambition (though not of the depth of his corruption), Firmin prefers to remain in the background rather than to challenge his colleague: unlike Dorival, he is reluctant to "stage" his virtue. With such inconsequential opposition, Dorival realises the possibility of marrying Laure and sealing his career. Manoeuvring to that end, he claims credit for a love poem, written for

Laure by Charles, Firmin's son, and flatters Ariste's mother, Mme Dorlis, with the ease of a practiced courtier.

Laroche, Dorival's childhood friend, alone stands in his way. The first victim of the bureaucrat's machinations, and subsequent narrator of his deceit, Laroche makes repeated denunciations, which all fall on deaf ears. Instead of believing him, Firmin and Ariste suspect him of lying, prompted by jealousy and unwarranted hatred. Despairing of ever being able to expose the true intentions behind Dorival's words and actions, Laroche becomes an actor (like Dorival). Masking his own virtue in conversation with Dorival, and hiding Ariste's in an elaborately constructed deception, Laroche entices Dorival to reveal himself before the astonished Ariste. As Dorival offers to house the minister's fictive mistress, Ariste has to recognise the truth of Laroche's accusations, and his own complicity in Dorival's success. Finally, pretending that both Ariste and the author of the memoir on the reorganisation of the Ministry that he presented to government are to be dismissed, Laroche lures Dorival into revealing that he took credit for the timorous Firmin's work. Yet, even after Laroche has exposed all of these deceptions (by engaging in his own petty tricks), Dorival is treated with pity rather than anger. For Picard, Dorival's guilt is not wholly his: rather the "means of success" available to him predisposed the administrator to intrigue.

Médiocre et Rampant turned on the disjuncture between appearance and truth, necessitating not only star turns from several well-known actors (St. Phal, as Laroche, garnered particular praise in the radical journals), but also a fundamental agreement between audience and actors on how virtue could be represented and misrepresented. In the theatre, the administrative villain had to be instantly recognisable to audience, as did the innocent Laure, the virtuous, mild Firmin, and his young, brave and charming son, Charles. Yet Picard played with the audience's preconceived notions of how a villain should act, having

---


13 "His friendship for me made him offer his services; Are our friends therefore those who serve our vices?", ibid., p. 89 (act five, scene five).

14 For example, Feuilleton de Littérature [Supplément à la Quotidienne du 3 thermidor].
Dorival change his attitude and gestures from one scene to the next. Before the enraptured audience of the Théâtre Louvois, Dorival made lightning-fast transitions from mean-hearted compatriot to loving son and prospective husband, from lazy, feeble bureaucrat to intrepid administrator. Before the audience's eyes, Dorival adapted himself to the Minister's line of thought, mimicking his phrases, aping his attitudes, and finally attaining his rhyme and syntax exactly. Dorival's ability to mould his words and to fool the other characters (and to engage the audience in his deception) was the key to his success. As a consummate dissimulator, he could manipulate the office hierarchy by force of his eloquent protestations of virtue and his ringing declamations of his colleagues' vice.

While Picard's critics welcomed this script as wildly innovative, they still considered it inherently flawed. Vérités à l'Ordre du Jour could not understand why the play was entitled "Means of Success" when it ended with Dorival losing all hope of regaining his colleagues' esteem and confidence. This journal clearly didn't like the fact that virtue had finally triumphed in the play: its reviewer had found the plot device with which Laroche unmasks Dorival too tenuous, remarking that the Minister's patience would not have been so elastic in real life.

---

15 Picard, Médiocre et Rampant, pp. 39-43 (act 2, scenes 6 - 8). Mme Dorlis requests Dorival to write a romance in couplets to sing with Laure that evening. Dorival is on the point of acceding (though incapable of writing the couplets himself), when surprised by the appearance of his cousin, Robineau, newly arrived from the country. Robineau, in an amusing récit of local gossip, reveals that: "Everyone's well, except for your mother / Who says it is hard to be living in misery, / With a child who's as rich as Croesus." Dorival, in response, feigns surprise, while whispering viciously to Robineau to shut up. He had, he claimed, sent a thousand écus to his mother. Mme Dorlis swallows this tale, praising his concern: "He who is such a good son, should be a good husband." Mme Dorlis' departure then allows Dorival to turn on his cousin. Robineau can only marvel at Dorival's about-turns: "But how all of a sudden, you change your tune! / First you are angry, but then you take a [pleasant] tone!"

16 Ibid., p. 65 (act 4, scene 3).

17 Ibid., pp. 23-25 (act 2, scene 1). In a highly crafted dialogue, Ariste broaches the subject of the embassy to Dorival, hoping to divine whether the latter has the necessary qualities. Dorival begins in a stuttering fashion, failing at first to understand that Ariste wants an honest clerk, not an agile diplomat, to fill the post. By mid-way through the conversation, he has "achieved the minister's phrasing".

18 Vérités à l'Ordre du Jour, pp. 36-7.
Where the *Vérités* looked for an out-and-out denunciation of "bureaucracy", Picard's critique of the offices was much more nuanced. By averring that appearances could be manipulated, Picard cast virtue firmly into the shadows: Firmin and Ariste were weak and vulnerable heroes who had no defence against the resolute villain, Dorival. It was hard to sympathise with Laroche, even knowing that his denunciations were true. His narration of Dorival's deceit served only to recall that there is no natural means to defeat the *médiocre et rampant*. Laroche succeeded only through a pretence as shameless as Dorival's own.\(^{19}\) The subtitle "Means of Success", therefore, applied not only to Dorival but also to Laroche: after he deceived his former colleague in the interest of virtue, to bring the play to a happy ending, the audience was left with the age-old philosophical question: does the end justify the means?

The *Vérités'* other criticism – that a trifling romance took away from the action of the main plot – also demonstrates the paucity of the reviewer's understanding.\(^{20}\) The theft of Charles' poetry not only parallels the message of the main plot, but plays an important role in bolstering a black-and-white condemnation of the villain. Dorival's requisition of Firmin's memoir, which seems at first sight to be a cut-and-dried case of intellectual theft, is no such thing. If Picard could play with audience certainties about the "truth" of physiognomy, their ability to tell a good clerk from a bureaucrat, "authorship" of an administrative report was a much more ambiguous signifier. Firmin, despite doing three-quarters of Dorival's work, does not recognise that he is being cheated. He declares:

\begin{quote}
But we relieve each other of work reciprocally; 
If I do [Dorival's] work, he often does mine.\(^{21}\)
\end{quote}

Firmin's belief that he and Dorival share their workload is, moreover, reinforced by the passage at the end of the play in which he and Ariste share responsibility for the memoir, which Laroche pretends has been received badly by the

\(^{19}\) Aристе calls it a "shameful proof": Picard, *Médiocre et Rampant*, p. 92 (act 5, scene 7).

\(^{20}\) Despite *Vérités'* characterisation of this subplot as a trivial romance, Dorival's theft of Charles Firmin's love poetry is far less ambiguous than his appropriation of Charles' father's memoir. Dorival immediately credits Charles as being their "master", grabs them from Charles' hand as he hesitates briefly, and presents them *unchanged* to the minister's daughter.

\(^{21}\) Picard, *Médiocre et Rampant*, p. 3 (act 1, scene 1).
Ariste, who had worked through the memoir before sending it to his superiors, accepts his (fictional) destitution equanimously. So too does Firmin, who declares his responsibility as soon as he realises that the author will share Ariste's fate. In the moment of fabricated self-sacrifice, however, the question of individual authorship is left unresolved. Firmin does not assert that the memoir is his alone; Ariste does not claim sole responsibility for sending it to their political masters. Dorival, as editor of Firmin's rough notes should also have fallen on his sword. However, his failure do so is not the crime for which he is condemned. Laroche's "shameful proof", in fact, fails to prove Dorival's duplicity when it accuses him of intellectual theft, not of lacking administrative spirit. In the end, Picard falls back upon the melodrama of Charles' love for Laure, and Dorival's theft of his poetry, to condemn the deceitful administrator as a bogus author. Like playwrights in the eighteenth century, he uses a sentimental narrative to provide a clear-cut critique of an ambiguous social institution.

Picard's manufacture of the proof of Dorival's guilt undermines the certainties of theatrical physiognomy he uses to announce the médiocre et rampant's rapacity to the audience. In the final scene, Firmin finally recognises the real Dorival, quick to change face to save his skin. Ariste discovers the villain behind the pleasantries, when Dorival leers towards him, offering his services as pimp. However, it is Laroche's superior deceit which manufactures such clashes of physiognomy, signalling that the visual proof of Dorival's deception was, in fact, an unnatural proof constructed by an actor turned bureaucrat turned actor. For Laroche and Dorival share their means to success, constructing both fictional authorship and fictional physiognomy. If Picard's play was successful, it was

22 A separation between "Ministry" and "Government" is maintained throughout Picard's play, one administrative and the other political.
23 Sarah Maza describes how eighteenth-century lawyers borrowed narrative techniques from the melodrama to write a new genre of trial briefs which allowed them to create sharp moral and social dichotomies in favour of their clients: Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France (Berkeley, L.A., London: University of California Press, 1993), pp. 63-64. Ruth Harris, Murders and Madness: Medicine, Law, and Society in the 'Fin de Siècle' (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989) locates a similar trend in the late nineteenth-century, where melodrama was a form that women could call on to describe the abuse they received from men. Harris explains how representations
because he did the same, inventing a world of bureaucracy for the stage. The lack of a coherent political charge in the play, lamented by Vérités à l'Ordre du Jour, was only one of the ramifications of Picard's exploration of the administrator's "means of success". It is hard to escape the ambiguity of his charge: taking the offices' problem of surveillance and institutional control onto the stage exposed the perilousness of using either physiognomy or production to judge merit within the bureaux.

Ephemeral physiognomies.

With distrust of the actor as interlocutor adding extra piquancy to anxieties about the trustworthiness of the victims of comedies about post-revolutionary social life, the corpus of physiognomic theory inspired by Johann Caspar Lavater's L'art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie, describing a direct correspondence between a man's inner character and his outward appearance, enjoyed a renewed popularity in the first decade of the nineteenth century. At the same time as Médiocre et Rampant was first produced, physiognomical portraits of Robespierre and Marat appeared as "proof" their "sanguinary disposition". This politicisation of physiognomy was further developed in a treatise on physiognomy by J.M. Plane, which not only saw the science not only as a useful means to judge "the great number of villains, which the Revolution has revealed to us" but also a means of judging a woman who spurned him (to his satisfaction, finding her wanting). When Médiocre et Rampant was enjoying its second run in the Théâtre Français, physiognomic science was becoming increasingly popular a

---

means to try and understand outsiders and others in a new urban milieu.\textsuperscript{27} Inspired by Cabanis' \textit{Mémoires sur les rapports du physique et du moral de l'homme}\textsuperscript{28}, the Parisian doctor, Moreau de la Sarthe, argued that physiognomy was a product of sensual experience, encompassing the entire body.\textsuperscript{29} He argued that man's faculties were not separate, but developed in tandem with one another over time.\textsuperscript{30} Therefore, a man's virtue could be judged, not only from the shape of his skull, but also from his attitudes and gestures, his tone of voice and his accent, his clothes and fashionable accessories, his penmanship and handwriting.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{27} Examples of "popular" physiognomies include \textit{Le Lavater portatif, ou Précis de l'art de reconnaître les hommes par les traits du visage}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition (Paris: veuve Hocquart, 1808); Hocquart, Édouard, \textit{Le Lavater des dames ou l'Art de connaître les femmes sur leur physionomie}, 4\textsuperscript{th} edition (Paris: Santin, 1812). Profiting from the popularity of physiognomy in the period, Dominique Vivant Denon held an exhibition of physiognomic drawings in the \textit{calcographie} of the \textit{Musée Napoléon} in 1806: Denon, \textit{Dissertation sur un traité de Charles Lebrun, concernant le rapport de la physionomie avec celle des animaux} (Paris: Calcographie du Musée Napoléon, 1806).

\textsuperscript{28} J.L. Moreau de la Sarthe, "Prospectus" for \textit{L'art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie} (Paris: Hardy, 1806), pp. 65-66. Moreau notes in his introduction that physiognomy is a means to link moral science and physical science, or (quoting Destutt de Tracy) a "philosophical physiology".

\textsuperscript{29} A new edition of Gaspard Lavater's physiognomy appeared in Paris in the early 1800s, edited by Moreau de la Sarthe: Gaspard Lavater, \textit{L'art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie}, (ed. Moreau de la Sarthe, trans. Antoine-Bernard Caillard & Marie-Elisabeth Bouée LaFite), new edition, 10 vols., (Paris: L. Prudhomme, 1806-1807). Antoine-Bernard Caillard, one of the translators, was Head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Archives and will feature later in this chapter as head of a Commission of Inquiry. Subscribers to the volume included two Division Chiefs in the Ministry of Interior and several other \textit{fonctionnaires}, particularly in the Ministry of War and the Prefecture of Paris. Most of the others also belonged to the "professions" — doctors, lawyers, notaries and booksellers: see Lavater, \textit{L'art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie}, vol. IX, pp. i-xii.

\textsuperscript{30} Moreau argued against Gall's theory that the shape and size of the cranial cavity determined one's ideas, in favour of a theory of development that encompassed the entire body: see J.L. Moreau (de la Sarthe), "Exposition et Critique du système du docteur GALL, sur la cause et l'expression des principales différences de l'esprit et des passions, lue à l'Athénée de Paris", \textit{La Décade Philosophique, Littéraire et Politique}, an XII — 2\textsuperscript{me} trimestre, 12 (30 Nivôse Year XII), pp. 129-137; 13 (10 Pluviôse Year XII), pp. 192-202; 14 (20 Pluviôse Year XII), pp. 257-265.

Moreau de la Sarthe's work brought physiognomy into the "real world" of the social statistician. He looked to make it a "useful" science, extending it to an analysis of the professions, arguing that the workplace was an environment which shaped man's moral development. In the French edition of Lavater's observations in 1806, Moreau remarked that each profession engendered a particular set of physical and moral habits, that their members had an "air of family". Moreau's intention was to draw up codes against which members of professions could be judged – to divine their aptitude, zeal and probity. It was a short step from that to judging the adaptation of the individual administrator to his task, to drawing a firm correspondence between ability, profession and status, on a physiognomic hierarchy. For, as a way of judging administrators' virtue in the Ministry, the value of physiognomy was plain: stealing furtive glances across the office, evaluating a correspondent's handwriting, or calmly analysing each twitch of a superior's mouth as he read an important report, the science of judging physical appearance might salve day-to-day administrative uncertainty. However, if the Ministry of Foreign Affairs bureau chief, Antoine-Bernard Caillard, the translator of Lavater for Moreau, best epitomises the importance of physiognomy for administrators, it was one of his subordinates, Louis-Jean-Alexandre Bonnet, condemned in Year VIII as médiocre et rampant for stealing seventy-seven gold and vermilion boxes, who best demonstrates its ephemerality as a means to negotiate the difficulties of surviving in Revolutionary administration.

Bonnet departed from the offices in Year VIII, suspected by his superiors and betrayed by his colleagues, who ganged up against a colleague they detested to force him into a confession of his guilt. It is therefore surprising to find that, under the Old Regime, Bonnet had attached himself to both his office and his superior with enthusiasm, helping to raise his premier commis' infant son,

---

33 Caillard owned several books on physiognomy, including ones by Lavater and Pierre Camper: Caillard, Catalogue des Livres du Cabinet de M. A.B. Caillard (Paris, 1805), p. 85. Moreau de la Sarthe does not, however, appear among the authors in his library.
Edmond Charles Genet, who would, in turn, become his superior. Bonnet seemingly saw no contradiction between his devotion to Genet and his "Revolutionary" activities, as patron of the local poor house, notable, and member of the General Council of the Commune of Versailles in 1791. Even during the Terror, Bonnet protected the Genet family fortune, property and papers against seizure, seeing no inconsistency between his protection of émigré possessions and his reputation as a fervent Republican. Hidden in Versailles out of sight of his Ministers, Bonnet in 1792 was a typical commis, dabbling in politics outside the office but maintaining the duties of his Old-Regime position in the Archives. It was only in a letter dated March 1792 to Bonne-Carrère, the Director-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, that Bonnet began to portray himself boldly as a committed Revolutionary, to push himself forward at the expense of his colleagues. He responded to the threat of widespread administrative reform promised by the new Minister, Dumouhiez with a proclamation of his own "virtue". He vehemently denied any intention of sycophantic praise, while simultaneously using hackneyed catch-phrases and slogans to demonstrate his loyalty to the Revolution (flattering Bonne-Carrère as a man who could recognise flattery). He declared

'Virtue and Truth', such is my motto. To my superior, I therefore open the frank and ready soul of a faithful servant to Foreign

---

34 Bonnet had served Edme-Jacques Genet in the bureau des intérêts from its creation until 1781, when the premier commis died. Although Edmond Charles Genet succeeded his father, his decision to leave Versailles to become the French ambassador in the court of St. Petersburg meant that the bureau (which depended utterly on its premier commis) was disbanded in 1787. Bonnet was given a transfer to the Dépôt, the Ministry's collection of treaties, correspondences, memoirs and maps: Samoyault, Les Bureaux du Secrétariat D'Etat des Affaires Etrangères sous Louis XV, pp. 131-140. See A.A.E. Personnel: Volumes Réliés, Origine - 1830, vol. XI, [Bonnet, L.J.A.], 3 recto verso, 61 verso, for Bonnet's request to maintain his place in the ministry he had served faithfully for twenty-seven years.


36 Ibid., 4 recto, verso. That Dumouhiez was going to purge the ministry was common knowledge, as he had outlined this step in his Mémoire sur le ministère des Affaires Etrangères in 1791. This memoir counselled that ministry employees should have absolute integrity: diplomacy should be based on honesty, not on mystery and deceit. It brought Dumouhiez into favour with the Jacobin club, and, in particular, with the deputies of the Gironde.
Affairs, born with the passion of work, a sincere friend to the Constitution, and free of any sort of prejudice.\(^37\)

It was after the Terror that Bonnet began to combine political rhetoric with physiognomic narrative. Having moved with the archives to Paris, he now worked closely with the Minister, Charles Delacroix. In Year IV, Bonnet was described as "a good patriot, a good commis, an honest man... a good father, a good husband, and a good friend": his opinion was valued; his efforts were noticed, and rewarded with special privileges.\(^38\) Moreover, a key to the locked store, where important treaties were kept, and the right to side step his immediate superiors and deal with Delacroix directly, distinguished Bonnet from his colleagues. Made head clerk of the bureau, Bonnet stayed late at night, scouring the archives for the papers the Minister needed the next day. In Brumaire, he wrote to the minister, once more under the threat of a administrative reorganisation: "I was born laborious. The vigour of my complexion disposes me to unflagging and forced occupation." Politics and proof of hard work merged with the history of his "complexion":

> If this advantage, joined to some learning, the study of languages and the knowledge of history, caused you to appoint me to draw up political memoirs — for which I dare to believe I have a certain aptitude — I pray of you, Citizen Minister, to take stock of my activity and my constant perseverance... \(^39\)

Bonnet's decision to combine political rhetoric with physiognomy came at the same time as his move to Paris, where his "vigour" could be proven not only on paper but also by his extra-curricular activities. Communicating both in prose and in prosopography (in its "archaic" meaning as the science of the face), Bonnet shone forth as a vital element in the ministry firmament, a colleague to emulate and — perhaps — a colleague to envy. He succeeded not only in keeping his job, but in gaining fringe benefits. In a letter dated Messidor Year VI, he bemoaned how he had been impoverished by his child's education, additions to his library, and aid to the poor house. Noting that he worked late and on his days

---

\(^37\) Ibid., 4 recto.
\(^38\) Ibid., 22 recto.
\(^39\) Ibid., 18 recto, verso.
off, he turned these proofs of merit into material benefit with a request for temporary accommodation in the ministry.\textsuperscript{40}

There was also another aspect to Bonnet's command of the physiognomic and political languages. A "historical memoir" in Frimaire Year IV, a companion piece to the solicitation above, by lavishing both praise and condemnation on his colleagues, used both as a means to cast his own judgements.\textsuperscript{41} Some of his co-workers were mediocre subjects; others were good citizens, praised for their education, their attention to their civic duty, and their patriotism. For example, Bonnet criticised an old colleague, Baud, for his royalism, but still allowed that he was "endowed with useful knowledge".\textsuperscript{42} The most unequivocal denunciations were of Fournier, an "ex-noble, a mediocre subject, one of the orators of the section, a persecutor of Patriots".\textsuperscript{43} He had earned these sobriquets, Bonnet alleged, by submitting a list of royalist employees to be retained (and, by implication, revolutionaries to be dismissed) to Bigot de Saint-Croix in August 1792.\textsuperscript{44} If in Fournier's case, the denouncer had become the denounced, this might have been a warning to Bonnet himself. Fournier's familiarity with the aristocratic Saint-Croix had tainted him forever in the eyes of his colleagues. Similarly, Bonnet's familiarity with Delacroix would later be punished by the other members of the bureau des archives.

If politics – not appearance – formed the basis of the accusations against Baud and Fournier, physiognomy formed the basis of his denunciation of Tessier, the most piquant bee in Bonnet's bonnet. Tessier, according to Bonnet, was an "adroit chameleon", able to adapt his physiognomy to circumstance, aspiring to become the chief of the Depot.\textsuperscript{45} Tessier hid "under a hypocritical mask an

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 28 recto. Bonnet was a trustee of the poorhouse in Versailles.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 26 recto. Another letter to Charles Delacroix, dated the 25 Frimaire (27 recto, verso), forms a more concerted denunciation of his co-workers, noting in particular how Huet, although an excellent man, was "devoted to excess", and that only two of the "subjects of the depot" were proven patriots.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 22 recto. Baud had served with Bonnet under Genet, and moved, like him, to the dépôt. He was dismissed, shortly after the "historical memoir", on the 21 Frimaire Year IV.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 22 recto.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 22 recto.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 22 verso.
\end{itemize}
unmeasured ambition" under a obliging demeanour, he was "semi-learned, intriguing, as supple and sharp-edged as a Jesuit." Yet Bonnet had to admit that careful surveillance of the "chameleon" had yielded little, except that Tessier, a "mediocre geographer", had ousted Barbié du Bocage, pupil of the celebrated geographer, d'Anville, and author of the map supplement for Abbé Barthélemy's *Voyages du jeune Anarcharsis.* Bonnet argued that Tessier had convinced the premier commis, Sénonin, to promote him by renouncing part of his wage for working in the Ministry. Even if Tessier's chameleon-like physiognomy was fabricated, this accusation at least was true: Tessier had made his reduction in wages possible by striking a deal with Sénonin to tutor his grandchildren (the children of the ex-Farmer-General Preuze) for an extra three thousand livres, food and board.

It is significant that, even when Bonnet had proof of Tessier's political corruption (or at least, of his association with the family of a Farmer General), he chose physiognomy, not politics, to give force to his denunciation. As a strategy, it bore fruit when Charles Delacroix decided to dismiss Tessier from the Archives. Tessier's reappointment to the archives a few years later, however, showed that both political and physiognomical proofs were ephemeral. A note urging Tessier's reappointment blamed the geographer's dismissal on the "pretexts that were current at the time". "Prejudices," the note continued, had been "suggested against nearly all the employees of the Foreign Affairs archives, whose principles and morality have always been beyond the hint of reproach, and whose former services merit a better fate". Tessier's own solicitation cited Antoine-Bernard Caillard among those supporting his reintegration. Reappointed in 1801, he

46 Ibid., 22 verso.
47 Ibid., 27 verso.
48 Ibid., 22 verso, 27 verso.
49 Ibid., 26 recto.
50 Preuze had been condemned to the guillotine some years earlier. The widow Preuze was the daughter of Claude-Gérard de Sénonin, Director of the Archives until September 1792. Sénonin died in retirement on the 20 Messidor Year II.
51 A.A.E. *Personnel: Volumes Réunis*, vol. LXVI [Nicolas-Antoine Queux-Dame, dit Tessier], 92 recto, verso; 93 recto, verso.
52 Tessier was dismissed on the 26 Frimaire Year IV, after a second denunciation on the part of Bonnet. He did not leave government service, however, moving from the archives to the Cadastre.
remained in the archives until his death in 1825. Bonnet's own story was less successful: in Year VIII, a year before Tessier's return, he faced an inquiry led by Caillard, accused of having stolen seventy-seven gold and vermilion boxes from the Depot.

That Bonnet had temporarily mastered the "means of success" is indisputable. He had managed to control his appearance, combining the language of physiognomy and political denunciation, to gain the Minister's ear, passing memorandums (both denunciatory and otherwise) to him directly. Despite claiming to speak "with all the frankness of an honest man"\(^{54}\), the line Bonnet drew between virtue and vice was an artificial one. His actions had no fixed value: rapid changes in the sort of "historical notice" necessary to clinch politicians' support were compounded by frequent reorganisations within the Ministry — the announcement of each Ministry budget triggered an annual avalanche of internal mail. With so many others competing for Ministerial attention, protesting one's virtue could have the opposite effect to that desired. If anxieties were stoked by the fear that one's virtue would not be recognised, the desire to be seen was often offset by the need to protect one's faults from the notice of one's superiors. With the end of the Directory, Talleyrand's elevation to Minister, and Caillard's appointment as Head of the Archives, Bonnet was in a particularly perilous position. There was little difference between his denunciation and Fournier's, between his devotion to Genet and Tessier's service to the widow Preuze, between his use of physiognomy to state his virtue and the chameleonic ambition he decried. When Bonnet himself was accused of theft by his colleagues in Year VIII, it is unclear whether they acted as "Dorival" or "Laroche". It is only clear that their mastery of the science of both opinion and appearance had finally outwitted poor Bonnet, who was left speechless and immobile by a concerted effort to blame him.

After Delacroix's dismissal in 1797, an "altercation" with the other members of his bureau confirmed that the value of Bonnet's virtue was on the wane. Bonnet wrote to Resnier, Caillard's predecessor, to ask him to smooth over tensions in

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 96 recto, verso, 97 recto.

the bureau. He pleaded with his Chief to help clear up the disagreement between him and his colleagues, to preserve the "harmony" of the office. While it is unclear what the subject of this altercation was, it is plain that harmony could only be preserved with some loss to Bonnet: Resnier deprived him of the store key and forbade him from working late at night. Cast under a cloud of suspicion, Bonnet was no longer able to narrate his unflagging devotion with bleary night-vision eyes, nor by wielding his privileges like a talisman. Unable to trumpet his virtue, as he had done in Year IV, he was now desperate to enshrine the status quo. By advocating "harmony", however, Bonnet acknowledged his loss of control over the language of success. Trying to protect his reputation by institutional means, he admitted that he was no longer in a position to compete with the other bureau members to further his reputation.

On the 3 Fructidor Year VIII, Bonnet wrote to the Minister explaining his fear that he would be accused of a crime discovered the day before. Caillard on taking his post as Chief of Archives had discovered the theft of seventy-seven gold and vermilion boxes, which had held the seals affixed to the international treaties. Circumstances focused attention on Bonnet: he was in charge of looking after these treaties, and had held the key to their store. He also was known for arriving in the bureau before anyone else, and working late, after his colleagues had gone home. The physiognomic signs that Bonnet had used to such great effect during the Directory were therefore turned against him: his long hours in the office were cast as opportunity, his protestation of virtue as a sign of his desperation. In his defence, Bonnet boldly exclaimed that he that he had nothing to hide (and that he would be unable to conceal his guilt, if he had ever thought of committing such a crime). This time around, Bonnet claimed that his physiognomy would prove him, not a patriot, but a good colleague: he "could not live an instant longer if he had ever betrayed his duties and the tranquillity of his comrades". The physiognomic proof of Bonnet's innocence was nevertheless crumbling as he constructed it. Three days after the theft, he offered his

---

55 Ibid., 30 recto (letter dated 11 Ventôse Year VII); The statement to the Commission of a colleague, Jorelle, confirms this "altercation between Citizen Bonnet, his chiefs and his collaborators": 49 recto.
56 Ibid., 55 recto, verso.
57 Ibid., 55 verso.
resignation, still claiming his innocence, but pleading for a pension and an escape from the "cruel position" of being openly suspected of theft. Four days after Caillard had discovered the missing seals, Bonnet was sacked, his pleas for reinstallation ignored and his reputation in tatters.

Bonnet had broken down before a commission presided over by his Chief and "confessed" to having stolen the boxes. According to the minutes of this committee, Bonnet's outrage (in common with his fellow employees) had turned into a noticeable discomfort (in contrast to his colleagues). He was condemned by "the embarrassment in which he found himself, which was visible, joined to certain words that escaped from him". If the Commission also recognised that, apart from physiognomy and a couple of dubious remarks, it was unable to prove Bonnet the definitive author of the theft, it was saved the trouble. Urged on by his fellow employees, Bonnet made a "confession" to Caillard, despite which he received no mercy: his dismissal was immediate, and he lost any right to a pension and an honourable retirement. The final chapter in Bonnet's dismissal was not decided by physiognomy but by office politics: his colleagues, refusing to confirm his morality in their statements to the Commission, cast him to the wolves when he came to them for help.

From outside the office, Bonnet continued to claim his innocence, seeking a trial outside the Ministry, and dwelling deeply on conditions which surrounded his confession to reconstruct the story of his whirlwind fall from grace. Paralysed, unbelieving that suspicion could fall on him, a "peaceful citizen amongst his books... trembling with terror at being an object of suspicion", then dragged without warning before a Commission, unfamiliar with his principles, Bonnet

---

58 Ibid., 52 recto [6 Fructidor Year VIII].
59 Ibid., 66 recto.
60 Ibid., 31 recto. When considering Bonnet's request for a trial, it is important to note that the evidence against him, presented in a series of statements from his office mates, was highly circumstantial. In the absence of anything other than innuendo and physiognomy, Bonnet's confession alone had sealed his fate. His colleagues' statements are to be found in ibid., 45 recto to 51 recto. Their substance was later challenged by Bonnet, in 35 recto - 44 recto.
61 Ibid., 36 verso.
62 This commission (which met on the 5 Fructidor Year VIII) was composed of Caillard, the archives chief, D'Hermand, chief of Commercial Relations.
believed himself "no longer master of his reason, or of his responses". He claimed that he had sat mute, unable to utter a word in his own defence (although the Commission recorded that he had tried to cast blame elsewhere, accusing Rouet, the garçon de bureau, of stealing a book some years previously). In the years after his dismissal, Bonnet clung to this cut-and-dried tale of misinterpreted physiognomy, claiming that he had been shocked by the theft, or that he had sacrificed the right to argue his innocence to protect his son's nascent career as a scientist from the shame of a criminal process. What emerges from Bonnet's solicitations during the Empire and the Restoration is his own surprise at the speed at which events transpired: in one petition for his readmission to the Ministry, he described how, faced by the Commission of Inquiry, "without measuring the depth of the abyss which was opening up below me, I jumped..." Bonnet's final appeal argued that his former colleagues had hoaxed him: they had simulated the theft of the boxes to discredit his success.

For the Ministry, the ambiguities of the Bonnet affair were too myriad to ever be allowed to reach a civil court. The affair was over: whatever story of physiognomic collapse Bonnet told, he would receive no clemency. A wall had been built between Bonnet and the Ministry, constructed in a personnel file of denunciations and solicitations. The conspiracy of his ex-colleagues had worked to ensure his permanent exclusion, searching frantically in the Ministry archives, and in those of the Comité Révolutionnaire in Versailles, for proof that he was the vilest of denouncers. If Bonnet's ghost stalked the cartons, both literally, as

(appointed in Prairial Year VI (May 1798)), and Bresson, chief of Funds (appointed in Brumaire Year VIII (November 1799)). None had served in the central bureaux under Delacroix.

63 Ibid., 36 verso, 37 recto.
64 For Bonnet's denunciations of Rouet, see ibid., 57 verso. He blamed his ex-chief, Resnier, for not punishing the earlier crime.
65 Ibid., 36 verso, 37 recto.
66 Ibid., 71 recto.
67 His colleagues took extreme care to leave no stones unturned. When Bonnet appealed to the First Consul in Year IX, his ex-colleagues uncovered a denunciation in his name against the Count d'Ornano, a relative of Bonaparte. This death was blamed on the unfortunate Bonnet, though the Count's execution occurred eight months later on the frontiers of Switzerland. Indeed, in ibid., 68 verso, Bonnet queries how a denunciation made before the Comité
Talleyrand referred his appeals to successive Archive chiefs, and figuratively, as his ex-colleagues searched out his letters of denunciation and solicitation, the "shameful proof" which had led to his dismissal could be "forgotten". Replacing the story of his physiognomic collapse with evidence of his other betrayals, his colleagues catalogued his denunciations to construct a dossier of his guilt. Known to posterity as a Jacobin extremist, Bonnet's career ended in a slew of unanswered petitions, passed to the Archives and filed, forgotten in the bureau where he had worked for thirteen years. Instead of mulling over physiognomy, his ex-colleagues had moved on, relegating the affair to the furthest reaches of their depot, and chronologising their own history of service to the Nation, by counting the years, months and days they spent in the bureaux.

The politics of authorship

In the Ministry of Interior, employees also constructed their reputation in a tangle of tales, a hundred hard-luck stories, a thousand trick or treats. Anecdotes and hear-say informed the dry decisions of the minister's organisational memoirs, where the choice of where to make cut-backs might be dictated by the constraints of budget or new responsibilities, but the choice of who to dismiss might be completely arbitrary. Yet, the legitimacy of an employee's claim to be a bon commis was no more established than the legitimacy of the Minister's criteria of dismissal. The difficulty of judging administrators on the basis of their work matched the ambiguity of political opinion or physiognomic appearance. Competing claims of individual production made the ministry a stage for tense encounters; inside the offices, harmony was wrecked by furious disputes, which pitted administrators against one another. Office politics therefore centred, not only on cases of material theft, but also on cases of plagiarism and misappropriation. These disputes, in which there could be no "thief", might run on and on, disrupting daily bureau routines, and spreading outwards to "infect" Révolutionnaire in Versailles could have been satisfactorily transmitted to the other side of the country.

68 Ibid., 67 recto - 75 verso.
other offices and involve personnel from other offices up to the Secretary General.

In 1808, Cochaud, a sous-chef and rédacteur in the Bureau of Arts and Manufactures, was working on a project concerning the School of Arts and Trades at Chalons-sur-Marne. He had passed two drafts of the report to his bureau chief, who gave them to their Division Chief, who included them in his weekly business with the minister, Champagny: the result of this process was that they had both been returned, covered with marginalia. The Division chief, Lansel, therefore sent for Cochaud to discuss how the report should be altered. As they pored over the manuscript, crossing out paragraphs and scribbling notes in the margin, Cochaud realised that he and his superior had very different ideas about who had authored the text. Cochaud, who had spent long hours researching and writing about the school, was aghast to find that his Bureau Chief, Claude-Anthelme Costaz, had taken the credit. Cochaud believed that the only explanation for this could be Costaz's duplicity: he had claimed ownership blatantly to Lansel and the minister's face, or at the very least, he had allowed them to get that impression.

Cochaud implored Lansel to unmask Costaz as a plagiarist. To Cochaud's thinly concealed disgust, however, the Division Chief told him not to approach the minister with the story, and not to confront Costaz. Instead, he asked Champagny to give Cochaud permission to send his reports directly to the Division Chief's office, securing Cochaud's grudging silence, by bypassing Costaz in the hierarchy of correspondence.

Cochaud transmitted ten more versions of the project directly to Lansel, who reviewed it with the commis, and brought it to the minister. When time came for the thirteenth revision, Champagny, moved to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, had been replaced as Minister by Cretet. Costaz took the opportunity offered by the changeover of ministers (and the hiatus preceding a new reorganisation of the offices) to reinstate his control over his employee, storming into Cochaud's office

---

69 This school, founded by the Emperor, was under the immediate surveillance of the Minister of the Interior. 450 pupils, chosen by the Emperor, were kept at the Government's expense. In addition day-pupils, each paying 500fr, were enrolled.

70 The narrative that follows is largely taken from a letter, Cochaud [to Lansel], 29 June 1808, A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Cochaud].
demanding an explanation for why he had been sidelined in the report's manufacture. The two men finally came head to head, and Cochaud accused Costaz of plagiarism in front of all their colleagues. Costaz responded by strictly applying the rules laid down by the Minister, which technically forbade the expéditionnaires to copy Cochaud's notes, unless Costaz had already applied his visa and approved their contents. Marking Cochaud's reports as "seen" and "approved" documented Costaz's part in their manufacture. However, Costaz continued to treat reports drawn up by other commis as he had before, allowing them to copy their reports without his visa, marking Cochaud out as an exception. By structuring the story of how paper passed through his office, he presented Cochaud as the miscreant, and himself as the injured party. Cochaud might complain that such petty-minded control was to substitute penalty for reward, to humiliate one whose zeal ... and obedience are worthy of praise, to discourage those of my colleagues who know the inconveniences I will have suffered to stay a laborious employee, and to conform strictly to the intentions of the Minister, but his protestations were worthless. Champagny having departed, Cochaud had no proof that he had permission to work directly with his Division Chief: as long as Costaz stayed within the forms of the ministry organisation, and manipulated appearances within the prescribed order of things, Cochaud was effectively deprived of his right to own his intellectual product, to claim authorship of the reports he produced.

At first, Cochaud thought that this extreme submission to form would only be temporary, and that Costaz would relent. Six weeks later, however, Costaz was still determined to apply his visa on any document Cochaud produced and the sous-chefs patience was wearing thin. He addressed a report to Lansel demanding the suppression of the inconvenient, insulting, "humiliating and vexing" visa. Another six weeks passed. Cochaud sought out Lansel several more times, but was put off repeatedly. He complained bitterly that he had done nothing to deserve this treatment, that his honour was impugned by

---

71 Letter, Cochaud to Lansel, 9 mars 1808, ibid..
72 ibid.
Costaz's "theft" of his prerogative. Denied the help that he believed his "capacity" had earned him, Cochaud decided to bring his narrative to the attention of others, and to fight Costaz in the realm of opinion. What had begun as a minor dispute escalated into a ministry-wide conflict: Cochaud not only involved the Secretary-General, DeGérando (charged with the order and surveillance of the bureaux), but also the ex-minister, Champagny (from whom he demanded a certificate to prove he had had permission to bypass Costaz).

DeGérando decided to reconcile the two, instructing Cochaud to write to his bureau chief. Cochaud did so, proposing that they either continue working as they had before or that Costaz could continue to examine his work before it was copied out, but not to write bon à expédier or vu in the margin. Costaz's input into his work would in either case not be documented, as it was not for any other rédacteur in the bureau. Cochaud would therefore preserve his honour as the writer of the work, and Costaz would preserve his as bureau chief. They would bury their dispute, and forget the whole story. However, when Costaz did not reply to either of his proposals, the exasperated Cochaud wrote once more to the Secretary-General, describing how he was a victim of the abuse of confidence ... that I did not believe Costaz capable of committing; victim for having discovered by hazard that he had committed it; victim for having executed the orders of M. de Champagny and those of M. Lansel; victim of the reserve and the silence of M. Lansel ...; victim in that, out of respect for the general rule, I consented to deprive myself of an honourable exception; [victim] in that the work that I had done was mine to keep; victim of the attacks that M. Costaz directed against the delicacy of my sentiments, even though it is he who has not conducted himself well; victim of his lack of deference to the Chief of Division, and of his humour ...; victim, to say it in one word, because I am vexed and tormented instead of praised for my zeal.

---

73 *Propositions remises à M. le Secrétaire général, le 7 avril 1808*, A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Cochaud].
74 Ibid. For procedures regarding the other two rédacteurs see letter, Cochaud to Lansel, 9 March 1808, A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Cochaud].
75 Letter, Cochaud to [DeGérando], 12 April 1808, ibid.
and the trouble which I have taken to draw up a long and difficult report.\textsuperscript{76}

Cochaud's torrent of recrimination was provoked by his powerlessness against Costaz's stubbornness: as the dispute continued, Cochaud was more likely to be seen as a troublemaker, not an aggrieved party. If he continued to tell the same tale, it would lose its lustre, and he would be treated as a nuisance, and not as a victim. He trod the thin line between reasonable complaint and denunciation, knowing that - however justified he believed his claim to authorship - Costaz held the upper-hand.

DeGérando was also leery of letting Costaz continue to throw his weight about and took his own steps to end the dispute. The Secretary-General, learning that Costaz had ignored the offer of reconciliation, enforced its terms: he ordered Costaz to suspend the visa in return for Cochaud agreeing to submit his work for Costaz's examination. Therefore, when Cochaud met Lansel "by chance" the day after on the way from the Pont Royal, it was to tell him that he and Costaz had reconciled: the danger of becoming a nuisance seemed averted. Cochaud later reported that he had found this return to the original order of the bureaux a tremendous relief: there would no longer be any "formulae of exception" to mark him out from his colleagues.\textsuperscript{77} Yet the dream of a rapprochement with Costaz was shattered as soon as he turned from the Pont Royal, into the faubourg St. Germain and into the rue de Grenelle. Instead of obeying DeGérando, Costaz, furious at the Secretary-General's reprimand, had ordered that no reports were to be sent to Cochaud's desk, freezing him out of the bureau's routines, and denying him the right to work. In a worse position than ever, Cochaud now not only feared being the source of ennui, but also of suspicions that "some malicious language could inspire" by making him seem lazy and unwilling to work. Cochaud busied himself with compiling reports on reforming administration, desperately searching for a way out of his new predicament. He also turned to ridicule, writing a memoir, Mon appel au peuple, which offered to resolve a "serious question" - whether the Chief of the Bureau of Arts and Manufactures was not obliged to keep his word and to conform to the orders of

\textsuperscript{76} ibid..

\textsuperscript{77} Letter, Cochaud to [Lansel], 29 June 1808, A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Cochaud].
the Minister. He circulated this work to three bureau chiefs, in an attempt to erode Costaz's reputation as Costaz was eroding his. This attempt was foiled by Lansel, who ordered him to destroy the memoir, even if it was written in jest.

Soon, subject of an accusation of laziness as he had feared, Cochaud played his final card, claiming his "right to communicate" with the minister as the object of a denunciation. He demanded that he should be allowed to view the minutes of any report made against him. Bringing the Minister into the fray of office politics seemed initially to have worked. Soon after, Costaz charged him with the final rédaction of the Chalons-sur-Marne project — to be presented to the Emperor on his return from Bayonne. However, as this gave Cochaud a mere month to finish the report, this had all the hallmarks of a pyrrhic victory, an impossible task. Cochaud had been forbidden to work on the report with Lansel during the dispute, and would not have time to contact Chalons-sur-Marne for information before the deadline. Moreover, he learned that Costaz had put his own version of their dispute to the Secretary General and that DeGérando was beginning to believe the stories of his laziness. Unsure of who supported him and who had been convinced by Costaz, he desperately called on Lansel's support, and offered his reports on manufacturing as proof of the "facts" of his assiduity. None of these proofs were enough, however. He had only one chance to prove himself as a good commis and an energetic colleague: by finishing the report on Chalons-sur-Marne on time.

Two weeks later, working both Sundays and weekdays (and despite losing some important correspondence), Cochaud made it. A final report was ready to be brought to Lansel. This proved not only his capability, but also his dedication and hard work. Yet even this moment of triumph was soured by Costaz. The bureau chief went to Lansel's office and complained once more about his sous-chef. By now, a thoroughly confused (and, at this time, quite ill) Lansel was no longer sure

---

78 Letter, Cochaud to [Lansel], 17 May 1808, ibid..
79 Letter, Cochaud to [ ], 1 June 1808, ibid..
80 A part of Cochaud's correspondence with Lansel in this period is preserved in Lansel's papers in A.N. f/10/225.
81 Letter, Cochaud to [DeGérando], Paris, 12 July 1808, A.N. f/1bl/263/4 [Cochaud, Antoine François Rambert].
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he knew the full facts of the case. He sent the sous-chef a series of categorical questions, asking for one-line answers to one-line requests:

1. Had Cochaud ever fomented the division existing between Costaz and himself?
2. Had Cochaud himself produced this division?
3. Had he approached Lansel to suggest ideas of division?
4. Had he plotted secretly to foster division in the bureau?
5. Had he told anyone that he was sure of Lansel’s support, if he distanced himself from Costaz?
6. It is certain that one of the two of you is a man who seeks to make trouble (des dégoûtants tracasseries). Is it M. Costaz? Is it you?82

In the second year of the dispute, Lansel did not want to hear any more stories of victimisation, of laziness, of exclusion or impugned honour. He had no stomach for fantastic tales of devotion or heroic zeal. Although the whole episode might eventually be put down to a misunderstanding—a silly squabble between two grown men—in the months in which it raged, it had involved two ministers, a Division Chief and a Secretary General as arbiters, and an entire office as spectators. Returning day after day to the same suite of offices where Cochaud first accused his superior of plagiarism, Cochaud and Costaz replayed their enmity again and again in a series of spiteful manoeuvres. Costaz’s legendary bellicosity was, in fact, only silenced in 1815, when he was dismissed on full pension and Cochaud replaced him as head of the bureau.

By the end of Cochaud’s and Costaz’s dispute it was uncertain to at least some of the participants whether it was more about intellectual theft, administrative hierarchy or simply personal vendetta. According to Costaz, his dismissal in 1815 might even have been about politics: he presented himself as the victim of a political purge, and a target of the Restoration Ministry of the Interior.83 Shortly

82 Letter, Cochaud to [Lansel], 29 June 1808, A.N. f/1b/11-14 [Cochaud].
83 During the so-called “white terror” at the beginning of the Second Restoration, new ministers, wanting to reward those who had remained faithful to the Bourbon monarchy (or those who purported to have done), tried to purge the offices to make space for new recruits. On the “reality” of this purge, however, see Chapter Six.
after leaving the offices, the Ministry of Interior again accused him of intellectual theft. Unlike Bonnet, Costaz enjoyed the right to appeal against the accusation. Bringing documents before the Procureur Général of the Royal Court in Paris, however, he successfully defended himself by arguing that the minutes of the notices he had drawn up for the Ministerial bulletin in the Moniteur were his own property. His success in court, however, did not mean he had any chance of returning to the offices. The paperwork behind his dismissal in 1815 had already calculated his pension: the royal decree, which gave him 3611 francs a year, beginning on the 16 August 1815, blocked him from ever returning to the employ of the Ministry of the Interior. Once his paperwork had been completed, any appeal against either the pension or the calculations which had been made would be fruitless. After the Revolution of 1830, when Costaz tried to return to the offices, he played the political victim: he had published a work on the administration of Agriculture, Commerce, Arts and Manufactures, which was favourably reviewed across Europe (in particular by the Edinburgh Review) but ignored by his own government. He dismissed the allegations of intellectual theft, claiming that the minutes for the various projects he had drawn up in the Bureau of Arts and Manufacture would be in his handwriting. Although he constructed a work history in which he had been a zealous administrator (and his erstwhile colleagues had been political cronies), his petitions — like Bonnet's — were ignored. His personnel file was no longer current: his petitions were filed mutely beside the ministry's final appreciation of his service.

The état de services

Cochaud's and Costaz's dispute began as early as 1807, and they continued to work together for another seven years. Costaz's dismissal might alternatively be

---

84 Costaz claimed that he had enjoyed a salary of 12000 fr instead of 10,000, as recorded in his file. Payments made to the employees, in bonuses, or from irregular funds, were not included in the pared-down chronicle of their service, though an essential part of the employees' yearly salary. Costaz also complained that his service during the years when the pension levy was not in force was not being counted.

85 Letter, Cochaud to the Minister of Commerce and Public Works, 14 December 1831, A.N. f/1b/263/4 [Costaz, Claude Anthelme].
seen, not as an end to his rivalry with Cochaud, but as the beginning of a new battle between him and his old Division Chief, Fauchat (the evidence of which is placed in a different series in the Archives Nationales). All that one can take for certain from the stories of Bonnet's theft and Costaz's plagiarism is that denunciation and solicitation stoked office anxieties and fed interpersonal uncertainties. One can only imagine the disruption caused in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Archives or in the Bureau of Arts and Manufactures. In the former, all members of staff were called to give depositions to the Committee of Inquiry: fear and distrust hung as heavy as the grey, choking dust, when they met each other among the cartons. Bonnet might have watched his colleagues huddling in little groups, excluding him; he found no solace in the hollowness of his famed "republican virtue". Likewise, in the Bureau of Commerce, expéditionnaires and rédacteurs were caught in the midst of a battle of wills between their chef and sous-chef. Countermanded orders, torn-up reports, shouting matches and, eventually, civil action, made life in their office not merely difficult, but impossible. No one could hold sway. The other sous-chef, D'Epéry, who might have mediated between his colleagues, had died the year before. Trapped six to eight hours a day in a single suite of rooms, the members of the bureau must surely have been heartily sick of one another. Instead of engaging in solicitation and denunciation as a means of competition, administrators therefore looked for means to demonstrate their zeal and assiduity, exactitude and promptitude, discretion and probity, in written chronicles of their work history, neatly organised and tabulated to avoid the problems caused by telling tales.

While administrators were used to battling uncertainties in their daily tasks, the uncertainties of office politics had a more direct and immediate impact on their lives than the question of pasturage. One might use the same skills to judge sheep as to judge administrators (if not the same criteria). When the rédacteur could not choose which sheep were better for which region, he temporised, sending for more information from the provinces to find a categorical basis on which to compare and contrast two breeds. When Costaz and Cochaud were locked in combat, attempts to reconcile them were constantly prejudiced by one or both men's twisting the facts of the dispute in their own favour. Lansel's categorical list of questions looked for a way to penetrate the confusion of
denunciation and counter-denunciation, in order to establish, once and for all, the reason behind their dispute. With both men acting the victim, he had instead to find an more unambiguous means to judge their respective merit. Yet his categorical questions spawned not one-line answers but an eleven-page memoir: moreover, he had no means to measure their guilt in their reactions, as each man reacted as the victim of the dispute.

The employees themselves suggested imaginative ways to judge their work rate scientifically. The clerks in *enregistrement*, for example, devoted their time to counting the pieces in their register, sending a synopsis to the Minister to legitimise their claims for a bonus. Loiselet, the chief of the registry, declared to DeGérando, the Secretary General, in January 1808, that, if he added the 73,849 letters sent to the Ministry in the previous year to the 39803 responses and decisions dispatched, he and his colleagues had recorded 113,652 different documents in the previous year. The discrepancy between the letters received and the letters sent off, he assured his superior, was not down to an enormous backlog, but due to the work of the ministry in combining information from several documents into a single report. Out of the total, one clerk, Dusieu, Loiselet believed merited particular praise: he had processed 33,582 documents single-handedly. He and his comrade, Pihet, often returned to work in the evenings when their office was running behind.\(^\text{66}\)

What worked for the Registry did not work for the Bureau of Agriculture, however, and a report processed was not always a report processed well. When necessary, the Secretary-General had little compunction in dealing out punishment on far less *objective* grounds.\(^\text{67}\) How could one ever know the

\(^{66}\) Letter, Loiselet to DeGérando, 3 January 1808, A.N. f/1bl/2727 [Loiselet, Edouard Ignace Joseph].

\(^{67}\) Much like historians, who have felt little compunction in judging Bonnet's guilt, or believing Costaz's story of his summary dismissal on grounds of politics, *fonctionnaires* thought that judging fairly was less important than coming to a conclusion which ended the disruption. When Frédéric Masson criticises Bonnet for his Jacobin fervour, we are told of his crimes in a short few sentences, and not of his repeated appeals, and of continued efforts to deny them: *Le Département des Affaires Étrangères*, pp. 255-256. Masson gives his reader the same information as Talleyrand would have had when sent the Committee of Inquiry's report. Though Bonnet's file in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is large, it
"truth" of what happened in the offices? The Ministries needed a way of tracking their employees, a way of aggregating histories of individuals without generating conflict, of writing virtue without the confusion generated by office politics. The Secretary General had no way of preventing the practice of solicitation and denunciation, but he had a means to control it: documents could be hidden away in the archives, "forgotten" by the offices, and hidden from the prying eyes of the public. To let stories tell themselves, "facts" could be re-arranged so that one thing seemed to happen after another. While office politics jolted from mini-crisis to mini-crisis, work histories, by hiding petitions in personnel files, proceeded slowly and surely towards a definite conclusion. The Bureau of Arts and Manufactures' dispute was finally settled when the Registry drew up Costaz's final **état de services** and when a single piece of paper established his right to a pension.

Pension legislation, ordered by Napoleon in 1806, and enacted in the offices in December 1807, provided a vehicle for the codification of office chronicles. Until then, the line between pensions and indemnities had never been clear. Under the Old Regime, pensions were awarded to active administrators, as tokens of

contains no concluding report, no neat summation, and no end to his tale. Similarly, when Catherine Kawa writes Costaz's work history after 1800, noting he was "Chief of bureau... Director of Manufactures in 1812, Secretary of the Society for the Encouragement of National Industry" and that he "claimed to have been "sacrificed on the 15 August 1815, despite his numerous writings on commerce", she lists his achievements in the fashion Costaz himself did, without investigating the rich ambiguity of his claims to be an author: Kawa, "Dictionnaire biographique des employés du ministère de l'intérieur de la première république", available at ftp://ftp.univ-orleans.fr/pub/kawa. Kawa, surveying every single employee of the Ministry of Interior between 1792 and 1799, puts herself in the position of a Minister, who needs to know something about everyone, but not too much about any one person.


"The value of narrativity in the representation of real events arises out of a desire to have real events display the coherence, integrity, fullness, and closure of an image of life that is and can only be imaginary": White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality", p. 23.
satisfaction or of esteem, on the word of a particular chief or Minister.\textsuperscript{90} The revolutionaries judged the amount of these pensions excessive, a contributing factor to the size of the national debt, and one of many symbols of aristocratic decadence.\textsuperscript{91} They re-defined the conditions on which pensions should be awarded using the same notions of virtue and service to the nation they used to chose their employees. While the first revolutionary decree on pensions in 1790 set down minimum conditions under which pensions would be accorded — an employee had to have served 30 years, to be over 50 years in age, although exceptions would be made for those injured or infirm — those who reached the cut-off point had no guarantee of a cosy retirement. Sufficient funds did not exist to reward all the army officers and administrators who felt justified in making a claim. This state of affairs was a fertile breeding ground for employee petitions. The never-ending stream of hard-luck stories, and shifting definitions of who had served the nation and who had been its enemies, meant that the interpretation of pension regulations was being constantly re-drafted. After responsibility for giving such pensions was taken over by the Treasury in Year X (1802), pensions were once again attributed on the basis of the Minister's personal recommendations. The law of 1806 aimed to put an end to the perceived injustice of this system, asking for exact information from each employee, and archiving that information for future use. It aimed to establish the virtue of the Nation’s employees in terms of ancien
teté, to lay down fixed, uniform, inflexible criteria to judge those who were worthy of this reward.

The usefulness of new pension regulations for judging employees’ virtue in other circumstances, and for reducing competition within the bureaux, was immediately recognised. The circular dated the 23 September 1807, inviting all Interior-Ministry staff to furnish details of their work history, proceeded:

\begin{quote}
The desire that I have, Sirs, of knowing all the employees of the ministry, and the necessity of stating their services, whether for promotions, or for retirement pensions to which they might
\end{quote}

\footnote{On Old-Regime pensions see Vida Azimi “Les traitements des agents publics sous l'Ancien Régime”, Revue historique de droit française et étranger, 67 (1989), pp. 428-468.}
\footnote{Kawa, Les Ronds de Cuir en Révolution, pp. 200-202.}
have later rights, necessitate these measures ... which I recommend you execute immediately.

In consequence, if you would please forward to me your names and forenames;

The date and place of your birth;

The note of your public services, civil and military, before your admission to the bureaux of the Ministry;

The date of your entry to the bureaux, in what quality, and at what salary;

The indication and the date of your movements in the different grades, and the variations of wages that you will have experienced (que vous aurez éprouvées).

Please append justificatory documents to support your declarations: these will be returned to you after verification and registration. In time, you will receive a certificate stating your services.

I have the honour of saluting you,

Cretet.92

Each member of the administration arrived in the office one morning to find on his desk this same uniform piece of paper. The employee's name written by hand was the only sign of his individuality. Otherwise, the same information was asked of both garçon de bureau and Division chief. Thus this magical piece of paper seemed to promise an objective system of promotions, on scientific bases, determined by the limited set of criteria for comparison. Merit was to be counted in time, rather than in production. While an employee might dispute whether or not he was responsible for producing a memoir, he could not fabricate years in a bureau where he had not served. Reference to zeal, to assiduity and to application were relegated to ancillary remarks on certificates. Some were pleased with this new state of affairs, others were dismayed, but all were forced to conform. The Bureau de Comptabilité verified, registered and tabulated the information given by the employees. By the end of December 1807, the accountants had finished the arduous process of compilation.
Therefore at the very same time that Costaz was battling with Cochaud, the ministry was drawing up this service record:

Costaz, Claude Anthelme.
Chief of the Bureau for Arts and Manufactures.
Born in Champagne (Ain).
He was 36 in October 1807.

Employee at the Direction of military provisioning, in the Department of Montblanc, from the 21 December 1793 to the 10 October 1794: 9 mths 19 days.

The 13th October of the same year, called to the Commission of Agriculture and the Arts and stayed to the suppression of this Commission in Year IV:

Brumaire Year V, 26 November 1795
Entered the Ministry of the Interior at this time in the quality of sub-chief of the bureau for arts and manufactures on a salary of;
increased to 3800f in Year VI, reduced to 3500f in Year VII, increased to 3900f in Pluviôse Year VII, reduced in Year VIII to 2200f. Named on the 1 Germinal Year VIII, the 22 March 1800, Chief of the Bureau for Arts and Manufactures on a salary of 6000f. On the 31 December 1807, he will have 13 yrs, 2 mths, served: 18 days.

92 A.N. f/1bl/262/3 [Béranger, Jean Baptiste].
Statement of Services that he will have on the
31 December 1807: 14 yrs 7 days.®

All reference to Costaz's bellicosity, his dispute with Cochaud, his reputation for appropriating the work of his subordinates was therefore erased from own record. The état de services created the semblance of a history, on which a person could be judged, but replaced the employee's own narratives with a "scientific" calculation of his work history. His career progressed — and was processed — from office to office, from salary reduction to hike, from Ministry to Ministry. Costaz, whose identity was confined to the top of the page, hung over the aggregate of years of service like a ghost, disembodied and depersonalised. His protestations and arguments were silenced on paper, even while he vocalised them in Lansel's office. Judging the employees' services, the pension decree obliterated the need for any reference to the employee himself. There was no need to enter his office: each office in each Division was reproduced in a separate carton held in the Secretariat.® There, his virtue could be counted — his years could be marked off, and his need judged quantitatively rather than qualitatively. The état de services provided a means for employees to compete without quarrelling, to follow models offered by those who had devoted their life to administrative service (and whose work chronology had already been added up) or simply to conform to an ideal type (the principle of ancienneté itself). Work chronologies therefore promoted emulation within the offices: yet it was not Costaz or any other "role model" that one might emulate. Career-making in the Ministries was no longer a zero-sum system, where one succeeded only at the expense of someone else: the état de services made it possible to continuously produce "honour", without impugning the honour of anyone else.

While chronicling work histories — like checking office hours — in fact revealed little about the merit of the administrator concerned, employees spoke about

®® \footnote{A.N. f/1bl/263/4 [Costaz, Claude Anthelme].}
®® \footnote{"Note pour Monsieur Labiche", A.N. f/1bl/6 [1807].}
ancienneté as if it was a "real" indicator of their prospects of promotion. This is not to suggest that they gave up personal contact with their superiors, assuming that their personnel files would be sufficient to attract attention. However, even when one's superior was also a friend, one still sent a formal letter of solicitation, setting out in black and white one's entitlement to a position, based on years of service in the Ministry or in civil society. Even if the system of promotion by ancienneté was sometimes ignored in "reality", most employees were content to disavow other more fractious means of proving their merit. Ancienneté provided a stable language through which they could communicate, combine, and collaborate — without ever directly competing — as they moved on their individual trajectories through the administrative hierarchy. Accumulating honour in years of service allowed them to get a handle on their chances of success, and to calculate what they needed to do in order to progress up the Ministry and social hierarchy.

95 See my discussion of Barbié du Bocage's solicitations on behalf of his son, Guillaume, in Chapter Five.
Chapter Four

Civil Servant, Civil Society:
The Accumulation of Honour in Sociétés Savantes.

The light of renown

On the 1st of Fructidor Year XII, a commis in the bureau of passports, Jean-Baptiste Joly, wrote to his chief of division, Ernest d'Hauterive, presenting his entitlement to membership of the Legion of Honour. Encouraged by the certainty that d'Hauterive "loved justice", he asked for his "protection" and "benevolence". As well as listing his services to the Nation both in and outside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Joly went further to try to tell the story of his life: he had worn the Revolutionary Cockade in 1789, battled Vendéens and anarchists in his hometown of Niort in 1792, and, while employed by the ministry in Paris, suffered imprisonment during the Terror in 1794. He claimed that this mini auto-biography showed that he had always remained at the "post of honour" whenever the Nation was in danger. Although he was "confident" of d'Hauterive's support, his letter also betrayed his insecurity about revealing his ambition so openly: "I hope to belong to a body destined to venerated by the Public... by this means, I would be able to serve the state more effectively".\(^1\)

Yet his declaration that, by tackling a group of malevolent conspirators, he had saved Talleyrand's life on the eve of the 18 Brumaire\(^2\) could no more be

---

\(^1\) A.A.E., Personnel: Volumes Réliés, vol. XXXIX [Joly, Jean-Baptiste Charles], 394 recto, verso; 395 recto, 396 recto, verso.

\(^2\) Ibid., 394 recto, verso, 395 recto: "Some time before the ... 18 Brumaire, anarchy lit the torches of civil war; [conspirators] meeting in a stable, swore their vengeance on the our best men. M. Talleyrand was the object of their hatred... . I resolved to approach this horrible place, to know the nature of the danger awaiting our estimable Chief. In effect, I had hardly arrived at the doors of the stable when I heard the most seditious proposition. I could not contain my indignation and addressed those who surrounded me. I told them that M. de Talleyrand had given the revolution such tokens [of his loyalty] that it was impossible that he should be its enemy ... I was seized at once by the madmen,
substantiated than his royalism had been by the *Section du Mail* in 1794. More importantly, his work behind a desk in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs could not be measured in anything other than the vaguest terms: although the absence of official *états de services* did not prevent him from quoting his *ancienneté*, it was buried in the middle of more exciting events from a myriad life. Jean-Baptiste Joly therefore based his solicitation on other evidence of his positive contribution to the public good. Concluding the list of his achievements, he mentioned that he had received medals both from the Government (during the National Exposition) and from the *Lycée Des Arts* (for the invention of a *lampe à double-courant d'air* in Year X). Though he was the veteran of an eventful military career and an administrator of over ten years' service, Joly used his work as an inventor to justify his entitlement to the Cross. In the realm of post-revolutionary civil society, this administrator had found new means to present his virtue, cataloguing not only his service within the Ministry, but also his service to civil society.

Joly might have exaggerated his tales of disarming an *insurgé* in the halls of the National Convention, and facing down conspirators against his Minister, but a printed report of proceedings during a public séance of the *Lycée* documented his claim to having invented the double-ventilation lamp. The *procès verbal* told the story of how Joly's lamp had been constructed, how it worked and how it had been tested in direct competition with the Citizen Carcel's mechanical lamps, in the presence of *Lycée* members. Explaining how the members of the special commission had measured the light emanating from each of the lamps, gauged the quantity of fuel consumed and the heat generated, and recounting how each...
of the two inventors had delighted in showing the panel their lamps’ best qualities, the procès verbal picked over every significant detail of the séance, and consigned them for posterity to print.

Practical tests coupled with a scientific appreciation for their theoretical premises gave an authoritative tone to the Lycée's findings. Yet, what was missing from the Lycée's intensive investigation was any debate on the provenance of the machines. The form – and the forum – of its investigation simply assumed the right of both men to claim ownership of their intellectual property. When Joly received the Lycée's medal at the general assembly of the 7 germinal, Antoine-François Fourcroy had to draw on a broad definition of intellectual property to acknowledge Joly's "true invention":

Citizen Joly, ventilated lamps have so varied in their construction over the last twelve years that it had seemed that no other enhancement was possible. You have, however, added several improvements, giving more illumination and volume to the flame. In according you this medal, the Lycée des Arts appreciates the difficulty in adding a new perfection to a machine that has already been perfected.

In order to "own" his idea, Joly did not have to prove that he had devised the original prototype: he simply had to convince the Lycée des Arts that his lampe-à-double-courant-d'air was a useful extension of the oil lamp's capacity.

In fact, Joly's innovation was no more than the application of conical funnels – which had already been used successfully in the design of furnaces – to the lampe à courant d'air, or quinquet (as it was more popularly known in France). The lamp's basic design – a hollow circular wick – had been invented by Ami Argand in Geneva in 1783, and represented the first real advance in lighting technology for several hundred years. Joly had no doubt been inspired to improve on Argand's work while sitting in his darkened office at three o'clock on a winter afternoon, screwing up his eyes to process a pile of passports. His portable lampe à double-courant d'air effectively addressed the problems of illuminating an office: it responded to the need for more light, removed the stink
of oil lamp in enclosed spaces, was portable and dismantled for easy cleaning. Moreover, it proved economical compared both to other lamps of the same type and to candles, costing only four centimes an hour to operate: it was, according to his peers, within the price range of larger artisanal workshops, and was certainly within the price range of the ministries. "Richly glowing, pure, constant" (a dependable enlightenment), Joly's double-ventilation lamp was "of a practical form and size, and economic on combustibles". In all its enhancements, it was a product for a New Regime. For Joly in the revolutionised office, it was an everyday solution for an everyday problem: the workday could be structured by fixed hours - effective artificial light could overcome the limitations imposed by the seasons. Outside the office, the power of improved lighting, which illuminated public spaces, epitomised a new nineteenth-century definition of usefulness. As the perfecter of a machine that had already been perfected, Joly's minor fame therefore rested, not on his lamp's unique quality, but on its convenient illustration of the revolutionary lesson that the savant's work should benefit society at large.

---

6 For the sorts of problems related to the use of oil lamps in offices, see the personnel file of Bousquet, the Ministry of the Interior lampiste: A.N. f/1bl/262/7 [Bousquet, Jean]. After the Baron Mounier complained of the weak illumination and the rancid smell of the lamps in his apartment, the ministry deemed Bousquet too old to be able to clean and maintain the ministry's lamps on his own. There were 26 lamps in Mounier's apartment alone when this note was written in December 1820.

7 In Year X, the Athenée des Arts calculated the oil usage of Joly's lamp at 33 grammes an hour: see A.A.E., Personnel: Volumes Réliés, vol. XXXIX [Joly], 390 recto, verso – 393 recto. The Société d'Encouragement pour l'Industrie Nationale, investigating an improved model in 1806, calculated its consumption at 26 grammes per hour (one kilogram every 39 hours): Bulletin de la Société d'Encouragement pour l'Industrie Nationale, vol. XXIV (June 1806), p. 293.


The *Lycée des Arts* thus found in Joly's invention, not technical innovation, but an illustration of "improvement", the Society's *raison d'être*. Looking to create a reproducible tradition of useful invention and to create consensus on the attributes of quality goods, its commissioners preferred the *lamp à double-courant d'air* to Carcel's *lampe mécanique*, though they considered Carcel's a more novel design. Ultimately, both artists "acquired new right to the Athenée's esteem" simply for having participated in the contest. The society members watched Carcel examine Joly's lamp himself; they heard him confess that his rival had outdone him, and then, with perfect candour, ask for the secret of the double-ventilation lamp's increased volume. They witnessed Joly demonstrating the conical air funnels to Carcel and offering the right to use his innovation, despite a patent pending. For both inventors and their society, the *procès verbal* was a title deed. For Carcel it was permission to market Joly's improvement. For Joly, it documented success: the endorsement of the *Lycée des Arts* was a "sufficient recompense". For the *Lycée des Arts* itself, the *procès verbaux*, presented to members as part of their bulletin, enhanced its reputation as arbiter of the useful arts. By such means the society determined the direction of "progress" and the perpetuation of its own authority by requiring its members to emulate and not to innovate.

The Bulletin was therefore also a means to perpetuate a rhetoric of emulation, promoting this "virtuous" competition, immune to jealousy and envy, as the ideal means to encourage progress. Described in the seventeenth century by La Bruyère as a

---


11 Walter Benjamin describes Carcel's lamp in his *The Arcades Project* (trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin) (Cambridge MA and London: Belknap Press, 1999), pp. 562, 564, 568. Unlike Joly's lamp, Benjamin believes that that Carcel's clockwork mechanism marked a material change in the technology of light production: "In the Carcel lamp, a clockwork drives the oil up into the burner; whereas in the Argand lamp (quinquet), the oil drips into the burner from a reservoir above it, thereby producing a shadow". (p. 564).


13 The organisation of freemasons in the eighteenth-century foreshadowed this rhetoric of emulation, where the "secret" was never divulged, yet promised a common purpose for the members.
voluntary sentiment, courageous and sincere, which makes the soul fertile, allowing it to profit from example, often allowing one to surpass those whom one admires, emulation had long been used to bolster cooperation within eighteenth-century Academies. When the Chevalier de Jaucourt echoed La Bruyère in the Encyclopédie, lauding the effect of emulation on the Sciences and Arts, on learned men, on orators, painters, sculptors, musicians and poets, and on all who turned their hand to writing, he echoed a popular belief that emulation was the best means to manage squabbles between rival intellectuals in the eighteenth-century Republic of Letters. The Lycée therefore encouraged both Carcel and Joly to collaborate in bettering their inventions, not only by setting down strict rules and procedures for the competition between them (enforced by the commissaires who tested the two lamps), but also by convincing them that emulation was the only viable means by which to attain the progress of the Arts and Sciences. To claim legitimacy, its Bulletin directed, they needed to be seen to work, not for individual gain, but for the progress of French science and manufacture. Under the rhetoric of emulation, the authenticity of the individual producer no longer derived from his product, but from the way in which he presented it. The politesse of "honourable emulation" allowed a member to surpass his collaborators in virtue, in knowledge or in application, but did not allow him to challenge another's credentials or question his reputation as an inventor. The institutions of civil society therefore balanced the need to massage its members' amour propre with the necessity of avoiding conflict within its ranks by rewarding perfectionnement over innovation. In the 1780s, the oil lamp had been the subject of a long-drawn legal battle between Ami Argand and

---

14 Jean De La Bruyère Les Caractères ou les moeurs de ce siècle, fifth edition, (1690), vol. XI, p. 85. For an example of the use of emulation in eighteenth-century societies, see Bollioud de Mermet, Louis, Discours sur l'Émulation, Adressé à la Société Royale des Sciences et Belles-Lettres de Nanci (Lyon: Périsse frères, 1763). Rebecca Spang kindly provided both these citations.


16 Also for that reason, the professors who lectured at the Lycée normally went unpaid (though a fee of twenty-four livres had been agreed), being content with a mention in the Society's prospectus and the recognition of their fellow members:
Bonaventure Lange over the right to claim the invention of the tubular wick.\textsuperscript{17} Avoiding such disputes over "authorship", Jean-Baptiste Joly's munificence in offering the secret of his "invention" to his competitor was, no less than his lamp, a creation of the New Regime. The power wielded by the nineteenth-century société savante, and its public use of emulation, created a set of formulas by which ownership could be claimed and reclaimed— and then documented in the black and white of a Bulletin.

The authority claimed by the societies over the progress of the sciences, as arenas in which emulation could be fostered and promoted, was bolstered by the absence of "big government" at the start of the nineteenth century and, consequently, a rival definition of useful production generated by the "state". Although government could define the technical grounds on which an invention was regarded as property\textsuperscript{18}, it was unable to police intellectual competition without the help of "enlightened" society members whose information-gathering networks and expertise were at that time impossible to duplicate.\textsuperscript{19} Nineteenth-century civil society therefore proved indispensable to administration's

---


\textsuperscript{18} To constitute a perfectionnement (according to the legislation on brevets d'invention) an adaptation of an existing invention had to offer a "new idea that the inventor himself had not thought of, and which results in easier usage or an extension of its utility": Madival, M.J., & Laurent, M.E. (founding eds.), Archives Parlementaires de 1787 à 1869, (Paris: P. Dupont / CNRS, 1867 - ), 1\textsuperscript{er} series, vol. XXI, p. 730.

\textsuperscript{19} See my comments on ministry dependence on agricultural correspondents in chapter one. Parmentier, Vilmorin, Huzard, Silvestre and Gilbert—the backbone of the Ministry of Interior's bureau of agriculture during the Directory—as well as their Minister, François de Neufchâteau, were all key members of the Parisian Société d'Agriculture. When it was proposed that the society receive Imperial authorisation as a national institution, in 1804, negotiations with Napoleon floundered over Silvestre's refusal to relinquish his dual position as chief of the bureau of agriculture and perpetual secretary of the Society. Editing both the Ministry's instructions and the Society's Mémoires, Silvestre would have had an unassailable authority over the progress of French agriculture. Despite the breakdown in negotiations, the society continued nevertheless to received 40000 francs from the Ministry's annual budget and their close co-operation continued: Jean Boulaine. Histoire de l'Agronomie en France, 2nd edition (Paris, London & New York: Lavoisier Technique et Documentation, 1996), pp. 238-239.
encouragement of invention. Key figures in the Ministries often held analogous posts in the sociétés savantes: they exploited their dual position to gain funding for the Societies’ scientific projects, to generate subscriptions and to sell their Bulletins to a larger audience. In particular, the creation of the Société d’Encouragement pour l’Industrie Nationale in Year X was nothing less than the acknowledgement of this co-operation between administrators and other members of civil society in promoting the “useful arts”. Sponsored by the Minister of the Interior, Jean-Antoine Chaptal, the S.E.I.N. functioned both as a practical extension of the Ministry of Interior’s influence and a necessary brake on the superimposition of theoretical rulings on the realities of the processes of manufacture. Claude-Anthelme Costaz, for example, chief of the Ministry of Interior’s bureau for Arts and Manufactures, was also a permanent secretary of the S.E.I.N. Moreover, the make-up of the S.E.I.N.’s Commissions clearly mirrored that of the Interior’s various bureaux consultatifs.

The S.E.I.N. uniquely merged the talents of the administrators formulating France’s industrial policy with the talents of scientists (Frédéric Cuvier, Cabanis, Laplace), bankers (Bastarèche, Fulchiron, Jubié), and entrepreneurs (Bontemps, Noel Delaistre, Denis Julien, Jacob frères).

For these men, membership of the S.E.I.N. meant the chance to combine theory and practice and to steer the development of French industrial progress. Contributing to civil society also allowed members to enhance their individual reputations and provided a vital means to display their productive capacity. Having turned his thoughts to the problem of the shadow projected by the oil reservoir inside the body of his lamp, Jean-Baptiste Joly used his solution (a thin tube feeding the wick) to excite the interest of this new société savante.

---

21 These names represent only a fraction of members from each of these occupational groups: see "Première Liste des Souscripteurs de la Société d’Encouragement pour l’Industrie Nationale", ibid., vol. I, pp. 143-148
proceeded to work with fellow society members on the problem of oil consumption; together, they presented their findings regularly to the S.E.I.N.'s administrative council. The society's "encouragement" of Joly's invention in Year XII took the form, not only of a capital injection, but also of a priceless recommendation, which he used to try and gain the Legion of Honour cross. It was not only administrators who turned their hand to invention to make their reputation: "Count Rumford" (Benjamin Thompson, an American émigré after the War of Independence and social parvenu, who would be given the title "Count of the Holy Roman Empire" by the Bavarian government as a reward for his scientific endeavour) found his "Rumford chimney" become an instant success, boasting a "20 to 30% reduction in the use of combustible fuel". It competitor, the Bourriat furnace (using "2/3s less combustible fuel than other furnaces") also profited by the S.E.I.N.'s recommendation. It was mentioned in a report to the Société Philanthropique, and Bourriat consequently won the contract to supply economical burners to their expanding number of soup kitchens. As solid fuel was both costly and hard to procure in the combustible crisis of the turn of the century, competition among the manufacturers of economical stoves was fierce. They willingly rolled up their sleeves to work with administrators from the Parisian bureaux de bienfaisance and administration des hospices distributing soup to the unfortunates of the city. Bourriat, for instance, worked for his sale to the Société Philanthropique by playing a much more hands-on role in running the rue du Bacq and Gros Caillou kitchens. He knew that orders for his furnace turned on public recognition of its social utility.

By participating in the S.E.I.N. and the Société Philanthropique, entrepreneurs like Bourriat could help define what was "useful". The principle of emulation also

---

24 For an extended debate on the economics of fuel consumption in large-scale stoves, see Rapports et Comptes Rendus du Comité Central d'Administration des Soupes Économiques de Paris, pendant l'an X (Paris: Éverat, Year XI), the official bulletin of what was soon to become the Société Philanthropique.
25 For a list of those involved in Year IX, see "Recette: Souscriptions et Dons", ibid., pp. 49-64.
26 Ibid., pp. 2 (rue du Bacq), 15 (Gros Caillou).
implicitly entailed the expansion of his market: it was beholden on civil society to lead by example, to educate the morals of the less enlightened. Careful to keep the world abreast of their activities, the societies "animated the zeal" of both their members and the general public by organising regular competitions. The Société Philanthroplque's first taste-test -- "a mode of proof and comparison that seems to fulfil all our purposes" -- was overseen by the Minister of the Interior, Chaptal, and Rumford, "that ingenious friend of humanity who has given us so many simple and useful things". The competition proved so successful that the Society immediately named a four-man commission to travel to the kitchens and to judge the soups économiques on-site, with the publisher Éverat reporting back to the society. While members of the committee were sometimes disgusted by the quality of soup they were offered, they were nevertheless surrounded by the grateful poor, who assured them that the soup was of the highest quality. By physically working in soup kitchens -- not simply donating money to the poor\textsuperscript{29} or financing third-party charitable efforts -- the members directed the consumption of the "less fortunate", encouraging them to emulate their own tastes (and shaking their heads despairingly when they did not).\textsuperscript{30}

While the members of the S.E.I.N. and the Société Philanthroplque were certainly among the "haves" of the nineteenth-century world, their aim in forming societies was not to consolidate their power or to kill worker unrest by kindness. Even if a large number of society members combined their economic with their charitable and intellectual pursuits, financial gain was not behind everyone's involvement. They were bourgeois -- but only insofar as they met within the

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p. 10.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., p. 12.
\textsuperscript{29} Giving money directly to the poor was forbidden by the Society Philanthroplque's statutes: see ibid., p. 101.
\textsuperscript{30} The Société Philanthroplque expanded its activities to include the establishment of mutual-insurance companies for the poor. Imposing strict regulations on how the workers could handle their finances and binding them to a systematic code of conduct, they hoped to educate the labouring classes in the virtue of budgeting and household management. The involvement of "bourgeois" societies in the establishment of mutual-assurance companies for labourers is dealt with in detail in Carol Harrison's The Bourgeois Citizen in Nineteenth-Century France: Gender, Sociability and the Uses of Emulation (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1999) pp. 123-156.
Men of different ranks, of different political persuasions and various intellectual orientations, mingled, directed soup kitchens together, and tested new inventions in public séances. They imagined — and worked towards — a cohesive productive and economic social world in which the individual could be rewarded for his contribution towards civil society's collective enterprise. Ordered by an institutionalised strategy, a regulated framework for belonging — the society constitution — the individual could demonstrate his virtue in public sessions, formalising (and formularising) the transaction of information between him and his collaborators. The boundary between the taste-testers and the poor was the boundary between those who embraced progress and those who laboured in ignorance. Those who preferred a mediocre soup challenged the direction of perfectionnement. Within the society, social standing was not based on financial clout or innovative contribution: the member proved his virtue by situating his product in a tradition of social improvement.

The dead hand of geography

When a Société de Géographie was first mooted on the 19 July 1821, with the intention of creating a practical and socially valuable geography, the first task of its founders was not to call a public meeting, but to appoint five of their number to write a constitution. The society constitution's function was two-fold: it had to provide an open forum where everyone could exercise the right to emulate (and to contribute towards the progress of their science) and had to control the composition of its membership to ensure that harmony reigned in their conception of what that "progress" involved. The regulations drawn up by

---

31 Maurice Agulhon, *Le Cercle dans la France Bourgeoise, 1810-1848: étude d'une mutation de sociabilité* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1977) uses the term "bourgeois" to connote a "middle class", neither aristocratic nor "popular". However, since members of both aristocratic families and artisan clans belonged to the societies, it is difficult to accept this definition. Furthermore, as seen above, society members differentiated between themselves and others on the grounds of specific differences of taste or education rather than by social "class".


33 Importantly, this did not include the exclusion of women: a motion for the inclusion of women members, proposed in February 1823 by Barbié du Bocage,
Langlès, Walckenaer, J-D. Barbié du Bocage, Fourier and de Rosse! (all respected members of the *Institut de France*) for the Society of Geography commenced by laying out the object of the society’s efforts and the means by which they could provoke emulation of its goals:

The society is set up to work towards the progress of geography; it will have voyages undertaken in new and unknown lands; it will propose and judge prizes; it will correspond with learned societies, voyagers and geographers; it will publish unedited manuscripts ... and will have maps engraved.34

Sharing knowledge, judging the quality of current research, and directing the ways in which that research was conducted, the architects of the new Society believed that it could wield a tremendous influence on the development of geography as a useful science.

---

was debated and carried [*Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, (Paris: Éverat, 1822), vol. I, p. 165]. The absence of female members was not an expression of the members' misogyny. The makeup of the society's membership was circumscribed, not by gender, but by professional utility: the society's masculine complexion reflected the professions of map-making and geography, navigation and exploration. Nevertheless, while nothing in the sociability of the institutionalised public sphere forbade the membership of women, the belief that their "natural" vocation was to care for their children meant that their contribution to civil society was effectively limited to participation in societies such as the *Société de la Charité Maternelle*. These associations, too, took an institutionalised form – in correspondence with organised religion as well as their masculine equivalents – and policed their own emulative order, organising educational programmes for young women under the watchful surveillance of their central commissions. These societies were public, even if they were not "published": on the "silence" of these associations compared to their male counterparts, see Catherine Duprat, "La Silence des Femmes: Associations féminines du premier XIXe siècle", in Alain Corbin, Jacqueline Lalouette & Michèle Riot-Sarcey (eds.), *Femmes dans la Cité, 1815-1871* (Grâne: Créaphis, 1993), pp. 79-100. The search by female societies for a "tradition" to emulate may also have been, in part, responsible for an upsurge in the veneration of Saints during the Restoration.

34 The society constitution can be found in *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, vol. I, pp. 3-8. Article 1 states "The Society is instituted to contribute to the progress of Geography; it will have voyages undertaken in unknown countries; it will propose and award prizes, establish correspondence with sociétés savantes, voyagers and geographers; published unedited accounts as well as finished works, and will have maps engraved."
An eighteenth-century precursor to the Société de Géographie, proposed by Jean-Nicolas Buache (a Ministry of Foreign Affairs geographer), had already envisioned the collaboration of mapmakers to better their craft. The 1821 Society—also championed by a Ministry of Foreign Affairs geographer, Jean-Denis Barbé du Bocage—was not limited like its predecessor to a discussion of drafting techniques or cartographic minutiae. It believed that perfection of the science of geography was intimately linked to the advancement of all other sciences, to the progress of civilisation and the prosperity of commerce and industry: it was progressive, looking to unite the efforts of mapmakers and explorers; it was expansionist, looking to map a new science of geography by expanding its frontiers. Barbé du Bocage's involvement was not incidental: working in the Napoleonic administration had forced him to accept a constantly shifting geographical world. The reputation of the Foreign Affairs geographer had been made by his map-book for the Abbé Barthélemy's popular Le Voyage du jeune Anarcharsis, an account of life in ancient Greece. His initial assignment in the Ministry had been to catalogue the collection left to the department by his deceased mentor, d'Anville (famous for his renderings of Greece under Roman occupation). Yet, Barbé du Bocage's recall to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1803 was to work on a modern geography of movement and change. Static maps, frozen in time and space, no longer satisfied the need of a Europe drawn and redrawn by Imperial armies.

---

36 BNF CP SG Colis n° 26 (3750).
38 Barbé du Bocage, we are told, resisted this change. According to Lacour-Gayet, he was a "convinced pacifist" frustrated that Napoleon's conquests had him constantly redrawing the map of Europe: see G. Lacour-Gayet, Talleyrand (1754-1838), vol. II (1799-1815), (Paris: Payot, 1946), pp. 41-42.
The particular conditions created by Napoleonic expansion make it unsurprising that, in general, government officials dominated the Society registers: in all, 73% of the members could claim to be fonctionnaires of some description, including army and naval officers, academicians, and university professors; 36 of the 217 initial members worked in ministry bureaux in Paris. Thus, the Société de Géographie, no less than the S.E.I.N. was formed in the interaction of the administrative with the practical world. The S.E.I.N. needed ministerial protection to guarantee the sanctity of intellectual property; it operated alongside the ministries in moulding French industrial policy to its vision of "progress". The Society of Geography worked even more directly with the ministries, gaining access to their store of important cartographic material and exploiting their regular communication routes across the globe. While friends of friends continued to do errands, delivering pamphlets and instructions to out-of-town correspondents, the bulk of the Society’s business was transacted via diplomatic channels. The society’s initial list of contacts therefore focused not only on "friends of science" but on fonctionnaires at home and abroad.

Though this list of contacts was extensive, and the Society enjoyed a healthy membership rate in the first years of its existence, its constitution ensured a

---

40 See the Society’s letter to the Minister of War, 26 June 1824, asking for maps published by the Ministry of War to add to their library: BNF CP SG Colis n° 6 bis (2020). Another letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 12 August 1824, tells of their gift from the Ministry of War and asks that Foreign Affairs, too, should donate its geographical productions: ibid. (2022). A final letter to the Minister of the Marine, 12 August 1824, asks for the maps published by the Ministry of the Marine: ibid. (2023).
41 BNF CP SG Colis n° 18 (2921) contains the Society of Geography’s decision to solicit this aid in transmitting their correspondence from the ministries of Marine and Foreign Affairs. A letter from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Society of Geography, 6 June 1822 [ibid. (2906)] agreed to their request, and offered to recommend their travellers to French diplomatic personnel. The secretary of the French mission to the United States, Bresson, proved of particular value as a correspondent: ibid. (2916 & 2917).
43 The Section de Correspondance distributed circulars inside journals, including the *Revue Encyclopédique*: BNF CP SG Colis n° 18 (2914).
socially and intellectually "elitist" composition.\textsuperscript{44} Article 6 of Section 2 prescribed an annual membership subscription of 36 francs, as well as an up-front levy of 25 francs; furthermore, applicants had to secure the nomination of two existing members and approval by the Central Commission.\textsuperscript{45} Once accepted, however, membership also had its rewards: one could use the society library (stocked mainly with unpublished manuscripts unavailable elsewhere), and express one's \textit{voix consultative} at the fortnightly discussions of geographical \textit{nouveautés} in the Central Commission. Eventually, one could aspire to election to one of the sections of the Central Commission (publication, correspondence and finance) and translate one's activity as an ordinary member into a more involved administrative role.\textsuperscript{46} Ensuring that those with ambition could only succeed by joining the society and emulating the dedication of Central Commissioners, the society formed a class of correspondents, not formally envisioned in the constitution, but which allowed it to benefit from the work of non-adherents as well as to influence the direction of their studies.\textsuperscript{47}

In this vein, the \textit{Société de Géographie} made an express commitment to ignore national rivalries, calling not only on Frenchmen journeying or living abroad, but also on foreigners (or, more usually, fellow Europeans) to contribute to their proceedings.\textsuperscript{48} The society was to function as a vast collaborative project; its members had to ensure that "all enlightened men can contribute by their support, their subscription or by their scientific communications".\textsuperscript{49} Indeed, working with

\textsuperscript{44} Initially there were 217 members, which increased to 300 by 1828-9: for a breakdown of membership, see Lejeune, \textit{Les Sociétés de géographie en France}, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Bulletin de la Société de Géographie}, vol. I, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{46} The Central Commission was divided into sections purely to ensure that all members would be required to take an active role: BNF \textit{CP SG Colis n° 26 (3748)}, 5.

\textsuperscript{47} See, for example, the despatch of a \textit{circulaire de correspondant} to Adrien Partarieux, a "man of color" en route to Sénégal asked to deliver letters to different people in that part of Africa: \textit{Bulletin de la Société de Géographie}, vol. I, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{48} “Circulaire Imprimée datée de 1822, appelant à adhérer à la Société de Géographie”, BNF \textit{CP SG Colis n° 6 bis (2013)}.

\textsuperscript{49} BNF \textit{CP SG Colis n° 18 (2921)}, 50. This claim to internationalism did not prevent a \textit{Société de Géographie} deputation from presenting the Dauphin with the first volume of their \textit{Recueil de Voyages et de Mémoires} and expressing their desire to extend the glory of France: BNF \textit{CP SG Colis n° 6 bis (2027)}. Their
non-affiliated geographers was a necessity: the society's finances did not stretch to financing its own voyages of discovery. It looked instead to direct the science more generally, while protecting against the "vain impulses" and "individual inspiration" that uninitiated voyagers often manifested in their choice of research. Establishing links both institutionally — with journals of all sorts, with learned, evangelical and commercial societies and with military, political and commercial establishments — and individually — drawing up lists of unresolved geographical questions, to be presented to whosoever might answer them, and offering modest prizes on domestic and international topics — the purpose of its correspondence was not only to gather information, but also to "excite the interest and emulation of all friends of science and civilisation". Though the Society had neither the funds to finance voyages of discovery nor to lavish large prizes on innovative young geographers, the Commission used its weakness to excite, rather than dampen, the members' enthusiasm. Anyone could serve the science of geography, whatever their level of instruction, as long as they were guided by firm principles and emulated "professional" methodology.

desire to extend France's honour — in collaboration with savants from across Europe and the World — is analogous to the desire of the individual member to extend his own reputation, through collaboration in the progress of geographical science.

50 This was a very real problem: subscription — even with rapid growth to 300 members — could not hope to finance all the Society's objectives. The Society recognised that they could not fit out expeditions with only 5000 francs in the society coffers: letter, J-P. Du Cros to De Rossel, President of the Central Commission, 25 April 1822, BNF CP SG Colis n° 19 (2927). Despite the Society's close links to several ministries, it received only 1000 francs in government subvention per annum during the Restoration. After the Revolution of July, they renewed their claim, to the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Public Instruction, requesting an annual subvention of 4000 francs: BNF CP SG Colis n° 6 bis (2038 & 2039). A further request was addressed to the Ministry of Commerce and Public Works at the end of 1831: BNF CP SG Colis n° 7 (2088).
52 BNF CP SG Colis n° 18 (2921), 14, 50.
53 For example, an entry, in German, for the prize for a memoir establishing a "description of Europe's mountain chains" in 1824 was disqualified for revealing its author, in the cover letter, on the seal of the cover letter, and in the text of the memoir itself: Bulletin de la Société de Géographie, vol. I, p. 166.
The Society's first publication, the *Instruction générale sur les lacunes actuelles de la Géographie et les moyens de la remplir*, therefore, was drawn up to "satisfy the impatience of the public, encourage active members and excite the emulation of those who did little, in order to spread the Society name to the most faraway nations". It aimed to structure correspondents' research. Having used the society constitution to organise a hierarchy of emulation at its centre, the Central Committee hoped to police non-adherents by delineating what had yet to be achieved in the *perfectionnement* of geography. Yet, while the society was keen to give the impression that it had identified the main gaps in geographical knowledge – topographically and theoretically – in the *Instruction Générale*, the transmission of this common agenda did not prevent the addition of supplementary questions and notes relative to the particular situation and location of the correspondent. When the *Instruction générale* was transmitted by Jaubert, a member of the Section for Correspondence, to Fontanier, a young French voyager in Tauriés, he adjoined an additional three pages of notes specifically on Persia, drawn up by his Section, and a series of questions he himself wanted answered. While the members of the Society were conscious of the need to apply its principles strenuously, and to protect the legitimacy of their instruction against rival programmes of geographic science, the content of the Society's own instruction was clearly suggestive, and not prescriptive. Aimed at policing emulative action and not at the rigorous pursuit of definable scientific goals, the *Société de Géographie* avoided openly choosing between the preoccupations of its members. While an "official" instruction presented an overview of the basic geographical questions to be answered in any situation, their correspondents were encouraged to respond to them innovatively, to develop their abilities as they wished, within the confines of the Society's instruction.

The possibility of openly challenging their collaborator's reputations was denied to the members, not only by the choice of uncontroversial (and wide-ranging)

---

54 BNF CP SG Colis n° 18 (2921), 70.
55 Ibid. (2921), 56-60.
basic principles to send to their correspondents, but also by making prize competitions anonymous. Nevertheless, some geographers tried to stake their claim for recognition in other ways. In an arena where the society regulations made comparison of the quality of their work taboo, they sought to compete quantitatively. An anonymous letter in February 1825 argued that the society should open a register, to collect the signatures of those ordinary members regularly attending Central Commission meetings. This, the anonymous writer argued, would be a way to encourage member participation in society administration and to make the rank and file more useful. The "regulars" (not those who had been most eloquent or whose work was most innovative) should then be incorporated into the various sections. Routine attendance was also on the mind of the ex-Secretary-General of Commerce, Coquebert de Montbret, when he offered his resignation as vice-president on the 16 December 1824. Moving to the country for reasons of ill health, he could no longer attend meetings and therefore, despite his formidable reputation as a statistician, had no right to hold his position.

The Central Commission seemed content to accept that emulation should be based on documented participation and not public praise of individual production. It regularly resisted any suggestion that the Society for Geography should provide a regular vehicle for the publication of members' work (already, they claimed, sufficiently accomplished by existing publications, such as the *Annales Maritimes*, the *Journal* and *Annales des Voyages*). As Langlès, the Commission's Vice-President, explained, the society refused to take the position

---

57 In this, the Society of Geography differed from the *S.E.I.N.*, perhaps because the differences between their scientific methods could be so extreme: see, for example, the overview of the different geographic methodologies in the early 1800s in Anne Marie Claire Godlewska, *Geography Unbound: French Geographic Science from Cassini to Humboldt* (Chicago: Chicago U.P., 1999), pp. 312-313. The categories of "perfection" that the geographers operated had therefore to be much less defined than those used by the oil-lamp manufacturers.

58 BNF *CP SG* Colis n° 19 (3058).

59 Ibid. (3044).

60 Ibid. (3039), 11.
of rédacteur and favour some of its members over the others.® The Bulletin de la Société de Géographie thus simply made mention of the correspondence, objects, unedited manuscripts and published works which had been communicated or presented at their meetings, and announced the annual winners of the society's competitions (though not, of course, the losers). Even such "honourable mentions" were sometimes criticised, however, as overly generous in certain cases.® In its reports of routine debates and lists of works received, the Bulletin formed, not a Journal which presented a vibrant geographical "movement", but a chronology of emulative action. Its layout, divided according to the dates of Central-Commission meetings, and listing works received and correspondence strictly in order of reception, represented the action of a corporate Society. Members were therefore able to prove their production within this chronology (by pointing to their names); nevertheless, they could not compare the importance of their work against that of others. The Bulletin, their material link to their colleagues, gave them the feeling of belonging to a scholarly community, without ever fleshing out a rigid hierarchy of knowledge within their ranks.

Reducing the Bulletin representation of individual accomplishment to a cipher did not, however, silence the repeated calls of ordinary members for the Society to begin publishing their manuscripts. The grounds on which these manuscripts would be selected, however, remained unclear. Férussac, a member of the Section of Correspondence, argued:

The Society of Geography was not formed simply to publish its members' memoirs, or to collect and present the ordinary achievements of geographers... If it publishes something, it should be an original account, a constructive observation, an

---

® BNF CP SG Colis n° 18 (2921) 43.
important rectification – in a word, the result of the Society's efforts.63

Putting such a premium on innovation, and alleging that it would begin publication as soon as it received answers to the questions laid out in its Instruction générale, the society managed to produce only a single Recueil des Voyages et des Mémoires in the first three years of its existence.64 Even then, by choosing to re-edit the memoirs of a thirteenth-century Venetian, the Society effectively sidestepped the problem of dictating the content of modern geography. By focusing on the example of an earlier time, the Voyages of Marco Polo straddled the conflicting needs to structure emulation and to promote useful innovation.

The Society's revised edition used an antique-French manuscript in the Bibliothèque Royale and contained 28 new chapters. A thorough glossary and comments on variations between manuscripts complemented the useful enlargement. The choice of Marco Polo, however, was not without controversy. While the Central Commission considered several alternative manuscripts held by the Bibliothèque Royale (including Czar Alexis Michailovitz's Voyage from Moscow to Pekin, a Portuguese History of the Kingdom of Angola, and a French translation of the Turkish text, Djihan Nouma), the utility of publishing any of these manuscripts was challenged by many, who saw no scientific progress in the publication of centuries-old memoirs.65 Critics agreed that Marco Polo was a "curious monument for the history of geography" but believed that it belonged in the past and not the future of their profession.66 A final choice was, nevertheless, made between Marco Polo and Barbié du Bocage's suggestion, the reproduction of a fourteenth-century map of the world painted on wood.

Opponents of Marco Polo argued that emulation was fed by regular communication and not by grand acts: an expanded bulletin regularly featuring

---

63 "Rapport de la Section de Correspondance: Ensemble des mesures adoptées par la Section de Correspondance pour établir les relations de la Société de Géographie", BNF CP SG Colis n° 26 (3782).
their articles would rekindle the zeal of members who despaired of seeing their work described in detail. The members of the Central Commission and its Section for Publication, however, responded that by publishing the work of one of the pioneers of modern geography, they could encourage others to submit manuscripts (copies of which formed the Society's library) and inspire voyagers to relive Polo's journey into the Orient. Malte-Brun, the Society's Secretary-General, in an avant-propos to the first volume, suggested explicitly that Marco Polo's primary achievement was to have inspired the adventurers that followed. Re-packaging Polo for the nineteenth century, Malte-Brun and his colleagues invented a history of geography as "the progressive march, infinite and unlimited, of the human spirit", an emulative tradition which had inspired its adherents to new and greater feats throughout the early-modern age.

In the celebration of Marco Polo's timeless genius, and the exhortation to emulate his capacity for discovery, however, the Society effectively overlooked the genius of the manuscript's editor, Charles Roux de Rochelle. Though the society had promised to "never fail to honour someone for the work which he has authored", it did so, in its first major publication, in order to insulate the tradition of geographic progress. Roux's evenings spent poring over antique French script after leaving his office in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were left unrewarded. He was neither lauded as the perfecter of Marco's work, nor praised as author of its commentary: as the Society sent copies to the learned academies, his name was conveniently omitted. Indeed Roux's application had become an inconvenience to the Society: his role in successfully manufacturing, though in-depth notation, a (non-contemporary) "founder" of rigorous analytical geography (from the memoirs of a Venetian merchant whose topographical observations were usually quite cursory), had to be obscured. The Society's appeal to an invented

---

66 "Une Lettre qui met en doute l'utilité de publier Marco Polo, 5 février 1823", BNF CP SG Colis no 19 (2963).
67 Ibid..
69 Circular of the Central Commission, 10 April 1825, BNF CP SG Colis no 18 (2917), 14.
"tradition" assumed a grand narrative of geographical progress; the truth, however, the history of geography they used to provide a model for emulation merely cobbled together potted autobiographies of individual explorers and commentators, selected and presented "naturally" for nineteenth-century consumption. It was left to Barbié du Bocage to warn Roux de Rochelle of this sacrifice, promising that if the Society undertook to publish a new and more complete version of the voyages, Roux would, second time around, get his share of the glory.71

The Société de Géographie's manufactured geographical tradition was less problematically encapsulated in the design of its membership certificate. On each one, a portico - framing the members' certification - supported the allegorical figures of geography and hydrography, depicted as goddesses meditating new conquests. Twelve medals, depicting the names of men who might serve as models in the different enterprises involved in the science of geography, hung on the portico's columns. As it had done in dismissing Roux de Rochelle as a second "author" of Marco Polo's voyages, the "pantheon" eschewed living geographers, whose work "had not received the sanction of the tomb".72 Instead, the Section for Publication chose among the great early-modern discoverers (Columbus, Magellan and da Gama), navigators (Cook, Lapérouse and Tasman), explorers (Marco Polo, Pallas and Niehbuhr) and scientific investigators (la Condamine, Saussure and d'Anville). Finally, the Section added the name Cassini at the top of an unfolded map depicted in the foreground, to silence a general outcry among ordinary members at its exclusion. When adding Cassini to the certificate, the Section for Publication avoided the public comparison even of dead geographers, by not replacing one of the names inscribed on the medals: it declared that the sacred duty of paying homage to these great men would not be sullied by a last-minute change of emphasis.73 It also stressed that the names chosen by the Section were by no means

70 Letter, 20 April 1825, ibid. (2917), 2. This template for a letter to be sent to several learned academies - including the Berlin Academy of Sciences and the Philosophical Society in Philadelphia - is in Barbié du Bocage's handwriting.
exclusive, but merely represented a range of episodes in the great geographical tradition. Offered as models for emulation, the "great men" of geography could certainly be surpassed. However, they could not be seen to compete: citing their work was evidence of geographic collaboration across generations – they (according to the Society of Geography) believed in the same principles and worked for the same object.

Although the goddesses mused on the ongoing development of the science, then, their trophies nevertheless all celebrated the gains of the past. The sanction of the tomb could turn a collaborator into an author, and a member into a model for emulation. Barbié du Bocage himself joined the "Pantheon of Geography" in December 1826, when his colleague, Renaudière, gave an oration on his lifetime of achievement to the General Assembly of the Society. "One of the most distinguished geographers of this era", Barbié du Bocage earned by his death the ultimate reward for his active service. A chronological account of his career and main publications served to document his limitless devotion to the interests of the Society. Though necessarily posthumous, his necrologies were the documented proof of his "public and private virtues, the qualities of his heart, his pleasant character and social grace, which are the preserve of the truly educated man and the homme de bien".

Having accumulated honours throughout his life – building success on success, earning membership of the Institute, of various foreign academies, and the post of Doyen of Letters, in the Academy of Paris – Barbié du Bocage's necrology was a final reckoning, the sum of his lifetime's achievement. Like his work chronology, held in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it added the years spent plying his vocation and confirmed his useful services. His immortalisation in the annals of geography and in the library of the National Institute, was final positive proof of his success:

---

74 Ibid., vol. I, p. 86.
76 Ibid., p. 260.
Barbié du Bocage, though his oeuvre is seldom consulted, remains to this day a vital member of the geographical tradition.\textsuperscript{78}

Necrologies of Barbié du Bocage also reveal a man whose increasing involvement in the activities of an institutionalised civil society was somewhat of a personal mission to accumulate honours. His letters also reveal this drive: asking the Minister's support for his application for the Cross, he noted that the it would encourage his work, and that, as a father of five children, the decoration would prove useful to his family.\textsuperscript{79} Receiving the Legion of Honour Cross in October 1814, he noted coyly in a letter to his son, that "one of your mother's aspirations on my account has been accomplished".\textsuperscript{80} Despite the contrived nonchalance of his private correspondence, Barbié du Bocage was keen to display this new proof of his virtue, signing even his personal correspondence from then on as \textit{le chevalier Barbié du Bocage}. The prize jewel in the emulative world, inter-linking the search for reputation in the various sociétés savantes as well as in the professional administrative world, the Legion bore strong witness to its members' virtue. Its members' \textit{Procès-Verbal d'Individualité}, signed by two fellow members and a Grand Officer, was not only proof of their honour, but also a passport to success.\textsuperscript{81} The chevalier's worth was thereafter to be told, not as a chronology, but in a formulaic narrative of how he was received into the Order. The \textit{Procès-Verbal d'Individualité} was a tender drawn on the limitless repository


\textsuperscript{80} Letter, J.-D. Barbié du Bocage to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 27 October 1814, Bibliothèque de l'Institut, \textit{Correspondance Barbié du Bocage} [MS.5497 (II), dossier 1 (6)].

\textsuperscript{81} For examples of this \textit{procès-verbaux d'individualité}, see the Legion of Honour records stored in the Archives Nationales, and catalogued on the Léonore system.
of French honour. The bearer belonged to a society whose members' virtue (or individuality) could never be contested.

Honourable Bodies

While the geographer was successful in joining the Legion, the inventor, Joly, was not. In a letter to his superior, Nicolas Brûlé, chief of the bureau of passports, he related how he had succeeded in being included on the list of candidates for his département in Year XII; however, the Grand Council of the Legion had dismissed his candidature unilaterally, saying that it would only allow those above the rank of chef de division to receive the honour. This arbitrary decision, Joly complained, robbed him of "justice" and reduced him to petitioning his ministerial superiors – d'Hauterive and Brûlé – for assistance. Joly's expectation was that his services – displayed both in his work chronology and the documented proof of his perfectionnement of the oil lamp – had given him a natural right to membership of the Legion. However, although the Legion of Honour had explicitly sought to regularise and formalise the award of national honours, both civil and military, complementing "natural" career hierarchies and strategies of advancement, there was no guarantee that a combination of his military service and contributions to civil society was enough to clinch a nomination. Becoming a chevalier of the Legion was an important social distinction: as a "moral institution" concerned with fostering the emulation of civic virtue, the Legion invested its members with a sanctioned authority. Keying into a Rousseauian belief that visible signs of distinction were necessary in Republics and placing their modern-day Legion within a tradition spanning back

---

83 A.A.E., Personnel: Volumes Réiliés, vol. XXXIX [Joly], 408 recto.
84 Fastes de la Légion d'Honneur, vol. I, p. 12 [the Legion of Honour was first debated in the Conseil d'État on the 14, 18 and 24 Floréal Year X].
85 Roederer to the Corps Législatif, in ibid., vol. I, p. 34.
to the Romans, the Legion served to police French "national honour" in the choice of Legionnaires and their communication of honourable principles to their fellow citizens. What deeds the Legion actually rewarded was less clear. The passage of the Legion's statutes through the Tribunat had stripped the nascent institution of any sort of hereditary principle or corporate privilege — it represented in theory neither caste nor court. When Lucien Bonaparte, the nominated rapporteur of the Conseil d'État, took the podium of the Tribunat, he assured the legislators that no special privilege or power would ever accrue to the Legion. It existed solely for the reward of those who merited a place among the most honourable men of France, whoever they might be.

The Legion of Honour thus was left with no central purpose, other than the transaction of "honour". The Legion was simply a repository of a "moral currency" and repayment for the efforts of both military and civil functionaries, who sacrificed financial gain by working, not for their own profit, but for the profit of the nation. It was the "natural" reward for a lifetime of public service, proof of an honourable career devoted to the public good (despite the paucity of wages and hope of advancement in most of such vocations). Yet "honour" was ill defined: the heterogeneous composition of the Legion served to conceal the reasons why specific members were appointed. Although there were some ground rules — a statutory requirement of ancienneté (25 years of service) — there was no guarantee that one's merit would be recognised, even when one had

86 Portalis to the Conseil d'État, 18 Floréal Year X, in ibid., vol. I, p.14, argued on the need for distinction in a Republic. For neo-classical inspiration, see Napoleon Bonaparte to the Conseil d'État, in ibid., vol. I, pp.12-14; Girardin to the Tribunat, in ibid., vol. I, p. 44.
87 Roederer in his speech to the Corps Législatif, in ibid., vol. I, p. 24, draws a direct comparison to the workings of administrative institutions. He explains how an authoritative figure can calm the fears of the ordinary people and service to conciliate them to the needs of the Nation, by explaining the reason for the state's action.
88 Ibid., vol. I, pp. 15 (introduction); Roederer to the Tribunat, in ibid., vol. I, p. 34.
89 Lucien Bonaparte to the Tribunat, in ibid., vol. I, p. 28.
92 Lucien Bonaparte to the Corps Législatif, in ibid., vol. I, p. 33.
devoted the best years of one’s life to public service.® The vacuum at the heart of post-revolutionary narratives of “honour” and “virtue” was never more apparent than in the Legion itself. The Legion sidestepped the petty jealousies of competing colleagues (or comrades-in-arms) by cloaking the conditions of the "production" of chevaliers in mystery.

The problem of proving one’s virtue in the office and the problem of proving one’s virtue in civil society neatly came together, when, during the First Restoration in August 1814, Louis XVIII formalised the use of work chronologies in the appointment of Legionnaires. Taking the responsibility for filtering candidates from the Grand Council and giving it to his ministries, he invited them to appoint Legionnaires from within their administrations.® Award for success in civil society would be negotiated in the same way: Louis XVIII’s legislation obliged each candidate to draw up a certificate stating his services, signed by five of his collaborators, and transmitted to the relevant Ministry.®® Each Ministry, in turn, had a quota of nominations to fill, decided by the size of its administration and the extent of its remit.®® The “moral currency” wielded by members of the Legion of Honour was therefore distributed directly through the office. Yet even then, not only administrative service, but also participation in civil society, was instrumental in demands for nomination.®®

®® “Décret du 29 floréal an X”, in ibid., vol. I, p. 44.
®® The annual intake of the Legion was divided into fortieths and distributed between the various ministries in 1815: "Ordonnance Royale qui fixe la Répartition des Grades de la Légion d’Honneur entre les divers ministères", 17 February 1815, in ibid., vol. I, p. 123. The Ministry of the Interior and Religions (as it existed in 1815) wielded five fortieths of the nominations – the large percentage is explained by its connection to civil society – in terms of sociétés savantes, religious functionaries, and, of course, the garde nationale.
®® As in Barbé du Bocage’s case: see letter, J-D. Barbé du Bocage to the Duc de Cadore, Minister of the Interior, 2 June 1814, A.A.E. Personnel: première série [Barbé du Bocage, J.-D.]. Barbé du Bocage signed this letter “Geographer of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Member of the Institute; Professor at the Imperial University, etc.”, noting the three different professional milieu in which he had served.
For the administrator, participation in civil society allowed him and extend his renown into other fields of endeavour (and augment his work chronology). The reputation he had earned in the office often allowed him to claim the right to sit at the heart of the société savantes. Honour as a "moral currency" was infinite: as the administrator moved into new arenas, or founded new societies, he could accumulate honour without taking away from that of his colleagues. The myth of progress – of an interlinked development of all aspects of the social world – legitimised this broader accumulation of distinction. The administrator could constructed his reputation without making any new discoveries or performing any new deeds by keeping within the boundaries of a rhetoric of emulation. Legitimacy for the society was also assured by its contribution to the "progress" of its science, rather than its development of a specific agenda. All societies looked to move the focus from competition over production to emulation: the Lycée and S.E.I.N. by constructing elaborate rituals of technological testing; the Société de Géographie by listing – but not publishing – its members memoirs and by keeping its prize competitions anonymous. Embracing a myth of social progress, and fleshing it out in bogus narratives of "tradition", post-Revolutionary civil society balanced the emulative imperative with the need to protect against the dominance of a single corporate voice. By creating "founders", it recognised individuals who could be safely emulated, while preserving the fragile balance of a fraternal meritocracy.
Chapter Five

Something Old, Something New: Manufacturing "Paternity" and Honourable Inheritance.

New problems, old solutions

When the successful career of Joseph-Marie DeGérando – Baron de Rusthsamhausen, Peer of France, Councillor of State, Intendant of the Catalanian départements of Ter and la Sègre under the Empire, member of the electoral college in the département of the Rhône, Member of the Institut, philosopher and linguistic theorist, noted philanthropist and member of the Société pour la Morale Chrétienne, Grand Officier of the Legion of Honour, ex-Secretary General of the Ministry of the Interior – came to an end with his death on the 10 November 1842, he was succeeded by his two sons: Gustave de Gérando, substitute for the Procureur Général in the Royal Court in Paris, and Charles Henri Camille de Gérando, a property owner, living in Toula (in Russia). A death certificate and a "certificate of ownership", both delivered by the Justice of the Peace of the eleventh arrondissement, substantiated their claim to the arrears due from their father's Legion of Honour pension. This documentation, procured by Chouveroun, a clerk in the office of Fremyn, a Paris notary, established the young men's claim to their equal share of 861 fr, 10c.¹ Neither young man came to the Chancellerie personally, and Charles Henri Camille did not even return to France: theirs was a succession regulated solely on paper, according to fixed formulae of reimbursement and depending on a fixed burden of documentary evidence.

Similarly, when Pierre François Louis Gambier Campy, former bureau chief in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, survivor of an old administrative family that had served the Ministry of War since the seventeenth century, and a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, died a bachelor on the 20 July 1832, his sisters, nieces and

¹ A.N. LH//1117/38/GERANDO DE RUSTHSAMH
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nephews claimed 138f 85 in back payments from his Legion of Honour pension, presenting the Chancellerie with his death certificate and a certificate of ownership naming each and all of his six heirs.\(^2\) The other aspects of Pierre François Louis Gambier de Campy's succession were also regulated on paper: the officier d'état civil of the tenth arrondissement wrote out a death certificate for presentation to the notaries, Froger Descenes jeune and Berceon (after noting that the man's birth certificate referred to Pierre Gambier, without the noble suffix, "de Campy"). Paper certification – including a written testament detailing special gifts to his nieces and to a friend of the family, described, measured and catalogued in the Département of the Seine's Tribunal of First Instance, and deposited in the minutes of Froger Descenes – underpinned the transfer of inheritance: so much so, that – from the moment of his death – there was nothing to negotiate, but simply items to be counted and valued.\(^3\)

The officier d'état civil sealed the ex-Bureau Chief's house, leaving the keys to his niece, Marie Madeleine Eulalie Gambier de Campy, who lived with him in a rented apartment on the rue Argenteuil. He nominated a commissaire priseur to undertake the room-by-room account of the dead man's possessions. On the day of the inventory, Pierre François Louis' nephews, Marc-Antoine and Léon Gambier (the latter furnished with documents proving his own succession, as well as procurations allowing him to act for his spinster aunts), and the ex-soldier, Michel Antoine Barthes de Marmorielles (procurateur for Marie Madeleine Eulalie) followed the commissaire around the house, accompanied by the female heirs they represented, all signing the inventory. The commissaire priseur began in the cellars counting bottles, full and empty, turning into the courtyard where he found a walking stick and coat, and up into the apartment itself through the entresol, where several rooms branched off – a store room, the domestic's quarters and the dining room, looking over the courtyard. In all these rooms, he listed, counted and priced the various furnishings, poking into drawers and judging the quality of mattresses by the amount of money into which they could be converted. After finishing with the bedrooms and listing the contents of

\(^{2}\) A.N. LH///1065/59/GAMBIER DE CAMPY P F

\(^{3}\) A.N. Minutier Centrale (M.C.) ET/LXV/723 [Dépôt judiciaire du testament de M. Gambier-Campy, 21 juillet 1832].
the old bureau chief's wardrobe, the *commissaire priseur* turned to the contents of the library. Counting rather than describing books, he priced them according to their folio size, the highest valuation going to thirty-six volumes of the Latin classics. Gambier's massive library, collected over a lifetime, was described in three pages of loose inventory: his accumulated possessions were transformed into their notional value in francs, and divided among his six heirs to everyone's satisfaction.

Finally the *commissaire priseur* turned to the various bills and contracts in the old bureau chief's *secrétaire*. Besson listed not only past transactions but also rental agreements and current debts with their registration numbers in the large volumes kept in the *bureaux des hypothèques* of Paris, Rambouillet and Evreux.4 First, however, the *commissaire* uncovered bundles of documents proving the civil estate of the various family members, and their inheritance from previous generations, including both the birth and death certificate of the dead man's uncle, a *premier commis* in the bureaux of War, and the details of the succession of his father, Jean Gambier, in 1807. In the *secrétaire*, the *commissaire priseur* found sufficient documents collected to prove the inheritance, even if Pierre François Louis's successors had not already furnished such evidence themselves. The old *commis*, meticulous in preparing the succession on paper, had left nothing to chance. His testament, signed and placed in the *secrétaire*, located before the seals had been set on the other documents, allowed Pierre to regulate with some finesse how his property would be transmitted, giving special consideration to his niece who had taken care of him at the end of his days (a princely 50,000 francs) and to her sister, with the express condition that that money not entered into the community established between her and her husband Guilleau -Formont, French Consul to Sardinia. He also left 50,000 francs to

4 A.N. M.C. ET/II/932 [inventaire après décès, Pierre François Louis Gambier de Campy, 21 août 1832]. The registration of private loan agreements in the *bureau des hypothèques* was a Napoleonic innovation. Loan and credit arrangements, transacted in the notary's office, had already existed; now they were written down in a register. Inscription in a volume could be used as proof of ownership. This new "publicity" forced on private credit markets undermined the power of notaries as brokers, however. See Philip T. Hofmann, Gilles Postel-Vinay & Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, *Priceless Markets: the Political Economy of Credit in Paris, c. 1660-1870* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
Arsène Philippine Claudine de la Roche, the second daughter of an old friend.\(^5\) For her to claim her piece of the pie, she too would have to produce the necessary documents. Campy had therefore taken every care that his wishes would be respected and that no challenge could be made to his testament: in the secrétaire, the commissaire priseur found not only documents related to his own family, but also those of La Roche, to make sure that the bequest could not be contested.

While such neat documentation would not have been out of place in the eighteenth century, when the commissaire priseur would have been appointed by the Châtelet, rather than the officier d'état civil, the forms of Old-Regime inventory now served a New-Regime purpose. Before the Revolution, pre-nuptial contracts, written testaments, notarial records, and registers of births, marriages and deaths – kept by the local parish church – had all existed. They facilitated a system where the transfer of property from one generation to the next was decided many years in advance; inheritances were the basis of financial speculation and industrial expansion long before the death they depended on ever occurred. Yet, as alliances had been transacted inside guilds and local corporations, between (and within) families on a purely local scale, the transmission of inheritance did not depend on this documentation as a starting point but only as legal confirmation of what everyone already knew.\(^6\) The emphasis on paperwork after the Revolution was not only more impersonal but also more imperative. The documentation asked for by the notary was mandatory: the forms he followed were not only traditional but prescribed by law.

\(^5\) A.N. M.C. ET/LXV/723 [Dépôt judiciaire du testament de M. Gambier-Campy, 21 juillet 1832].

\(^6\) David Garrioch, *The Formation of the Parisian Bourgeoisie, 1690-1830* (Cambridge MA & London: Harvard U.P., 1996), pp. 74-75. See, as an example in the administrative corps, A.N. M.C. ET/III/1124 [mariage entre le Sieur Fleurigeon et la Demoiselle Tassin, le 4 février 1781]. Rémy Fleurigeon's marriage guaranteed that he succeeded his deceased bureau chief, Tassin, in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Fleurigeon, in return for his promotion, pledged to provide for Tassin's family. Their marriage was transacted "in the presence and with the agreement of" the Count de Vergennes, Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; M. Moreau, his first secretary; and M. Petigny de St. Romain, premier commis in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Fleurigeon was transferred to the new Ministry of Interior in 1791 where he wrote the *Code Administratif* (discussed in Chapter One).
The forms he asked for could only be substituted in very specific processes: in particular, the facts of paternity had to be written down and proved, whether that of the deceased, his brother, or his best friend.

The increased emphasis placed on the thoroughness of paperwork stemmed from the Revolution, when the dependability of slow-maturing family alliances had been shattered by new legislation on marriage and inheritance. In dismantling the structures of privilege, which had underpinned the "estates" of the Old Regime, the National Assembly had not only attacked the Divine right of Paternity as the basis of monarchical power, but also shattered the dependability of the artisan's slow-maturing family alliances. The Legislative Assembly then attempted to restructure the family as an organic, harmonious unit based on free commerce and civil contract, ending what they saw as "forced" marriages and "unnatural" alliances. Legislation on marriage in 1792 made it possible for either husband or wife to end the marriage for reasons of "incompatibility", whenever they saw fit. Further measures established that sons and daughters should inherit equally: paternal inheritances could be established according to the principles of Liberty and Equality. Marriage should no longer be, the orators of the Legislative Assembly maintained, a case of transmitting legal privileges, name and fortune, or continuing bloodlines, as it had been in the Old Regime. Looking to establish a link between father and son on the basis of sentiment rather than unlimited power, they decreed that children should be loved for their own sake. Yet they also believed that a good father (and a good citizen) should provide for all his children equally. This tension between meritocracy and

---

7 The Constitution of 1791 first established marriage as a civil contract based on consent, and took control over civil registers of births, marriages and deaths.
9 A law of 17 Nivôse Year II (6 January 1794) declared that all legacies must be divided equally between children.
egalitarianism betrayed the incoherence in their idea of paternity as a natural form of social production.

Therefore, while Lynn Hunt characterises Revolutionary legislation on marriage and inheritance as the effect of a "band of brothers", seizing executive power in 1792, and grappling to institutionalise a political culture in which a Father no longer existed, "paternity" was never absent from the political culture of the French Revolution.\(^\text{10}\) The Declaration of Duties of 1793, for example, setting out the moral obligations of citizens, cited both Paternity and Fraternity in its exhortation: "No one is a good citizen, if he is not a good son, a good father, a good brother, a good friend and a good husband".\(^\text{11}\) Likewise, the law on illegitimacy passed on the 2 November 1793 (18 Brumaire Year II), which Hunt cites as a moment when paternity was destroyed, merely established the right of the "natural" child to seek his paternal inheritance.\(^\text{12}\) It aimed to allow citizens to discover legitimate paternity rather than prove all paternity illegitimate. Instead of pitting brothers against fathers (or brothers against brothers in quarrels about inheritance), Revolutionary legislation on marriage sought a way to invoke paternity, neither natural nor Divine, in a spirit of individual equality and liberty. In each inheritance, the law sought to give equal shares to everyone who could prove that they were a natural son. No longer would an eldest son inherit his father's title and entire estate, while second sons made their fortune in the Church or Army. No longer would illegitimate sons be denied all inheritance, all family and all fortune by dictate of law.

There was much debate, however, about what conditions "proved" that a man was a father. In the Legislative Assembly, Berlier argued that "legitimate paternity is based essentially on the decision to live together, on the sentiment that must exist between spouses, between parents and children".\(^\text{13}\) Oudot went even further to claim that "children born of a secret marriage, which is outside the

---


\(^\text{12}\) Hunt, Family Romance, p. 66.

\(^\text{13}\) Quoted in Mulliez, "Révolutionnaires, nouveaux pères?", p. 379.
usual forms but which shows all the signs of a "real" marriage, should be legitimate children by law.\textsuperscript{14} Nevertheless, both legislators recognised that, as it was the fidelity of the wife and mother that allowed recognition of a father, the institution of marriage should be protected. This fidelity, guaranteed by Sacrament under the Old Regime, would, under the New Regime, be guaranteed by surveillance – in public ceremony and the pronouncement of bans – and by the woman's free choice to marry – for sentiment and not for family strategy – the individual of her choice.\textsuperscript{15} The creation of the \textit{état civil} on the 25 September 1792 was a further means to make the facts of marriage public. The onus for taking records was taken from the church into the town hall; paternity was to be witnessed, not by priests, but by public functionaries.

Nevertheless, as Suzanne Desan argues, the Revolution's marriage legislation sparked tremendous hostility among those who had transacted property through marriage alliances before the Revolution, whose plans to favour one child over another were thrown into disarray. It had destroyed the ordinary property owner's strategies of economic expansion and long-standing expectations. Desan details the backlash against the "Revolutionary family", describing a search for moral and economic certainty in the two projects for a Civil Code, debated and abandoned by the Directory. Petitioners presenting stories of marriages torn by divorce, elderly parents deserted by their children, brothers and sisters fighting over family fortunes, illegitimate gold-diggers turning up to claim their share of an inheritance in the name of "equality"\textsuperscript{16}, besieged the Thermidorean Convention and the \textit{Conseil des Cinq-Cents}.\textsuperscript{17} Desan tells how

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 380.  
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 377.  
\textsuperscript{16} I follow here Desan's description in "Reconstituting the Social After the Terror", p. 81.  
\textsuperscript{17} In the reactionary spring and summer of 1795, the Thermidorian Convention put an end to retroactive application of the 17 Nivôse law on egalitarian inheritance, and, on the 12 Brumaire, to the retroactive effect of the law on illegitimate children's successions (retroactive effect would, however, be restored in mid-October 1795, and in the following August 1796, modified to date from the 4 June 1793 rather than the 14 July 1789). At the same time, it shored up marriage, abolishing the law of the 4 Floréal Year II (23 April 1794), which had allowed divorce on a six-month \textit{de facto} separation. In 1797 the Directory added a six-month delay to the procedure surrounding divorce for incompatibility. These pacifying measures – designed often in direct response to petitioner's
the Legislature struggled to "merge traditional notions about property, gender and obligation with the new constitutional order, the rule of law and a limited defence of socially useful rights". Rather than denying the legitimacy of the Revolution, in the late 1790s legislators looked to merge the need for equality with the rights of the family, to strengthen family alliances by redefining the ways in which paternity could be claimed. Napoleon's Code Civil of 1804 eventually created the neat documentary system of inheritance, used to regulate the successions of DeGérando and Gambier de Campy, combining strict rules outlining who and how to claim an inheritance with a rigorous system of written proof of ownership and identity via the registers of the état civil.

Napoleon's Conseil d'État subjected the question of how to establish rights of succession and guarantee inheritance against claims from outside the family to an intense scrutiny, before deciding to resolve the uncertainties of private life generated by the Revolution by establishing a strict framework in which individuals were invested with paper proofs of both paternity and filiations, guaranteed by the form of the marriage contract. In the Conseil d'État's debates, as in the debates of the Revolutionary assemblies, marriage was assumed to have a necessary value, to be the guarantor of civil society and the identity of the individuals within it. Unlike their predecessors, however they replaced the principle of publicity with the need for documentary evidence. Individuality was documented by the état civil in the local arrondissement's register of births and confirmed in a series of "moments" by which full individual citizenship could be legitimately claimed. The état civil chronologised these key moments of civil individuality – birth, marriage and death – and wrote them down as unalterable points of reference: last testaments, title deeds, loan agreements, and household inventories.

Inscription in the registers of the Napoleonic état civil therefore ended a crisis in competing claims for ownership of (re)productive creations and solidified a means not only to prove paternity but also to allow one's children to profit from it.

woes — did not, however, solve the primary source of grief among property-owning families: the ambiguity surrounding paternal production. See ibid., pp. 106-108.

18 Ibid., p. 106.
Presenting the Code's articles on marriage to the *Corps Législatif*, Bigot-Préameneu recognised that the debate centred on the uncertainty surrounding productive individualism. He noted examples of when several different men had claimed the paternity of a single child. This, he commented, was due to the fact that "nature has covered the transmission of our existence with an impenetrable cloak". Bigot-Préameneu urged the social fabrication of unshakeable conditions of paternity, of categories of individual production whose authority could not be challenged:

It is necessary that paternity does not rest uncertain. It is by paternity that families perpetuate themselves, and distinguish themselves one from another: it is one of the bases of social order; we have to maintain and consolidate it.\(^\text{19}\)

Yet, as paternity was covered by an impenetrable cloak, the legislators were powerless to make it public in any meaningful sense. Instead, Bigot-Préameneu urged the adoption of a highly systematised contract of marriage, subjecting French citizens not to Divine or natural right, but Civil law.\(^\text{20}\) As his colleague, Portalis, remarked, "It is up to civil institutions to sanction and protect all of nature's honest affections".\(^\text{21}\) While Treilhard argued in the *Conseil d'État* that "the sociétaires must be free to fix the conditions and the rules of their union themselves", husband and wife were in fact limited to a choice between two uniform formulae of association: the *régime de communauté* or the *régime de communauté*.\(^\text{22}\)

\(^{19}\) P.A. Fenet, *Recueil Complet des Travaux Préparatoires du Code Civil* (Paris: Hippolyte Tilliard, 1836), vol. X, p. 135. Bigot-Préameneu echoed Berlier, who had, in August 1793, announced that "society was a great family, whose happiness depends on the happiness of particular family units": Mulliez "Révolutionnaires, nouveaux pères?", p. 375.

\(^{20}\) Portalis, one of the principal "authors" of the Code Civil, further declared while introducing the Code Civil: "Only private virtue can guarantee public virtue: and it is by the petite patrie, the family, that one attaches oneself to the grande; it is good fathers, good husbands, and good sons, that make good citizens...": Portalis "Discours Préliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil, présenté le 1er pluviôse an IX", in Jean-Marie Portalis *Discours et Rapports sur le Code Civil* [Université de Caen, Centre de Philosophie politique et juridique (Bibliothèque de Philosophie politique et juridique: Textes et Documents)] (Paris: URA-CNRS, 1989), p. 62. See also Portalis' remark that families are the "breeding ground (pépinière) of the state": Portalis to the *Corps Législatif*, in Fenet, *Recueil Complet des Travaux Préparatoires du Code Civil*, vol. IX, p. 138; Portalis "Discours Préliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil ", p. 37.

\(^{21}\) Portalis "Discours Préliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil ", p. 62.
If a couple neglected the right to stipulate a contract, their marriage would be regulated by the régime de communauté: there was no way to escape the presumption of written contract (even when one had not been written) or the documentation of the état civil derived from it.

While the Code Civil reiterated the need for marriage to be public, warning that any attempt at secrecy automatically generated the assumption of fraud — of a commerce illicite — it was the written contract, rather than the public ceremony, of marriage that sheltered the production of children with a voile respectable, fabricating legitimacy even when none existed, covering the shame of the mother while "uncloaking" the potency of the father. Any child born within the marital tie would automatically be treated as legitimate; barring physical proof of impotence, adultery or incapacity, paternity would remain assumed in defiance of any rejection on the part of wife or husband. Yet, by listing existing children in their pre-nuptial contract, legitimacy could be established in writing where the husband's questionable private conduct (in not having, until then, publicly embraced his family) had brought his paternity into question. Moreover,

22 Portalis to the Corps Législatif, in Fenet, Recueil Complet des Travaux Préparatoires du Code Civil, vol. IX, pp. 156. Other examples include Berlier's comments to the Corps Législatif that women should have the "title of associates" (vol. XIII, pp. 666), or Portalis, again to the Corps Législatif, explaining that marriage was the "society of man and women, who unify to perpetuate their species, to aid one another, by mutual assistance, to carry the weight of life, and to share their common destiny." (vol. IX, pp. 139-142).

23 While Portalis argued that couples should not be forced into having a contract if they did not want to (Portalis in the Conseil d'État, 6 Vendémiaire Year XII (29 September 1803), in ibid., vol. XIII, pp. 526-7), the Conseil d'État agreed with Treilhard, who argued that if a couple neglected "the right [to stipulate a contract], or if they don't want to wield it, the law has to decide how their property should be administered, the extent of their reciprocal obligations, and how the property of each should contribute to the needs of both..": Treilhard in the Conseil d'État, 6 Vendémiaire Year XII (29 September 1803), in ibid., vol. XIII, pp. 528-529.

24 Portalis to the Corps Législatif, in ibid., vol. IX, pp. 160-162, discusses secret marriages, deciding that "husband and wife should not blush at being united "; see also p. 172.


26 "Legitimisation is not a necessary effect of marriage; rather, it is a legal favour": Bigot-Préameneau in the Conseil d'État, in ibid., vol. X, p. 150; see also Portalis, "Discours Préliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil", pp. 39-40.
formulae of adoption, written down in the notary's office, allowed fathers to claim sons whose legitimacy was unknowable.  

Under the Civil Code, paternity and its filiations were established in the moment of signing a marriage register; the conditions in which that paternity was exercised were set down beforehand in a pre-nuptial contract, signed and dated in the presence of a notary. Fatherhood was publicised before conception. When a family gathered to witness the signing of the contract and participated in signing the accord, they legitimised the spouses' right to transform from children to parents (the Civil Code setting down this necessity for parental consent for men under twenty-five and women under twenty-one). Not only that: the institution of marriage combined the notion of an individual contract, transacted at a particular place and time, with the "effect of generations" (the significance of marriage for both families across time and space). Therefore, paternity could  

---

27 For example, A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Grandjean, Antoine] & A.N. MC ET/II/894 [Testament d'Antoine Grandjean de Fouchy, 19 mai 1818]. During the Revolution, employees had been able to claim questionable paternities: a ten-year-old illegitimate son, "raised in the principles of liberty and equality that he professes as a Philosopher and as a Republican", figured in a letter of solicitation written by Antoine Grandjean de Fouchy in Year II. For Grandjean, the boy's illegitimacy was not a source of shame, but rather a reason for pride; registering the birth at the local mairie, he preferred to become the boy's parrain - his sponsor and protector in civil society - rather than his père. Grandjean's paternity, then, was not only "enveloped in clouds" but purposefully kept from his son's birth certificate. Maternity, on the other hand, was a fait palpable, involving distinct physical labour and impossible to conceal from public notoriety: Grandjean's long-term mistress appeared on Antoine Constant's birth certificate as his natural mother. On his deathbed in 1818, Grandjean was forced to take extraordinary measures to repair his son's succession, making a notarised declaration that Antoine Constant was indeed his "natural" son, filling the gap purposefully left in his birth certificate during the Revolution. Documented legitimacy had been made a condition of succession: unsubstantiated claims generated automatic suspicion.  

28 Code Civil des Français (Paris: Imp. Nat., 1804) [e-text (frantext) produced by the Institut National de la Langue Française], vol. I [Des Personnes], article 148: "A son who has not attained the age of 25, or a daughter who has not attained the age of 21, cannot contract marriage without the consent of their father and mother; in the case of disagreement, the consent of the father will suffice."  

29 Portalis "Discours Préliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil", p. 20: "We reason too often as if the human species begins and ends at every instant, without any sort of communication between one generation and the next. [Yet] the generations, in succeeding each other, mix, interlace and combine."
again guarantee long-term financial strategies based on family alliances. Under the Civil Code, however, such alliances could be transacted across professions and across the city, informed by public record, not by local knowledge. Succession was bound by written rules and written forms; the marriage contract allowed property owners to turn their capital to use safely in other industries and other fields of entrepreneurship, without fear of deceit or deception.\textsuperscript{30}

The need for a paper trail could not be made retroactive, so recognition by both parents guaranteed succession; likewise, "proof of possession", where the child carried his father’s name, had had his "education, upkeep and establishment" provided for, and was regarded as legitimate by witnesses drawn from both family and society at large, could be used to certify legitimacy.\textsuperscript{31} Children who were publicly disavowed could still claim their right to a succession; the putative son needed a \textit{commencement de preuve par écrit}, and then could only research the identity of his mother, which was provable by physical fact, not that of his father.\textsuperscript{32} The child could produce private papers belonging to his father or mother, or a declaration written by either party, which might act as a written entitlement to claim filiation. He could then call on witnesses to "prove" that the events described had taken place. The physical "realities" of pregnancy (and the "enigma" of insemination) were therefore reproduced in the world of paper. The danger that illegitimate children (or impudent women) might disturb marital harmony by alleging paternity when it did not exist led the writers of the Civil Code to impose "just limits", recognising the link, which united children to "the

interesting to compare these assertions with DeGérando's philosophical work and the ethos of archives: see Chapter One.

\textsuperscript{30} Daumard, \textit{La Bourgeoisie Parisienne}, pp. 379-387. Daumard notes that the more affluent "bourgeoisie" was more likely to contract marriage alliances outside their profession and quarter.

\textsuperscript{31} Such proof (name, chronology, certification by witnesses and family members) echoes the proof required of employees for Fauchat's work chronologies in 1807 (name, work chronology, certification by the Ministry and office mates).

\textsuperscript{32} On the need for beginning with written proof see Portalis, "Discours Préliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil", pp. 40-43. Bigot-Préameneau's argument in favour of allowing a child to claim right to a maternal, but not a paternal succession, was that the proof of maternity is established by the fact of her delivering a child. He explained that no other status, recognition of paternity, nor any title could be derived from that fact, however: Bigot-Préameneau to the \textit{Conseil d'État}, in Fenet, \textit{Recueil Complet des Travaux Préparatoires du Code Civil}, vol. X, p. 147.
authors of their days" but protecting against calumny. Indeed, as Cambacères remarked in the *Conseil d'État*, in the matter of establishing paternity, women were simultaneously "best witnesses" and potential "calumniators".

For that reason, the conditions under which paternity and maternity could compete to claim the fruit of their partnership were severely curtailed. Under both marital regimes, "paternal authority" administered the obligations of marriage, both financial and pedagogical. Women under the *régime dotal* were denied the right to administer any common property, as the "domestic society might be troubled, due to the lack of a common authority in this essential point". While the jurists who decided that the *régime de communauté* should become a standard means of regulating marriage alliances clearly believed that they were choosing a way for husbands and wives to work towards a common purpose (because the *régime* took account of female work in dividing the fruits of the couple's communal labour equally between the parties on dissolution of the marriage contract), the wife would never control that property herself, nor even claim her own successions against the will of her husband. The Civil Code prevented a wife from competing with her husband in any productive capacity; the priority placed on the need for a strong documented paternity meant that, while a husband owed protection to his wife, she owed him her obedience.

Responding to fears that the only "natural" legitimacy was that of a woman, the Civil Code created a social order in which only men could debate the categories of legitimate and illegitimate, removing the "dangers" of female prevarication and infidelity. While "paternal authority" was neither a Divine Right nor an "unlimited

---

34 Cambacères to the *Conseil d'État*, in ibid., vol. X, p. 112; Bigot-Préameneau to the *Conseil d'État*, in ibid., vol. X, p. 154. Eventually, article 37 of the *Code Civil* stated that "Witnesses to acts of the état civil can only be male."
35 This could be also be rationalised in terms of "natural" superiority: "Marital obligation is founded on the necessity of giving, in a society of two individuals, a preponderant voice to one of the associates, and to the pre-eminence of sex to which that advantage is attributed: Portalis, "Discours Préaliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil", p. 25.
37 Portalis to the *Corps Législatif*, in ibid., vol. IX, p. 177 (see also p. 73); *Code Civil des Français*, vol. I, [Des Personnes], article 213.
Empire as the jurists claimed it had been under the Old Regime), the Civil Code, debated entirely by men, turned marriage from a civil contract into a "sexual" contract by using civil certification to prove facts of paternal production otherwise "enveloped by clouds". The legal separation of a domestic "private" sphere, where paternal rule was assumed, from civil society, where fraternal rights were to be maintained, relegated wives and daughters to second-class citizenship. In property transaction and inheritance, paternity was no longer something to be contested: civil law protected the fraternal public sphere from disputes between brothers over the legitimacy of fathers. While Napoleon's Code Civil had not restored the essence of early-modern family alliance, inscribed in the documents of the eighteenth-century minutier, it had used the formulae offered by these documents to prove the right of men to claim their paternity.

Honourable Expectations

Outside of claims for pension arrears, the Legion of Honour files of both DeGérando and Gambier de Campy reproduced the same documents held in the dossiers of other colleagues in the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. To claim a procès verbaux d'individualité, they had presented the Chancellerie with an état de services, a birth certificate, and a letter of nomination. The procès verbaux had been signed by two other members of the order. For those administrators who based their claims solely on their service to the Nation in the Ministry, it facilitated the exchange of their accumulated honour in the workplace for a proof of their worth in civil society and the recognisable honour of being a chevalier. DeGérando, Gambier de Campy, and their fellow

38 Portalis "Discours Préliminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil", p. 43.
39 This was explicitly recognised by Portalis in his speech to the Corps Législatif when he remarked that his colleagues should enjoy "as children, spouses and as fathers, all the wise institutions that they sanctioned as legislators": Portalis to the Corps Législatif, in Fenet, Recueil Complet des Travaux Préparatoires du Code Civil, vol. I, p. civ.
administrators, had banked on their investment in their own career, exchanging the deposits placed on their état de services into another, more powerful, piece of paper. It is of no surprise that they looked for a means to allow their sons to inherit this capital – accumulated honour – in addition to the moneys generated by it during their lifetimes. The challenge facing the post-revolutionary administrator was how to transfer the accumulated honour of his état de services to his son or favoured protégé.

Pierre François Louis Gambier Campy was born in Caen on the 24 August 1754, entered the Ministry of War in 1772 and moved to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1790 where he became Chef du bureau de Chiffre in 1799. He began work alongside his uncle, Nicolas Jean, his brother, Jean Nicolas Mathieu Etienne, and eventually his younger brother, Robert Denis Timoléon, the last to enter the bureau in October 1779. Nicholas Jean, the boys' uncle, had inherited his position as premier commis of the Ministry of War's bureau du Conseil et du Contentieux from his own uncle. Dying a bachelor, he was, in turn, succeeded by his eldest nephew, Jean Nicholas. In 1791, the family unit was broken up when Pierre François Louis was reassigned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. His brother Jean Nicholas died and was succeeded by Robert Denis Timoléon while the royalist Terrier de Montciel was still Minister of Interior. The Gambier de Campy clan therefore still treated the position of premier commis as their family possession – to be passed to the eldest male heir – even after the bureaux had been forced to move with the King from Versailles to Paris. In the following years, the fortunes of the two remaining Gambier de Campy brothers did not suffer as badly as those of other administrative families: they managed to keep their jobs. Nevertheless, the abolition of "ownership" of offices in 1789...

41 For another example, see A.N. f/1bl/269 [Isnard, Joseph Paul Bathélemy (veuve)]. Joseph Isnard had inherited from his uncle the place of archivist and secretary to the Chamber of Commerce in Marseille. Not content with merely abolishing his inheritance, the Revolutionary government abolished the entire Chamber in July 1792, replacing it with a bureau provisoire de Commerce. Isnard, nevertheless, continued to fulfill the same function as before, backed by accounts of his zeal and assiduity, until his salary was wiped out by the assignat inflation. He then joined a convoy to Tunis, before returning to join the Commission des Approvisionnements in Paris. He was employed by the Ministry of Interior on its restoration in 1796.
in invalidated their inheritance in law. New Revolutionary ministers forced them to compete for the places they had once taken for granted, under the surveillance of the "public" and their own colleagues. The "property" Robert Denis Timoléon had inherited in 1791 was, by 1807, an "honourable position", which the holder earned by proving his merit: he held his office in trust but not in capital. While Robert Denis Timoléon had survived the Revolution, his legacy had not. He was left with no means to pass his place onto his son.

In a letter to the Minister soliciting a place for his own son, Jean Ernest, in 1823, he tried, nevertheless, to invoke their tradition of family succession, drawing parallels to the Bourbon succession re-established in 1815. He claimed that his great uncle had served under Louis XIV, his uncle under Louis XV, he himself under Louis XVI, and now his son should serve under Louis XVIII (the period of the Revolution conveniently removed from his chronology of succession). Nevertheless, Robert Denis Timoléon could not turn back time: the regime had been restored, his property in his office would never be. Although his son would eventually succeed him, the conditions under which this inheritance was transacted were much different from his own succession in the bureaux of Louis XVI. Jean Ernest was taken onto the états of the Ministry of the Interior on the 1 January 1825, but only after serving two years, unpaid, in his father's office. On the day that Robert Denis Timoléon retired, a ministerial letter advised him of the decision to admit your son in the quality of rédacteur expéditionnaire with a salary of 1400fr. I can do no better for a beginning; but convinced that he will show himself worthy of his father, I hope that it won't be long before I improve his position, and you should be persuaded that the memory of your long and honourable service will not be lost for him.  

While property under the Old Regime was guaranteed by the customs of corporation and the "property" of offices, Ernest-Jean Gambier's inheritance was the "memory" of his father's long and honourable service. The bureau chief in the Ministry of Interior had managed to give his son his status (though not his rank) as a servant to the nation.

42 A.N. f1b1/267/1 [Gambier, Robert Denis Timoleon].
Robert Denis Timoléon Gambier de Campy — and other administrators in the same position — needed an alternative means to establish paternal succession and to establish lines of transmission of rank and status. To prevent a crisis in public-sphere activity, calculations about their private life had to guarantee the transfer of honour from father to son. Codes of *ancienneté* and of emulation, while "fixing" problems of representing fraternal virtue in the offices, could not transmit that virtue to sons. Neither *procès-verbal d'individualité* nor *état de services* could be sold or given to a new owner — they had value only for the man they "described". The Code Civil had solved the social crisis of the late 1790s by providing uniform, positive laws built on defence of property and the authority of fathers and husbands. Paternity had also to be codified — established according to fixed burdens of proof and conditions of exercise — in other spheres of public life, including offices and the institutions of civil society. Members of both offices and *sociétés* looked for a means to cement the link between father and son, to "prove" paternal solicitude. Like in the marriage contract, paternal benevolence had to be established on paper; in the bureaux, the Minister had to collaborate in making paternal benevolence real, sometimes taking on the role of the good father himself.

The customs of the Old Regime had not simply died in 1792 and 1793. They had, however, adapted to new circumstances and new demands. During the

---

43 The Minister was obviously not the "natural" father of all his employees. However, his capacity for "ministerial" benevolence, and a rhetoric depicting the ministry as a "family" pushed him into the role. The direct productive relationship represented by paternity also extended to the avuncular. One administrator could write on behalf of his nephew, whom he "had placed as a *surnuméraire*" and who, as a "penniless orphan", had a "great need of employment": letter, Démaille to the Director-General of Agriculture, undated, A.N. f1/ib/278/1 [Raulin, André Jean]. While claiming paternity of a nephew would risk conviction for adultery or incest, claims made for nephews or parents operated on the same register as claims made for sons. If "paternity" was not natural, then claims made based on "paternal benevolence" could be extended to indirect dependents, like orphaned nephews, as long as they had no other father-figure to provide for them.

44 Robert Nye argues that the Revolutionaries, imbued with notions of Rousseauian virtue, adopted Old-Regime honour codes to police New-Regime personal loyalties and political allegiances to "virtuous individuals". A mix of Old-Regime hangover and New-Regime politics led to the exclusion of women from
Revolution, the "order of the family", with the father at its head, had become a way in which clerks could assert their entitlements. In the ministries, pleas written by administrators claiming to be bons pères, bons citoyens, and the recurrence of the same epithet in the lists of commis drawn up by Division Chiefs, show that both employees and employers continued to recognise the legitimacy of "paternity" as a proof of civic virtue. However, while being a bon père, bon époux figured highly in administrators' own accounts of their worth, it existed alongside other indicators, like physiognomy and ancienneté. Paternity therefore neither enjoyed supremacy nor pride of place as a means to prove one's virtue. In the turbulent years of the Revolution, employees made the best of a bad lot, and used whatever language they could to protect their position.

Moreover, in the offices, honours had to be distributed to colleagues and collaborators, to those who had "earned" them. "Fraternal" co-operation, encouraged by a common purpose and common benefits, could not be disturbed by the proliferation of family alliances. Therefore, it was customary to divide the deceased administrator's salary among his office-mates. Staged promotions and salary increases – the division of a deceased administrator's salary among his colleagues and the reorganisation of the office to fill the vacant place – allowed employees to believe that distinction was as calculable as the distribution of wages under strict budgets decreed by the Corps Législatif. While there was


Reddy in The Invisible Code discusses this practice as an administrative "abuse" (highlighted by a Ministerial personnel policy reform in November 1839). By the late 1830s, such practices were indeed being treated as "abuses", largely due to the influence of administrative satire and its characterisations of bureaucratic self-interest on the opinions of the reading public (see Chapter Seven). Ministerial personnel files in the first three decades of the nineteenth century reveal, however, the widespread acceptance of such practices as unproblematic, and indeed, just recompense for the deceased man's close collaborators. For example, Jacques Petit's letter soliciting 500 francs from the budget freed by the death of his colleague M. Blanchard in A.N. f/1bl/276/2 [Petit, Jacques].

Employees often calculated the possibilities afforded within the ministry budget, to solicit promotions or (in more desperate times) the reinstatement of
no dishonour in inheriting a father's title or any shame in soliciting a place for one's son, it had to be done within the system of _ancienneté_ and the rewarding of individual merit. Finding a means to bridge the gap between rewarding "brothers" and rewarding "fathers", the office had to map the boundaries between fathers and sons, between the exercise of "paternal honour" and the accumulated honour of the workplace.

During the extensive reformation of the Ministry of Interior in Vendémiaire Year VIII, pressed by a reduction in budget, the Minister of Interior, Quinette, wrote to his Division Chiefs, setting down written conditions – patriotism and talent, dependence on their place for a means of existence, marital status and _ancienneté_ – under which employees should be maintained or dismissed. Asking the unfortunate Division Chiefs to draw up an _état_ of their clerks, in six columns, indicating "name | age | marital status | means of existence | _ancienneté_ | other observations"[^5], however, Quinette prioritised marital status as a means to judge his employees by asking that it be noted directly after each employee's name.[^6] When his Division Chiefs used that column to enumerate each employee's family in their reports to the Minister, they further translated "married men" to "fathers". Lany, a dismissed _expéditionnaire_, in Robert Louis Timoléon Gambier de Campy's bureau, was therefore cited as thirty three years of age and a widower without children.[^7] Letellier, a chief of division who found himself suppressed with his bureau, was also classed as a widower:

[^5]: Other observations

[^6]: Patriotism and talent, dependence on their place for a means of existence, marital status and _ancienneté_.

[^7]: For example, a _sous-chef_, Louis Féval, complained that his claim for an augmentation in salary was being overlooked while 20,000 francs were being drawn out of the budget of the _Bureau de la Balance du Commerce_ to pay two employees whose responsibilities were outside of that office: letter, 9 December 1816, A.N. f/1bl/266/2 [Féval, Louis Théodore François].

[^8]: Letter, Minister of the Interior to Moulinot, Chief of the Second Division, Vendémiaire Year VIII, A.N. f/1bl/6 [an VIII: division II].

[^9]: Comments made by Champagneux reveal that "paternity" as the organising principle behind Lucien's reorganisation was common knowledge among personnel: preference would be given to married men and fathers in the new états: letter, Champagneux to Roux-Fazillac, 11 Vendémiaire Year VIII, A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an VIII].

[^10]: Lany's reclamation against his dismissal from the _bureaux d'administration_ held that he had no fortune whatsoever outside the offices. He complained – rightly or wrongly – that there had, in fact, been no need to suppress him and his place had been simply taken by a newcomer. See letter, Lany to the Minister of the Interior, undated, A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an VIII].
unfortunately, Anne François, his son, had not been dependent on him for sometime, having gone to serve as a cuirassier in the Revolutionary army. On the other hand, Gisors, a sous-chef, described as thirty-eight, married with two children, maintained his place. While other observations could also be used to decide the employee's fate, the question of their paternity was uppermost in the Division Chiefs' minds as they drew up their lists of personnel.

Both the severity of the reorganisation and the sudden systematisation of categories used to dismiss employees caused chaos in the bureaux: the pile of appeals generated in Vendémiaire Year VIII, swamped the Minister (Lucien Bonaparte, Quinette's successor, in reaction, ordered that all complaints should be addressed to the Division Chiefs rather than the Minister). LeTellier, for example, appealed against a consolation placement as sous-chef in the First division to the Division Chief, Roux-Fazillac, on the basis of his Revolutionary credentials (citing among other proofs, his time in the Bastille in 1779). He continued by claiming that he was not appealing for reasons of "vile interest or stupid pride" but simply

it is impossible for me to forget that I am a father and without a fortune of my own, and that twenty-five years of work and good conduct are the titles which recommend my full reintegration to my old position.

In a simultaneous letter to Quinette, however, his main argument was that he could not take the place as sous-chef as it disturbed the "order" of the bureaux: he would rather that Rémy Fleurigeon be reintegrated instead to a position which he merited "from all perspectives". LeTellier's multi-faceted claim to keep his

51 Anne François Letellier would win promotion to Chef d'Escadron, before being injured at Esling et Wagram. He was accepted as a member of the Légion d'Honneur, and served as Aide de Camp to the Duc de Reggio.
52 "État des Employés", A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an VIII].
53 Letter, Secretary General of the Ministry of the Interior to the Chief of the Fifth Division, 12 Nivôse Year VIII, A.N. f/1bl/6 [an VIII: division V]. The Chief of the Fifth Division communicated this letter to all his employees the next day.
54 Letter, Letellier to Roux Fazillac, Chief of the First Division, 15 Vendémiaire Year VIII, A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an VIII].
55 Letter, Letellier to the Minister of the Interior, 15 Vendémiaire Year VIII, A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an VIII]. LeTellier's eventual return to the bureaux was as commis
position as a bureau chief, drawing proof of his virtue from a range of different sources, and citing the harmony of the office as a reason to restore him to the position of bureau chief, cut through all of Quinette's written proofs of suitability. A re-organisation based explicitly on the categories of "paternity" revealed that what seemed, on the face of it, a watertight category of comparison, was too obviously arbitrary. As long as ministers rewarded paternity in isolated cases, no one would question their decisions; finding and rewarding "good fathers" in a more systematic fashion was to uncover a deep-rooted uncertainty in the heart of the employees' own language of self-description.

Other appeals also questioned the use of paternity as a governing category of virtue and the means by which it had been judged. Another complaint about the reorganisation – from the former Division chief, Luc-Antoine Donin de Champagneux – directly interrogated the ramifications of using paternity as a primary category of distinction. Asking for the reinstatement of his son, Anselme Benoît, a commis in Letellier's suppressed office, Champagneux's efforts aimed to overturn the effects of a terse description marked beside his son's name on the personnel list: "Champagneux, twenty-five years old, a returned conscript and with other means". Learning what motives had caused his son's demission, Champagneux revealed the paucity of his own resources (which he assumed were the "means" in question, as the boy had no personal fortune) and disclosed that, as a good son, Anselme used his salary to help maintain their family. Furthermore, Champagneux explained that the description "conscript" was technically untrue. Anselme not been a conscript; he had volunteered to join the Revolutionary Army in 1793, his place in the Ministry guaranteed on his return by Garat's arrêt. Indeed, the boy's military service only demonstrated that his virtue was unimpeachable, his service record unstained, a proof of unselfish patriotism.

(then chief) of the bureau des Commissaires du Gouvernement under Chaptal on the 20 Brumaire Year VIII (9 November 1799).

56 "Employés réformés", A.N. f/1b/10/1 [an VIII]

57 Letter, Champagneux to Lucien Bonaparte, Minister of the Interior, Vendémiaire Year VIII, A.N. f/1b/10/1 [an VIII]. Champagneux listed out an impressive catalogue of financial and personal disaster linked to Revolutionary events: he had married one of his sons to the Rolland's daughter, whose inheritance was destroyed by the Montagnards; his wife's dowry had been repaid in assignats; he had been forced to hide during the Terror, his family turned out of their house and some of his belongings seized by the Comité Révolutionnaire.
Anselme's Division Chief, judging the boy's marital status by whether or not he had served as a conscript (married men could refuse the draft), had erred due to the lack of more thorough documentation. Champagneux asked that something more substantial than a single-line comment scribbled on a personnel list be used to judge one's familial situation. In the absence of more information than the description "a returned conscript", the Division chief had assumed that Anselme's reputation as a soldier proved that he was still a bachelor.

On top of denying that his son had ever been drafted, Champagneux argued that, as Anselme's Ministry salary was insufficient to provide for a wife and family, it was hypocritical for the Ministry to promote married men above him. Champagneux contended that before an administrator could become a father, he first had to fulfil his duties as a son and support his parents. Champagneux complained to both Minister and Division Chief:

Put yourself in the place of a father of nine children and grandchildren who are all more or less under my charge. Calculate the unhappiness this father suffers with the dismissal of his eldest son, whom he had believed he had placed solidly in arranging for him to be admitted to the bureaux of your ministry, acquiring the knowledge that that career requires. All other career paths are now closed to him, as he is now too old to begin anew...

Anselme, his father argued, was still a good son who contributed towards the expenses of his family. He was unable to marry – to become a good father – until he reached a position where he could pay for the upbringing of his own children.

Champagneux then expanded on his own case to argue that Ministry could not exclude all bachelors from employment without compromising the talent, assiduity, honour and patriotism of service to the Nation: if all citizens were equal, and all potential fathers, no one could be excluded by the category of paternity. Nevertheless, appealing to the Minister and to Roux-Fazillac, as a

---

58 Ibid.
59 Ibid.
"former colleague" who had "served under Roland, Garat and Benezech", and soliciting a place for his son, Champagneux clearly agreed with using paternity as a legitimate means of solicitation between colleagues. Champagneux was therefore not against individual solicitations citing paternal benevolence, but against rewarding paternity systematically. This, he argued, would lead to the promotion of family interests above that of the Nation: one example in particular, provoked Champagneux's condemnation when he described a "step-father, step-son and nephew" working in the same bureau as a dangerous dynasty. Champagneux believed that *ancienneté* should be used instead of paternity as the basis for ministerial reorganisation (declaring proudly that, despite his senior position, he had never dabbled in nepotism during his time in the Ministry of Interior). Champagneux also clearly believed that paternity should remain outside the realm of written categorisation, until a more tried and trusted formula could be found to document it: therefore, to legitimise his own written claim of paternity to the Minister, he had to define the boundaries between fatherhood and filiation. As Champagneux understood it, to become a father, Anselme had first to prove in real terms that he could survive as an independent individual, without financial or moral aid, and with the experience acquired to flesh out an adequate service record. As in the office, he had to prove himself a dependable producer in his own right, cast off from the direct effect of his father's controlling influence. Lucien, overburdened by complaints about his predecessor's reorganisation, did not return to dismissing his employees on the basis of their home lives. Yet, 

i. Ibid.
ii. The dynasty which Champagneux cites as demonstrating the dangers of prioritising paternity over other categories of virtue is most probably the Lefranc-Riqueur-Roussel dynasty in one of the bureaux charged with administrative correspondence: letter, Champagneux to Roux-Fazillac, 11 Vendémiaire Year VIII, A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an 8].

*Ancienneté* or length of service was in Anselme's favour: he had joined the first Republican ministry on 10 August 1792; scarcely twenty of the remaining employees had served longer than he had. The father appealed on that basis: "If length of service is not in some way sacred, how do you hope to attach ministry employees to their duties? How do you hope to attract virtuous and educated men to these places? They will flee an administration where they have cause to fear caprice and arbitrariness": letter, Champagneux to Lucien Bonaparte, Minister of the Interior, Paris, Vendémiaire Year VIII, A.N. f/1bl/10/1 [an VIII].
neither did the Ministry discount fatherhood altogether as a means to judge employees. Instead, it found a way to document the transition from father to son, to establish a cast-iron means to judge paternity and fixed terms and absolute categories under which it could be justly claimed or discounted. It was Fauchat's uniform work chronologies, establishing length of service as the primary criteria for decisions regarding Ministry personnel, that proved the means to record "family", once and for all, in a systematic and comprehensive fashion.

Paternity therefore took on its paper proofs in the offices as it had done in the Civil Code. Solicitations on behalf of one's son were accepted as natural - even desirable - as long as they were documented and presented in the proper fashion. Even for those with direct access to their Division Chief, documentation was advisable. In 1821, manipulating the recognition of his paternity written into his état de services, Jacques Petit, a bureau chief in the Ministry of the Interior's bureau des subsistances, solicited a place for his son, Jacques-Auguste, verbally. Having arranged some years previously for Jacques-Auguste's entry as a surnuméraire in his own bureau, he had no qualms about asking Fauchat, the then Secretary General of the Directory-General for Agriculture, Commerce, Arts and Manufactures, to intercede personally with his Director, the Baron Capelle. Petit's solicitation proved successful: the Director's official avis, addressed to Fauchat (signed 'very affectionately'), rubberstamped Jacques-Auguste's promotion from surnuméraire to auxiliaire, recognising that he "helped and seconded" his father in his work and rewarding him with a modest salary of 600 francs. Yet Fauchat's tardiness in implementing this decision provoked Petit to write to the Minister, documenting his efforts on behalf of his son and causing the Minister's avis to be included in his file.63 Formal letters not only documented his paternity, but as Petit found out, protected against the danger of being forgotten about.

---

63 Bureau and Division chiefs could usually forego the flowery phrases of official letters of solicitation as they had access to the Minister's private office. The absence of such letters has, nevertheless, been attributed to a practice among higher officials of "weeding" their personal files of "shameful" (and potentially damaging) solicitations: see Bill Reddy's comments (citing Guy Thuillier) in The Invisible Code, p. 169. If they did weed their personnel files, they had less compunction about leaving boxes of their correspondence after them.
Formal requests provided a material focus for a request: a margin to be signed, or a well-spaced letterhead across which the Minister could scrawl his opinion. The regularised monotony of such solicitations moreover rescued the employee from the need to elaborate on tales of his own destitution, of his lack of means, and of the terrible plight of his home life (the sort of letter Lucien Bonaparte had refused to read in Nivôse Year VIII). A formalised rhetoric of solicitation, tracing the key milestones on the employee's *état de services*, guaranteed the tacit transmission of accumulated honour to a child noted at its head. Although inheritances were not automatic (a son had to earn his succession by first of all proving himself a valuable servant of the Nation in the *surnumériariat*), an interchange of formal letters between Father and Minister more often than not accomplished a son's placement outside of his father's sphere of influence, beginning his own *état de services*. In a new bureau, immersed in a "spirit of administration", the good son no longer needed to be seen as emulating his father but, rather, learning from his colleagues. Yet to get to this position of representing himself as a collaborator and *confrère*, and to begin establishing his own reputation as a producer, the employee had first to be introduced to the office as a son.

Although Jacques Petit no longer had to dramatize his paternity, painting lavish pictures of his battle against the odds to place his sons, he still marketed himself as a "good father" and Jacques-Auguste as a "good son", by claiming that his family spawned good colleagues and good administrators. To insert his son in the offices, he combined his own utility with that of his entire family in a single *état de services*. Jacques-Auguste's potential was linked to the proven ability of the elder son, whose military achievements Petit added to his own less adventurous chronology of service, in particular when the boy attended the *École Polytechnique*, when he received a commission as a sub-lieutenant in the 59th Infantry Regiment in Portugal, and, posthumously, when he died a captain on the battlefield at Pyrna.64 Making his elder son's success part of a presentation of his

---

64 A.N. f/1bl/276/2 [Petit, Jacques]. See especially, his appropriation of his son's honourable military service in a letter to the Minister of the Interior, 10 February 1811, asking that his salary be raised to match that of other sous-chefs (and soliciting the "paternal benevolence" of the Minister). See also, his (unofficial) *état de services*, 14 April 1815, soliciting the 500 francs difference between his
état de services, Jacques Petit exploited the notion that good sons learned from their fathers, to market his own paternity on the back of his son's reputation as a soldier. He, however, used this glorified paternity carefully, inserting it into the formal language of an état de services, rather than waxing lyrical about battlefield prowess. While the production of a well-adjusted successful son – a sign of a happy home life – was something to which he could allude, his claim to "own" the success of his son was too tenuous to form a more solid description of his merit. The sum of their services, brought together on a single état de services, represented a "joint" honour, shared between father and son. By allowing sons to appear on their father's état de services, the Ministry legitimised the transfer of accumulated honour from father to son, as long as claims made on it remained within the realm of plausibility.

By the end of the Empire, regular mention was made of children at the head of official états de services. At the head of Gambier Campy's état de services in 1815 was the description "married with two children". At the head of his son's état de services in 1831 was a similar legend: "aged twenty-nine and a half years old and single". Such regularised notification of paternity did not establish it as a ground for competition between employees (it did not contribute to the balance at the end of the sheet), yet allowed the Minister to reward his clerks by favouring their sons with low-grade positions and state-sponsored educational opportunities. Robert Denis Timoléon Gambier de Campy therefore succeeded in placing his son, not because he owned his position (as his uncle had under the Old Regime), but because the conditions under which that succession would take place were firmly established, both in precedent and in paper. Through the record of his paternity at the head of his état de services, and his formal solicitation's chronology of fatherhood (in other cases, reinforced by the production of birth certificates), he could make a direct link between himself and his favourite protégé. He and his colleagues could regulate the arbitrary nature of Ministry recruitment practices, creating paternal successions, guaranteed not by the boundaries of corporation but by a common adherence to the perceived "naturalness" of paternal benevolence. Intra-familial promotions – where the

and other bureau chiefs' salaries, in which he cites his son's death in a "battle charge".
Minister appointed sons to replace their fathers, or increased the son's wages as a recompense for the loss to family income – helped to solidify belief in the worth of a benevolent father. Where overuse of paternity as a category of virtue in Year VIII had provoked disapproval, defiance and accusations of deceit, paternal honour, recorded on an état de service and bounded by a formal rhetoric, could safely navigate such accusations by keeping within the structures of promotion by ancienneté.

Marketing Honour

When Alexandre-François Barbié du Bocage's necrology noted in 1835 that the name of "Barbie du Bocage" lived on in the Société de Géographie, it referred to his own service, that of his brother, Guillaume, and to the generous tributes paid to the memory of his father, Jean-Denis. Their accumulated position was confirmation of a stable, virtuous family, of generations of "good sons" succeeding "good fathers". Indeed, Alexandre Barbié du Bocage's service to the Society had been as important and crucial as his father's. Despite his tender years and his lack of an academic or professional pedigree, he had outpollen Baron Férussac, editor of the Bulletin Universel des Sciences et de l'Industrie, and a ubiquitous figure in Parisian society, to be elected both a member of the Central Commission and secretary of the Section de Correspondance at the founding meeting of December 1821. Alexandre was therefore responsible for

67 Alexandre was barely 24 when elected Secretary of the Correspondence Section 1821. Well-educated, he had attended the collège Louis-le-Grand, been licensed and called to the bar (1821). He later studied in the École des Chartes, writing a doctoral thesis on Herodotus. His geographical experience at this point, however, was limited to his sumumérant in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the lessons his father had supposedly given him as a child (though Alexandre was taken at an early age into a pension). For a brief chronology of Alexandre's career, see Christophe Charle, Les professeurs de la
composing and drafting the majority of the Society's official communications over the first ten years of its existence. The members paid him a further honour by electing him Secretary-General of the Central Commission in 1832. To gain a foothold in his professional cadre, however, Alexandre had depended on the value of his father's accumulated honour – on the renown of the name, "Barbié du Bocage".

Likewise, Alexandre's appointment as substitute lecturer at the Faculté de Paris in 1825 depended on the esteem in which his colleagues and collaborators held his father – not on the young man's own particular merits. A year later, Alexandre was also the Faculty's favourite to fill the lectureship left vacant by his father's death. It did not matter that Joseph-Daniel Guigniault – his main rival for the post (an ex-teacher of the École Normale, and the favourite of the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs and Public Instruction's Conseil Académique) had more sustained and extensive credentials as an educator and servant to the public. The post, a relic of the deceased Jean-Denis's accumulated honour was Alexandre's "paternal heritage" and a "testimony of the esteem and regret with which the Faculty considers their deceased Doyen". In the opinion of the Faculty members, a lifetime of steady reputation building could not be allowed to perish with the old geographer. As the Society for Geography had translated Barbié du Bocage's worth into Alexandre's election in 1821, the Parisian Faculty converted his accumulated honour into a position in 1825. When the place devolved temporarily upon Alexandre's elder brother, Guillaume, in 1832 (as the former attempted to recuperate his health in Italy), the Faculty proceeded to

faculté des lettres de Paris: dictionnaire biographique 1809-1908 [Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique: Collection "Histoire biographique de l'enseignement"] (Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1985), vol. I, pp. 24-25. 88 Again, Alexandre's rival was not unknown: see "Guigniault, Joseph Daniel", in Hoefer (ed.) Nouvelle Biographie, vol. XXI, pp. 573-574. Guigniault returned to the École Normale in 1826 as maître des conférences in Greek Literature. In 1830 he was named Director of that school. He finally won the Faculty's Chair of Geography after Alexandre's death in 1835, and entered the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in 1837. 69 A.N. f/17/20084 [Barbié du Bocage]. 70 Though there was no question of Alexandre's capacity (he had already taught his father's courses) or of his character (he could produce an impressive array of recommendations guaranteeing the "purity" of his principles and his good behaviour).
"inscribe" the name of "Barbié du Bocage, three times repeated" on the only chair of geography in early nineteenth-century France. Alexandre's death in 1835 earned him the epitaph "good father, good brother, good husband". His career, launched by his expeditious introduction to the inner circle of the Society for Geography, was initially galvanised by a social reckoning of his paternal heritage and his reputation as Barbié du Bocage's protégé. The transfer of Barbié du Bocage's accumulated honour to his son was accepted as natural and proper — beyond all suspicion of nepotism and deceit — and recorded in the minutes of the Ministry of Public Instruction, and in the Bulletin of the Société de Géographie.

Guillaume Barbié du Bocage also thrived in his chosen career and in society, benefiting from his family's accumulated reputation. Appointed to the bureau topographique in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1817, he replaced his father as Director of the Archives' map depot after his death in 1826. He became a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour only a few months after Alexandre's death in 1835 (although the secrecy maintained as to the reasons for Legion of Honour nominations means that one cannot be sure why that an honour he had solicited unsuccessfully since the late 1820s should be awarded to him at that moment).

Guillaume's nomination to replace his father in 1817 was the fruit of a long process of paternal solicitation: when, in 1805, Jean-Denis Barbié du Bocage wrote a letter to Talleyrand, asking for Guillaume's nomination as a language student at the Lycée Impérial, the response indicated that this was a reward for his useful service.

71 "Notice Nécrologique sur Alexandre-François Barbié du Bocage", pp. 277-278.
72 Before taking up the position of Secretary of the Société de Géographie, or lecturer in the Faculté de Paris, Alexandre had to establish himself as his father's pupil and collaborator. He is described as such in "Notice Nécrologique sur Alexandre-François Barbié du Bocage". Guillaume is described similarly: "Nécrologie: Paroles prononcées sur la tombe de M. Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, à Ivry, le 23 mai 1843, par M. Roux de Rochelle", Bulletin de la Société de Géographie, 2nd series, vol. XIX (Paris: Éverat, 1843), pp. 478-480.
73 The Minister charged Guillaume with re-cataloguing the depot's contents, as Barbié du Bocage himself had been charged with cataloguing the collections of his mentor, d'Anville, during his first spell in the Ministry in 1787.
74 See an état des services drawn up by Guillaume to that end in the late 1820s: A.A.E. Personnel: première série, vol. XVII [Barbié du Bocage, Guillaume].
75 Letter, Minister of Foreign Affairs to Barbié du Bocage / Beuscher / Lauxerois, 3 June 1806, ibid.. The Minister's letter, in a well-worn formal rhetoric, was
the tasks set for him by his superiors in the Diplomatic Service and Ministry of Foreign Affairs: despite his placement as a *jeune de langues*, it was still another twelve years before the boy had an *état de services* of his own.\(^6\)

The blandishments of Barbié du Bocage's formal letter to Talleyrand in 1805 — enumerating his offspring and the modesty of his means to provide for them — were designed to hide its meticulous construction. Nevertheless, Barbié du Bocage did not entirely succeed in glazing over doubts about his entitlement to solicit on behalf of his son. Though the geographer "confidently" called on the Minister's generosity, pledging that his son would emulate the example of his father and would prove his gratitude for the Minister's favour by his hard work and application, he simultaneously gave away his lack of certainty as to how he might prove this. He realised that there was nothing necessarily "natural" about acts of paternal benevolence, and certainly nothing "natural" about his right to claim the Minister's aid. Barbié du Bocage finished the otherwise impeccable missive on an uncertain note: "I dare to speak of his gratitude, yet how I am unable even to give you evidence of mine".\(^7\) Barbié du Bocage, perhaps full of the uncertainties endured as the adopted protégé of an old-régime *savant*, did not stay within the boundaries of formal solicitation.\(^8\) Instead, he worried out loud that, if he found himself unable to maintain the appearance of his own virtue, any promise made on behalf of his son would be phantasmagorical. Barbié du

---

\(^6\) Letter, Barbié du Bocage to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 15 Pluviôse Year XIII, A.A.E. *Personnel: première série*, vol. XVII [Barbié du Bocage, Guillaume].

\(^7\) D'Anville, the famous eighteenth-century geographer, had simply singled him out in the *bibliothèque Mazarine* and taken the otherwise unremarkable printer's son under his wing, introducing him to the circle of the Duc de Choiseul-Gouffier.
Bocage therefore decided that—on top of his rhetoric—he needed to act like a good father, and to find means to present Guillaume as a good son.

The geographer's second solicitation on Guillaume's behalf in June 1814 looked to establish the boy solidly in a network of protection within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Diplomatic Corps. The success of this letter took Guillaume to Constantinople, far from his family home and his father's example, where Barbié du Bocage hoped his son would make valuable contacts among the diplomatic and ex-patriot community. Successful solicitation therefore spawned a series of other notes, this time to friends and colleagues, whom Guillaume would meet when separated from his father. Preparing for Guillaume's arrival in the Turkish capital, Barbié du Bocage sent personal introductions to colleagues posted in the Ottoman Empire: in July 1814, as Guillaume still waited in Marseille to catch a naval ship, his father dispatched three mail packets to the East, to recommend his son to his friends, the General Andréossy (France's Ambassador to Turkey), Deval (Andréossy's Secretary-Interpreter), and Ruffin (the Embassy's Councillor). He asked the latter to pass on two letters to the administrators of the École his son would be joining. Though punctilious and polite (perhaps even perfunctory), Barbié du Bocage's letters served to introduce Guillaume to his colleagues, to allow his son to exchange a few words with these influential men while they deciphered the handwriting. They facilitated personal contact: delivered through Guillaume (not by the courier who had brought the letters to Constantinople) they were a means for Guillaume to navigate the anomie of the administrative labyrinth.


80 Letter, Jean-Denis to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 12 October 1814, Bibliothèque de l'Institut, Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [MS.5497 (II), dossier 1 (3)]. Of the contacts he arranged for Guillaume, only Doula, the school administrator, was not a personal acquaintance.

81 The difference between a formal letter of solicitation and a personal letter is striking—in terms of length, amount of detail, and in particular (due to the cost of paper and postage) size of handwriting. Solicitations made to friends preserved the formal rhetoric; additional remarks, made "privately", were attached in postscripts or attached on separate notes. See, for example, the difference between Barbié du Bocage's personal letters to Général Andréossy (Bibliothèque de l'Institut, Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [MS.5497 (II), dossier 2]) and those sent to the Minister to solicit a place for Guillaume.
Barbié du Bocage did not hesitate either to use his contacts in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to curry favour on his son's behalf, using his "paternity" to appeal to their generosity. As well as sending formal solicitations, he also invited colleagues to his home. As his slip in the letter to Talleyrand already indicated, Barbié du Bocage believed that the best father was one who could combine a formal rhetoric of honour with the (equally formal) appearance of domestic bliss.

When General Andréossy's departure from Constantinople, during his son's voyage from Marseille, had deprived the young man of that particular contact, Barbié du Bocage instructed Guillaume to read the letter and then to destroy it. Despite its formality, Andréossy's letter was a currency that was valuable only between the two men; it could not be passed on to anyone else. Nevertheless, Andréossy's return to France proved a new opportunity to enlist the ex-Ambassador's aid in advancing his son's career. Inviting Andréossy to his home on the rue des Petits Augustins, Barbié brought Guillaume's talent to the General's attention. With a fire ablaze in his salon, and surrounded by the accomplishments of his children - a piano played by his daughter Adèle (who would marry a music teacher (and son of the Ministry of Interior bureau chief, Aimé Lemoine) in 1824) and, more importantly perhaps, scenes of Turkey penned by Guillaume himself - Barbié du Bocage marketed his son's skill, driving up its value, which he hoped to aggregate with every new line on the boy's état des services (modestly, Barbié du Bocage pointed out to the General how his son's perpendicular lines were not always at right angles). Whatever Guillaume could draw, his father promised that he would "make it worthwhile".

Guillaume's breakthrough had to be seen to be the result of his own effort; nevertheless, his first steps into the professional world were meticulously constructed by his father.

---

82 Letter, J-D. to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 19 December 1814, Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [dossier 1 (9)].
83 These items existed in Barbié du Bocage's house when he died in 1826, and, thus might not have been there in 1814: A.N. M.C. ET/XLIII/753 [inventaire après le décès de Jean-Denis Barbié du Bocage, 29 mars 1826]. For Adèle's marriage contract see ET/XLIII/744 [mariage entre M. Lemoine et Mademoiselle Barbié du Bocage, 18 octobre 1824].
84 Letter, J-D. to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 17 January 1815, Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [dossier 1 (10)].
Barbié du Bocage also courted the new Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, the Marquis de Rivière (Andréossy's replacement), and his secretaries, the Count de Beaurepaire and M. de Montigny, before their departure for Constantinople. Charged with the purchase of maps for de Rivière's voyage, Barbié du Bocage mentioned Guillaume's ability to the Ambassador, and suggested that his son should sketch the countryside he crossed on his promenades (foreseeing every complication, the diligent father wrote to M. de la Boullaie requesting a military escort for his son's sketching excursions). He invited the Count de Beaurepaire to his home, where he entertained the young diplomat. The concerned father, luring the Count into his home on the pretext of asking him to transport French cloth for Guillaume's trousers to Constantinople, was also a clever promoter, engineering an audience for his son with the new Ambassador's aide. Having made an ally of the Count de Beaurepaire, Barbié du Bocage told his son:

I advise you to court him, because everything depends on him... If
... [he] employs you in making copies, accept this sort of work with
good grace, because it is the means to progress.®®

Convinced that the Count de Beaurepaire might be an enormous asset in the construction of Guillaume's career, a potential collaborator in the private office of the French Embassy, Barbié du Bocage now looked for Guillaume to do his part of the job – to establish himself as a productive individual, whose talent merited attention.

"Scientific work, and particularly the investigation of the surroundings of Constantinople", followed by an official assignment to work on demarcating the Turkish frontier, occupied the young student in 1815 and 1816.®® By 1817, although suffering from ailing health, Guillaume was a certified producer with his own état de services.®® Like his father, however, he had still to be careful to maintain the appearance of a virtuous private life. Barbié du Bocage's main

®® Ibid.. Barbié du Bocage added, "That is not to say that you should neglect M. Duval, because he is essential for you".
lesson from father to son, then, was to establish himself as a useful colleague; in
the process, however, he warned his son gravely not to succumb to "cajolery",
"extravagance" or "dissipation". In particular, he should be honest, thoughtful for
the opinion of the Ambassador and that of the women present and respectful of
all the other members of the French community in Turkey. Barbié du Bocage
warned his son to be discreet, stay within French circles and not pick up the bad
habit of visiting Greek households or demoiselles. More particularly, Barbié du
Bocage warned his son never to reveal differences of opinion between the
various diplomatic officials to the world outside the offices, and, in general, to
avoid discussing politics and expressing too zealous an opinion on the topics of
the day. Though Barbié du Bocage had no direct experience of the ex-patriot
community in Constantinople, he nonetheless believed that there were certain
unshakeable social rules, the mastery of which would be Guillaume's means of
success. Barbié du Bocage feared that his son would be sucked into
inappropriate situations, and become an easy victim of calumny. The young man
would have to master the art of appearing blameless in order to be seen as a
dependable collaborator. If Guillaume's success reflected on Barbié du Bocage's
prudent fatherhood, his failure would equally be a source of shame for the
nervous geographer.

By codifying the ways in which paternity and filiations could be counted, and
establishing a formal rhetoric of solicitation by which it could be invoked,
administrators necessary erected a voile respectable to obscure the conditions of
paternal benevolence. Barbié du Bocage's efforts on behalf of his son appealed
directly to the sentiment of the Count de Beaurepaire and his old friend, the
General Andréossy. He retained the formal letter as a means of direct
solicitation, however, invoking a formalised paternity when requesting particular

88 Letter, J-D. to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 17 January 1815, Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [dossier 1 (10)].
89 Letter, J-D. to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 18 February 1815, Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [dossier 1 (11)].
90 This advice was offered as Barbié du Bocage suspected that "such things interested him"; Jean-Denis went so far as to counsel his son to avoid frequenting Turkish market places, where his presence among the market
women might be noted by some mischief-maker out to destroy his reputation: letter, J-D. to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 24 December 1815, Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [dossier 1 (19)].
assignments and positions for his son. In the New Regime, transfer of wealth from father to son could be authenticated by (chronologised) family and genealogy in the registers of the état civil. In offices and sociétés savantes, the transfer of position was legitimised by a rhetoric of paternity, established within a system of chronologised ancienneté, and transmitted in the codes of formal letter writing. The sanctity of paternal benevolence, however, depended on discretion, and even employees whose fathers had laboured to establish their career and to fill the first line of their état de services could manage to throw it all away. Nevertheless, indiscretion was mostly ignored by the Ministries as long as it stayed out of sight and out of mind.

(Dis)Honourable retreats

Even when dishonour came to light, in some cases the Minister could chose to ignore disruption in the interest of harmony. Another victim of Quinette’s reform, Edme-Michel Delétang, a commis d’ordre in the Ministry of the Interior’s bureau d’administration générale solicited his reinstatement on the grounds that he was a zealous worker, the father of five children, and an amputee.91 Despite these claims, his salary of 3000 francs in Year VIII was soon reduced to 2400, where it remained pegged until he received a 200-franc increase in 1807.92 Consequently, Delétang suffered from financial difficulties: in 1809, he asked (unsuccessfully) that his former salary of 3000 francs be reinstated, and that the Minister favour his two sons, whom he had not the means to educate himself. He repeated this request in January of 1812, this time successfully, citing the expenses of supporting seven people, which had forced him to contract debts and sell his possessions.

It was in the same year that "Mme Delétang, née Charveys", began to write to the Minister, thanking him for increasing her husband’s salary, and excusing her

91 Both Delétang and his wife probably mention his amputated leg hoping the Minister would assume he was a war veteran. His amputation, however, was as the result of a childhood accident, and did not occur in military service to the Nation.
92 "État de Services", A.N. f/1bl/264/2 [Delétang, Edme Michel].
"boldness" in soliciting a new favour – lodgings in the Ministry building. Her husband's amputation, she explained, made it a chore for him to get to the office, which he, nevertheless, attended every day, even on Sundays: this zeal would be increased if he were to live in the same complex. She appealed on the basis of her own female honour, writing "without having consulted my husband" and citing her own maternal chronology: "I am the mother of five children". Abandoning her husband's strategy of soliciting on the basis of his ancienneté (19 years of service scarred by the reduction of his salary), the bold Mme Delétang appealed in the name of her family and its domestic needs. Nevertheless, her "maternal" honour could not be chronologised on a Ministry état de services: it belonged outside the offices – which is where Mme Delétang continued to live. The Ministry refused her request for a logement, keeping the private life of both Edme-Michel and Mme Delétang outside of the walls of the Ministry.

Ongoing solicitations from Mme Delétang incurred further disapproval among her husband's superiors. In 1829, the incumbent Secretary-General removed the majority of her correspondence from Edme-Michel's personnel file, with the instruction that it was to be burned and not returned to the couple for fear of their becoming a new subject of discord. She had left her husband in 1818 to live with her son Louis Emile Julien (a clerk in the ministry since 1813). Edme-Michel then refused to pay her maintenance. Even the solicitation of a M. Ferry on her behalf failed to convince the Minister to deduct from her husband's wages to pay for her upkeep. She returned to her marital home in November 1819, bringing an end to the saga (though not to her son Louis' debts, incurred in housing her during his parents' estrangement). The purging of her letters reveals, if not the substance of their argument, the refusal of the Ministry to involve itself in its employee's domestic affairs.

—

93 Letters, Mme Delétang to the Minister of the Interior, October 1812, A.N. f/1bl/264/2 [Delétang, Edme Michel].
94 M. Ferry's exact role in the saga is a mystery, although the note does mention that he was the author of some of the files destroyed.
95 Letter requesting an augmentation in wages, Louis Emile Julien Delétang to the Minister of the Interior, 26 January 1820, A.N. f/1bl/264/2 [Delétang, Louis Emile Julien]. Despite his parents' marital difficulties, Louis Emile Julien continued to appeal as a good son, responsible for supporting his mother.
The purging of correspondence relating to the Delétang's marriage difficulties also allowed the "Widow Delétang, née Charveys" to claim her pension after Edme-Michel's death in August 1826. A short and to-the-point letter asked that her pension of 480f (a quarter of 1920 francs) be liquidated; shortly after, an equally terse Conseil d'État ordinance confirmed that she would receive her monthly allowance backdated to July. She benefited, therefore, from her husband's services to the state, even if their marriage had been less than exemplary. The widow Delétang had, of course, to certify that their alliance had been "uninterrupted": two local carpenters of the 10th arrondissement swore before the mayor that no judicial separation had occurred between the spouses since their marriage in Year II, and signed a document attesting that to be sent to the Ministry of the Interior. The written testimony of men — and the provisions of the 1807 legislation on pensions — thus absolved her from the need to petition the state (on the basis of her maternal honour or otherwise). Where before 1807, women had to appeal to ministerial benevolence in order to guarantee a minimal existence, their claims were now invoked by short formal requests and processed as a calculation of their dead husband's work chronology. When she did petition, the solliciteuse was automatically suspected of deceit: the caricaturist delighted in painting them wearing pretty bonnets and ankle-length skirts, wooing indolent Division Chiefs. The right to claim the minister's benevolence was restricted to appeals based on male production and paternal honour. Women could operate only within that language; as long as they accepted the rules of succession, laid down by the Ministries, they would receive their legal dues — nothing less and nothing more.

---

96 Letter, Mme Delétang to the Minister of the Interior, 6 September 1836, A.N. f/1bl/264/2 [Delétang, Edme Michel]. There is a noticeable difference between the style of this formal letter and her earlier solicitations.

97 One might contrast the ease with which Mme Delétang claimed her pension with the trouble undertaken by Julien Nicolas Sausseret on behalf of his ex-colleague Hennebert's widow in June 1807 (immediately prior to the pension legislation): A.N. f/1bl/279/1 [Sausseret, Julien Nicolas].

98 See, for example, Monnier's caricature of a M. le Chef de Division donnant une audience in the Appendix.
While female inappropriateness could be excused (if kept at arm's length and purged from the Ministry archives), male inability to keep a virtuous private life was frowned on to the point of dismissal. Jean Cécile Delangle, a garçon de bureau, was dismissed from the Ministry of Interior where he had served since his father had died (occupying the same position) in September 1800. Although only twelve years old at the time, his placement had substituted for the lack of pension regulations at the time, and his mother's resulting destitution. Called as a conscript in 1807, he served seven years in the Imperial army, rising to the rank of sous-officier, before returning to the Ministry as a porter in 1814. Returning to his logement within the Ministry walls, Delangle was ill paid but secure, his firewood and uniform paid for by the state. Yet Delangle's personal conduct within the walls of the Ministry brought this "safe" existence to an end. In February 1822, his chief Despery called for his dismissal from the Direction de Police: he was an "incorrigible drunkard" and had been "drunk all day" the day before. A report to the Minister translated this to his being an "incorrigible man", who had "several pardons which have accomplished nothing". This was indeed not the first time that Delangle had been censored for his drunkenness: a report to the Minister five years earlier had spoken of "reprehensible conduct caused by drunkenness ... in Your Excellency's own hôtel". The combination of his alcoholism and the exposure of ministerial dwelling provoked the downfall of the erstwhile garçon de bureau, who could not appeal, either on the grounds of a "moment of forgetfulness" or on the good name of his father.

Injunctions to collect employee addresses, as a means to scrutinise employees, and the systematisation of those lists around 1814, demonstrates that Ministers continued to want to know if their employees were "good fathers" and "good

99 "État de services", A.N. f/1bl/11-14 [Delangles].
100 For firewood provision in the Ministry, see "Noms des Personnes auxquelles il est accordé, 1. à celles logées au Ministère, deux doubles stères de bois, 2. à celles logées en ville, une indemnité de cent francs", A.N. f/1bl/9/1.
101 Letter, Despery to the Minister of Interior, 6 February 1822, A.N. f/1bl/264/2 [Delangle, Jean Cécile].
102 Ibid.
103 Report to the Minister of the Interior, 12 October 1817, A.N. f/1bl/264/2 [Delangle].
104 Letter, Delangle to the Minister of the Interior, 14 February 1822, ibid..
sons". Nevertheless, the employees erected their own voile respectable, cloaking their homes from scrutiny, and protecting any cracks in their paternal benevolence from disclosure. When the Comte de Lavalette, the treacherous Director of Posts during the Hundred Days, was spirited out of his detention during the Second Restoration and hidden in the apartment of Bresson, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' bureau chief, inside the hôtel Gallifet, he was warned on his life not to make any noise. Given a pair of slippers, and ordered not to open the windows except at night, Lavalette spent his first hours in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs afraid to move. When Mme Bresson came late that evening, bringing his supper with her, she informed him that it was leftovers mixed together in a single dish: she feared making other arrangements, in case the domestics revealed her family's secret. Likewise, he could not have beer to quench his thirst, as the employee's family was not in the habit of drinking. Not only would Bresson's own place be lost, if he had been caught, but he had a niece and nephew to establish: their chances would equally be ruined by exposure. Ironically, it was the location of Bresson's apartment within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that made it an ideal hiding place. A Royal Ordinance ordered the searching of all other rooms within the barriers of Paris, and the next day the entire city was sealed off to prevent Lavalette from escaping. If Lavelette had chosen to hide in a nearby boarding house, all would have been lost. So close to thirty other residents, there could be no privacy — no place to hide. Lavalette was saved because those who lived in the Ministry building — Division Article Seven of a Ministerial order of 8 June 1814 (during the Treaty of Vienna negotiations), signed by Talleyrand and countersigned by Bresson, mandated employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to move their residences into the neighbourhood of the Ministry from next January. It stressed that there were no exceptions to this rule, and that each employee, when leaving his office, should leave an indication as to where he might be found. See "Arrêté du Ministre pour régler la répartition du travail dans les trois Divisions politiques et commerciale, 8 juin 1814", A.A.E. Organisation et Règlements du Ministère, vol. II (1808-1844), part 1 [PER L: Volumes no. 4], 87 recto, verso, 88 recto, verso. In fact, address lists had already been drawn up in the Ministries of the late Empire, with the idea that employees should be permanently "on call". Such orders — and the inscription of their response — forced employees to house themselves at a "respectable" distance from the office.

105 Lavalette, Mémoires et Souvenirs, pp. 413-414.

106 Ibid., pp. 417-419.

107 Ibid., p. 416.

108 Ibid., p. 415.
Chiefs, Ministers and Secretary Generals – were the most honourable of all, and beyond suspicion of treason.¹¹⁰

The formal rhetoric of paternal honour was thus reproduced in the arrangements for housing employees. Mme Delétang's boldness did not win her a logement. Delangle's inappropriate drunkenness led to his losing both his position and his rooms. Conversely, Bresson's solidity was rewarded handsomely with a Ministry apartment.¹¹¹ On the other hand, Barbié du Bocage used his home outside the Ministry as a site in which he could market his paternity, lauding the achievements of his sons and daughter, by his choice of how to decorate his salon. For all four, the formalised rhetoric of honour and culture of appearances expected of them shaped their private life. The administrator's choice of where to live, its distance from the ministry, the route to and from work, expressed an understandable desire both to protect himself from the prying eyes of the Minister and his colleagues and to display his ardour in turning up at the prescribed hour each morning. The clerk lived and worked in different spaces – walking to the bureau each morning and home each evening allowed him to regulate contact with office mates outside the hours of nine to four.¹¹² The streets became a

¹¹⁰ For example, on Poyet's plan of the Ministry of Interior in Year VI, only chefs de division were allotted residences (excluding "domestic" staff -- garçons de bureau, porters and the concierge). The Minister and his Secretary General lived in the hôtel opposite on the rue de Grenelle. The rest were expected to find lodgings in Paris. For a similar list of those lodged in the Ministry in 1816, see "Noms des Personnes auxquelles il est accordé, 1. à celles logées au Ministère, deux doubles stères de bois, 2. à celles logées en ville, une indemnité de cent francs", A.N. f/1bl/9/1. The arrangement of living quarters in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is described by the Comte de Garden, *Histoire Générale des Traités de Paix et autres Transactions Principales entre toutes les puissance de l'Europe depuis la paix de Westphalie* (Paris: Amyot, 1851), vol. 10, pp. ii-vii.

¹¹¹ Jean-Baptiste-Marie-François Bresson entered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1800, and served until 1825. He had been a "respectable" Revolutionary by the standards of the Empire and Restoration: elected to the Convention in September 1792, he voted against the execution of the King and was declared an enemy of the people in 1793. After Thermidor he was re-elected a deputy of the Conseil des Cinq-Cents. Bresson would nevertheless lose his apartment in 1821, when the Ministry moved from the hôtel Gallifet to the boulevard des Capucines. He received, as compensation, a housing allowance: letter, Ministry to Bresson, 1 October 1821, A.A.E. Personnel: première série, vol. XXXIX [Bresson].

¹¹² In spaces they adapted, rather than designed, the bourgeoisie did their best to hide from the dangers of a public privateness: see Sharon Marcus' comments on
barricade, a way to avoid or attract the public scrutiny of his colleagues and superiors, but also a theatre, a place to display his virtuous and blemish-free bourgeois credentials. On their way to work, the higher echelons strolled through the Palais Royal or the Jardin de Luxembourg; the subordinate employee, on the other hand, picked his way along the uneven tracks of the faubourg. Only the very worst and the very best, the most self-assured and most desperate, the truly honourable and the already dishonoured, asked to live in the ministry building itself.

the difference between apartment houses built in the eighteenth century (which were mostly "maisons à allée") and those built in the nineteenth-century (which were mostly "hôtels particuliers"), Apartment Stories: City and Home in Nineteenth-Century Paris and London (Berkeley & L.A.: U. of California Press, 1998), p. 21. See also Monique Eleb-Vidal, Architecture domestique et mentalités: les traités et les pratiques au XIXe siècle [In Extenso, 5] (Paris: École d'Architecture Paris-Villemin, 1985), p. 14, on the changing design of domestic space, particularly after the 1830s.

113 For instance, the "chance" meeting of Lansel, a Division Chief, and Cochaud, a sous-chef, on the Pont Royal, during the 1807 dispute over authorship discussed in Chapter Three. Lansel lived on the passage du Vognol, near the rue des Fosses Montmartre. His route to work thus took him across the Palais Royal and over the bridge to the faubourg St. Germain. Cochaud, on the other hand, lived on the rue de Sèvres and had gone to the bridge hoping only to intercept his superior.

114 For example, a simple commis d'ordre, Sausseret, lived on the rue du Carême prenant in the faubourg du Temple in 1811 (this road has since been swallowed up in the expansion of the Hôpital St. Louis): A.N. f/1bl/7. A sous-chef by 1818, he had moved to the Grande Rue Taranne, shortening his walk to the office considerably: A.N. f/1bl/279/1 [Sausseret, Julien Nicolas].
Chapter Six
The Art of Making "Bureaucrats".

The "crisis" of 1815

On their resumption of power in 1815, Napoleon's ministers attempted to eliminate those who had "betrayed" them - to establish the fidelity of their fonctionnaires. Aware of the ease with which Louis XVIII had taken over the apparatus of government in 1814, they - like their Revolutionary counterparts in 1792 - sought to establish loyalty by means of public oaths and private denunciations. The employees were "encouraged" to contribute financially towards the war effort, both by piquing their emulation (by publishing the amounts donated by other bureaux) and by direct ministerial invitation (published in the Journal de l'Empire).\(^1\) They were also asked - and then required - to enrol in the garde nationale.\(^2\) If these measures had a limited success, the attempt to use private denunciation to police the office did not. The administrators continued to use états de services, the rhetoric of emulation and "unassailable" paternity to represent their "honour", operating as they had done before Napoleon's return to power - and as they would continue to do under the Second Restoration.

---

\(^1\) See, for example, the list of donations in Journal de l'Empire (24 May 1815). In the Ministry of Interior, the bureau des longitudes contributed 1000fr, the Direction of Mines, 1365fr, and the Direction of Commerce and Manufactures, 3000fr. An "invitation" from the Minister of the Interior to all functionaries was published a week later, Journal de l'Empire (31 May 1815).

\(^2\) Letter, Secretary General of the Ministry of Interior, to Lescarène, Chief of the 5th Division, 7 June 1815, A.N. f/1b1/10/3. This letter, ordering Lescarène to make sure that all his subordinates had conformed with Carnot's order to join the garde nationale is followed by an état listing the date of their enrollment and their military grade.
After Carnot, the Minister of the Interior, ordered the exclusion of royalist employees on the 10 May 1815, he received a series of negative replies. On the 13 May, the Director General of Mines, answered his letter, explaining that among those of my employees with whom I have direct dealings, there are none who have not expressed their attachment to the Emperor. The others, according to the information which has been sent to me, dedicate themselves assiduously to their duties and, otherwise, seem to be animated by a good spirit; given their reserve ... to judge them properly, I would have to have a sort of contact that simply doesn't exist. The mania for politics and for commenting on the newspapers has sometimes spawned animated discussions on political questions, as happens in all places where men meet together. These conversations have sometimes ridiculed opinions favourable [to the regime], but, on the other hand, they make no particular criticism of the Emperor himself: the same men have taken an oath of fidelity to His Majesty and voted for the constitution; they work diligently and with all the appearances of loyalty. I see in them only Citizens devoted to the patrie and to the Government. Laumont finished his letter (in his own hand, as he would not allow his employees to learn of such a potentially provocative letter) by remarking that he intended to dismiss none of his employees. Citing his conscience, his attachment to Napoleon and the best interests of the administration (which would always serve as "the gauge of his public and private actions"), Laumont refused

---

3 Order, 10 May 1815, A.N. f/1bl/8 [Reorganisation, 1815]. The purge was not aimed at those who had served Louis XVIII (who had been subject of a general pardon on the 12 March), but at those who were politically "royalist". Carnot's involvement might have contributed to the failure of this attempted political purge: those with long memories would remember that he had urged the "regeneration" of administration in a speech on Revolutionary government, given on the 12 germinal year II (printed in the Journal des Débats). The shadow of the Revolution still hung over the clerks of the Ministries of Interior of Foreign Affairs, many of who had felt its repercussions in the loss of family fortunes and status.

4 Letter, Laumond, Director-General of Mines, to the Minister of the Interior, 13 May 1815, A.N. f/1bl/8 [Reorganisation, 1815].
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to take part in Carnot's purge. Yet his rebellion took care to be neither confrontational nor conspicuous, using dissemblance rather than disruption to voice a silent protest against political interference.

Laumont was not alone in protecting his employees from ministerial politics: Arnault, the Division Chief of the Bureaux de l'Université Impériale, also replied to Carnot, noting that his employees, as well as the teachers of the University and the lycées, had all been appointed prior to Napoleon's fall. He added an addendum in his own handwriting, to confirm that all his clerks had taken the oath of obedience and loyalty to Napoleon, which he portrayed as sufficient proof of their private opinions on the Emperor's resumption of power. Both Laumont and Arnault were concerned to keep their reference to oaths of obedience from under the eyes of their subordinates. Unwilling to return to the days when solicitation and denunciation had turned the offices into a battleground for personal vendettas and unprincipled careerism, they sought to preserve the fragile peace constructed with états de services. They were keen to maintain the mystique of oath-taking, hiding from their employees that the Minister, by sending the memoir, had acted as if their oaths of fidelity to the Emperor were worthless. The "crisis" of 1815 spluttered to a halt, faced by the resistance of men like Laumont and Arnault who saw that no good would come of subjecting administration to overt political interference. The political purge never happened. The offices continued to judge merit on the basis of ancienneté: a circular of the 15th May recognised that the état des employés, compiling in rows and columns each employee's length of service, family situation and function, was the only means to judge an educational establishment "loyal" to the regime.

5 A few administrators did lose their positions for political reasons during the Hundred Days, but they were the exception rather than the rule. Antoine-François de Forceville, a clerk in the Bureau of Agriculture, for instance, was dismissed after leaving to join Louis XVIII in Gand (a fact which could not be concealed from Carnot): see Fauchat's comments on Forceville, 21 July 1815, A.N. f/1bl/8 [Reorganisation, 1815]. Fauchat, Secretary General at that time, reveals that a denunciation had been made (citing indelicate behaviour outside of the ministry), but that this would not have been enough to cause his dismissal had he not gone to Gand.

6 Letter, Arnault, Chief of the Imperial University Offices, to the Minister of the Interior, 13 May 1815, A.N. f/1bl/8 [Reorganisation, 1815].

7 Journal de l'Empire (24 May 1815).
The employees were hardly unaware of the precariousness of their situation. They took care to keep their heads down until they were sure what the outcome of Napoleon's return would be. As the Allies waited to invade in April 1815, Barbié du Bocage advised his son, Guillaume, not to compromise himself, to stay discreet whenever he heard the latest news. Even after Louis XVIII's return, he continued to tell Guillaume to "keep the dignity of a French man, do your duty as a jeune de langues and do not mix yourself up in this business". It was hard to find the means to unmask political enemies, when the employees were so careful to conceal their opinions. Therefore, if the Hundred Days suppressed and replaced the majority of prefects and sub-prefects, it was because these men were political rather than administrative appointments. Similarly, the purge of prefects that accompanied the resumption of power by Louis XVIII in July 1815 was limited largely to fonctionnaires. In the Ministry itself, Division Chiefs again argued against an overhaul of personnel on political grounds. The first ministry reorganisation of the Second Restoration was therefore quite narrowly "restorative": a Royal Ordinance of the 7 July reinstated all administrators who had been "victims" of the Hundred Days, discharging those who had replaced them, but made no attempt to interrogate any of its employees' political

---


10 See the excellent analysis of nineteenth-century political purges of administration by Jean Tulard, "Les Épurations administratives en France de 1800 à 1830", in *Les épurations administratives, XIXe et XXe siècles* [Centre des Recherches d'Histoire et de Philologie de la IVe section de l'Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes: Hautes Etudes Médiévales et Modernes, V, 29] (Genève: Librarie Droz, 1977). Tulard argues that the first "political" purge of administration in France occurred during the Hundred Days, when Carnot was ordered to suppress the "traitors" of the First Restoration. His analysis, built on a study of prefectural changes (only six prefects survived the return of Napoleon from Elba), does not, however, go into the detail of how these purges affected less conspicuous officials (pp. 54-55). Nicholas Richardson, *The French Prefectoral Corps, 1814-1830* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1966), p. 16, moreover argues that prefects became politicians from this moment.
opinions. The same held true outside the Ministry: Chabrol, the prefect of the Seine, wrote that he "made every effort to protect any employees ... who had not been compromised openly during the Hundred Days". While Jean Tulard clearly finds this statement ambiguous, using it as proof of the reality of a purge in one place, and proof of its lack of force in another, it is clear that, contrary to François Furet's assertion that the "Restoration preserved the structures of the Imperial state, but used its own men", the majority of employees survived the events of 1815. They continued to approach employment by the Nation as they had during the Empire (as well as continuing to build their reputation as honourable producers by attending sociétés savantes). Moreover, the Division Chiefs' white lies, protecting the sanctity of the employees' oath of loyalty, succeeded in reinforcing codes of ancienneté in daily practice. With his Division Chiefs manipulating the rhetoric of honourable service, the Minister could do little to penetrate the true opinions of his office workers.

In spite of its failure, Carnot's "purge" became notorious, when Le Moniteur reported on the 14 May how "political motives" were behind the latest administrative reorganisation. It stated candidly that ministerial reforms had

11 This order was reproduced in Journal des Débats (9 July 1815). Even those who had been dismissed for other reasons during that period benefited from this political lottery: see notes on the reorganisation, Goubault, Chief of the First Division to the Minister of the Interior, 16 July 1815, A.N. f/1ib/8 [Reorganisation, 1815].


13 François Furet, Revolutionary France, 1770-1880 (trans. Antonia Nevill) (Oxford & Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 281-282. Furet seemingly makes his case on his interpretation of the character of the Duc de Richelieu. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, however, did not undergo any major purge. Instead, its leading fonctionnaires benefited from the return of Louis XVIII: as Barbié du Bocage explains in a letter to his son, Guillaume: "There have been big changes in the State: M. de Hauterive, La Besnardière and Reinhardt have all been named Councillors of State. M. Fleury, Chief of the Bureau des Consulats, is named an honorary Councillor, all of which doesn't prevent them from keeping their positions. M. Bourgert, Chalais and Renneval have been named Masters of Requests. Poor M. Roux has not been given any new position; I am disappointed for him": letter, Jean-Denis to Guillaume Barbié du Bocage, 29 August 1815, Bibliothèque Thiers, Manuscrits: Fonds Masson, carton 5. Roux de Rochelle was to take responsibility for editing the Society of Geography's Marco Polo in 1824, for which he also received no credit (see Chapter Four).
centred on those who had "spent part of the last year offering proof ... of their
devotion to the Bourbon dynasty, while still engaged by their oath to the Emperor
Napoleon". The Moniteur claimed that no one would be dismissed for voting
against the Constitution, and that Carnot respected his employees' liberty of
opinion: the purge was directed instead against girouettes, men who broke their
oath of loyalty when changing their opinion to suit the Bourbons. The Moniteur
did not consider that this distinction between those who had professed royalist
opinions by choice and those who had mouthed them when coerced was
impossible to make in practice. The majority of employees had seamlessly
adapted to the new regime, serving Louis XVIII as dutifully they had Napoleon.
How could Carnot tell which had converted by choice and which by coercion?
How could he recognise a royalist or tell Bonapartists and liberals apart?\footnote{The Moniteur article was reproduced in full in the Journal de l'Empire (15 May 1815).}

Nevertheless, using the dialectic of Revolution and Restoration, the Moniteur
subjected office politics to high-political interpretation, and, after Louis XVIII's
return, the press, with their tales of ministerial corruption, would continue to
spread uncertainty as to true motives and real effects in the organisation of
ministerial personnel.\footnote{Bijaoui-Baron La Bureaucratie, pp. 171-187, provides a detailed account of critiques of "bureaucracy" during the Restoration from across the political spectrum.} Allegations of political girouettisme in the aftermath of
1815 were nourished by the royalist papers' desire to blame someone other than
Louis XVIII for the spectacular collapse of Bourbon power on Napoleon's return
from Elba; on the other side of the political divide, stories of "bureaucracy" were
fed by scare-mongering about a "return" to old-regime Bourbon elitism. The
Journal des Débats, a supporter of the regime, urged it to take more strenuous
action against those of "Bonaparte's agents" still working in the Royal
administration.\footnote{Journal des Débats (13 July 1815).} It reported how the First Restoration's mistake had been to
maintain traitors like Lavallette on a pension of 20,000 francs, and called for all
those who had received the Legion of Honour Cross during the interregnum to be
stripped of their honour.\textsuperscript{17} Like the \textit{Moniteur} before it, it heightened apprehensions of a purge, giving the "restoration" of personnel, which had already occurred on the 7 July, the air of an administrative execution.

Like the \textit{Moniteur}'s, the \textit{Journal des Débats}' politics of accusation was completely unrealistic, unforthcoming on how one might find "Bonaparte's agents" amongst those "forced" to swear allegiance, to distinguish between willing \textit{girouettes} and reluctant state servants. Its editors were positive that blame should be placed on Carnot, who had "carefully investigated all those who had ever expressed an opinion or shown a royalist sentiment to persecute and destitute them"\textsuperscript{18}. Yet, even though it argued that Carnot had exercised a despotic rule over his helpless clerks, forcing them to swear allegiance to Napoleon against their will and to accept a constitution they despised, it continued to decry an administration full of \textit{girouettes} and Bonapartists (men who wilfully misrepresented their opinions for personal or political reasons). Out of this incoherency, the impression of an administration full of \textit{roués} (used men), whose oaths of loyalty and vaunted merit carried little value and no legitimacy, emerged. Portraying the ministries as "ruled" by the "will" of Carnot or Bonaparte, it turned all administrators into impostors, all \textit{commis} into political ciphers. While most employees continued their daily routines, working towards promotions and pensions as they had done previously, "politics" was once again a potent language with which to discuss the virtue of employees, as petitions flooded the administrations in the Restoration \textit{manie des places}\textsuperscript{19}.

This \textit{manie des places} was not simply due to the return of \textit{émigrés} and soldiers, with claims on the gratitude of Louis XVIII, or the return of administrators who had been posted in the further reaches of the defunct Empire. The \textit{manie des places} also drew strength from a contraction of Ministry budgets: active personnel joined hopefuls in the battle for too few places in the Minister's

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Journal des Débats} (15 & 17 July 1815). A Royal Ordinance annulling nominations made between the 27 February and the 7 July 1815 was signed on the 28 July 1815: \textit{Fastes de la Légion d'Honneur}, vol. I, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{18} "Variétés", \textit{Journal des Débats} (19 July 1815).}
antechamber. In 1815, a reduction in the ministry's funds of 13 million francs necessitated a reduction in the Ministry payroll. Where it had spent 440,000 francs in 1814, it aimed to spend only 300,000 francs in 1816.\textsuperscript{20} At the same time, ministry hôtels were being repossessed by their old-regime owners, forcing many administrations into expensive deménagements, 1,200,000 foreign soldiers had to be fed and entertained on French soil, and war indemnities had to be paid to Louis XVIII's allies. It was not until 1818 that the government's finances were again in any way solvent, by means of a forced loan on the wealthiest contribuables and a mass sale of national timber.\textsuperscript{21}

Therefore, while the "crisis" of 1815 had few real victims (those who were denounced were rarely dismissed)\textsuperscript{22}, there was no dearth of those willing to claim that they had been discharged due to politics, rather than personal failings or arbitrary economics. The dismissal of Claude-Anthelme Costaz in August 1815, is an example of how an employee, dismissed within the context of an economy drive, could "become" a political victim nonetheless. The recommendation that the rambunctious Chief of Arts and Manufactures be let go was made in a report on possible economies in personnel sent by his Division Chief to Nicholas

\textsuperscript{19} For example, Clive Church, Revolution and Red Tape, p. 290, tells how in 1815 there were 387 applications for twelve positions in a fiscal establishment in the Eure.

\textsuperscript{20} In December 1815 "reasons of economy" forced the Minister of the Interior to dismiss all but the most necessary employees. Those who had not yet earned the right to a pension were placed on a waiting list, and guaranteed a return to the ministry as soon as possible. In light of this waiting list, the Minister placed an embargo on new surnuméraires. Yet, at the same time, some exceptions were made, and several existing surnuméraires were promoted (perhaps because they could be paid less than pre-existing copy clerks). Such measures stoked both the petty jealousies of office politics and strengthened myths about political interference in personnel decisions: Annales politiques, morales et littéraires, 15 (30 December 1815).


\textsuperscript{22} For example, Huard, a sous-chef in the Division of Public Works and shareholder in the Journal de Paris, was denounced as a "vile Bonapartist" in "Copie d'une question adressée au Ministre de l'Intérieur, communiqué au S. Huard, le 26 9bre 1815", A.N. f/1bl/8 [Reorganisation, 1815], but not dismissed. In his "Réponse à cette vile dénonciation , Paris le 26 9bre 1815", Huard named Salguès and Martainville, two Royalist journalists who had recently left the paper, as his denouncers. Martainville started up Le Drapeau Blanc in 1819, one of the newspapers most fervently critical of administration.
Fauchat (now the incumbent Secretary General). Costaz's retirement was part of a "definitive" organisation of the Ministry of the Interior, drawn up to "reflect the real needs of Service" and according to the strict economy imposed by the finances of the state. The report noted his personal fortune and his right to a pension of 3,000 francs a year, which would mean that unemployment would not impact on him too harshly. Finally, in the revelation that another reason for the Division Chief's recommendation was the "spirit of insubordination which ... at this moment persists in his refusal to communicate with the Chief of the Fourth Division", one got an glimpse of the old Costaz, who had made life in the Bureau of Arts and Manufactures a nightmare in 1807 and 1808.24

None of this suggested that Costaz was a political victim, nor even that his Division Chief knew his political opinions. When Fauchat presented his own report to the Minister of the Interior, however, he dressed the decision to pension Costaz in political clothes. He sweetened his recommendation by adding an allusion to Costaz's "dangerous political opinions" (perhaps hoping to remind the politician that the bureau chief's brother, Baron Louis Costaz, was a noted Bonaparte loyalist and a veteran of Napoleon's Egyptian campaign). Costaz also sweetened his retirement by portraying himself as a target of the Restoration government, which had robbed him of his place and then accused him of intellectual theft in the Cour Royale in Paris. In 1831, when writing to the new July-Monarchy Minister, Costaz echoed newspaper rhetoric when claiming that he had been a zealous administrator, not "one of those parasitical employees who holds his place as a means of obtaining a revenue". Turning Costaz into a victim had suited both himself and Fauchat: the stories of political purges told in

23 Ministerial Order, 8 August 1815, A.N. f/1bl/8 [Organisation 1815].
24 "Projet d'organisation définitive de la 4ème division du Ministère de l'Intérieur, août 1815", A.N. f/1bl/9/1. Costaz's political opinions were not cited in the Division Chief's list, which Fauchat used to write his report to the Minister: "4e Division du Ministère de l'Intérieur: Projet d'Organisation définitive, August 1815", A.N. f/1bl/8 [Organisation, 1815].
25 Ibid.
26 Letter, Cochard to the Minister of Commerce and Public Works, 14 December 1831, A.N. f/1bl/263/4 [Costaz, Claude-Anthelme]. The memoir in question was probably Mémoire sur les moyens qui ont amené le grand développement que l'industrie française a pris depuis vingt ans, suivi de la législation relative aux fabriques (Paris: F. Didot, 1816).
newspapers, even if untrue, could be used by the clerks themselves to tell stories of administrative virtue and vice.

Denouncing Denunciation.

The newspapers' accounts of administrative corruption were fed by opportunist ex-employees and fonctionnaires, attempting to regain their place in the offices or to build a name for themselves in the world of journalism. Among them, the most famous of the Restoration critics of administration, Fievée, collaborated with Chateaubriand and the Conservateur to lambast the system of administration inherited from the Revolution, and, by that means, undermine Decazes' position at the head of the government. Fievée had established his royalist credentials by writing as an opposition journalist during the Empire: fortunately, his decision to serve Napoleon as prefect of the Nièvre in 1813 did not prevent him from becoming an ultra. His Correspondance politique et administrative, commencée au mois de mai 1814, et dédiée à M. le Comte de Blacas, calling for the replacement of current personnel by those loyal to the Monarchy, ridiculed "this monstrous administration, which believes it can embrace everything and only succeeds in embarrassing itself in details". To make this argument, he manipulated doubts about the loyalty of administrators, alleging that "the uncertainty about character is one of the sicknesses of this century; this sickness weakens public doctrine and cannot be cured under a government unable to count on the opinion [of its administrators]". Fievée's letters to Louis XVIII's favourite, the Count de Blacas - a man Fievée flattered as "unmoved [by solicitation and denunciation], his mind fixed on his duties" - looked to ingratiate himself, to thrust himself forward, and to put Decazes down: while publicising the ills of Revolutionary and Imperial administration, he promoted men like himself as the only cure.

---

28 Ibid., p. 71.
29 Ibid., p. ix.
Fiévée's authority as an ex-administrator was key to his success, making him one of the most notorious journalists of the time. When the *Journal des Débats* reviewed Fievée's *Correspondance politique et administrative* in September 1815, it legitimised Fievée's right to denounce by noting that he had been an "observer", that he "had seen, and now recounts". The newspaper alleged that Fievée's work would prove a treasure trove of "precious information" for those engaged in representing the interests of France and for all administrators ("even though it is probable that they will be the last to read it"). It then manipulated the power it had invested in the ex-administrator to "agree" that the growth of administrative tyranny would proceed unabated unless the structures of Revolutionary administration were dismantled. The *Journal des Débats* therefore also manipulated the authority of the observer to legitimate their denunciation of administration — by citing a semi-periodical it was in agreement with, it built up a weight of evidence against the wastage and greed of administrators. The pro-ministerial *Journal des Débats* therefore continued its campaign against "Bonaparte's agents" by lionising a man who — although this fact did not emerge until much later — been a spy for the Emperor, a role which had won him his appointment as prefect.

In 1816, the *Constitutionnel* was reviewing a very different sort of pamphlet, written anonymously by an ex-Bureau Chief called Jacques Ymbert. Ymbert's

---

30 "Semi-periodicals" escaped the censor by the irregularity of their appearance; they were outside the system of pre-authorisation, and, furthermore, were exempt from the need to provide caution money introduced by the de Serre press law. Regular newspapers — monarchist, liberal and republican — on the other hand, were limited in the amount of commentary they could safely make on the King's government. They therefore circumvented the censor by publishing "literary" reviews: Bijaoui-Baron, *La Bureaucratie*, pp. 176-187. See also Irene Collins *The Government and the Newspaper Press in France, 1814-1881* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959).

31 *Journal des Débats* (22 September 1815).

32 Joseph Fiévée, *Correspondance et relations de J. Fiévée avec Bonaparte* (1802-1813), 3 vols. (Paris: A Desrez, 1836). For a commentary on their relationship, see Jean Tulard, *Joseph Fiévée, conseiller secret de Napoléon* (Paris: Fayard, 1985). The Bertin brothers, who owned the Journal des Débats, claimed to have remained loyal to the King throughout the Empire (although their newspaper had rallied to Napoleon on his return to Elba).

33 Ymbert was dismissed in 1815, after which he began his literary career. His vitriol against his ex-colleagues did not, however, stop him from returning to the
first published work, *L'Art d'obtenir des places* found immediate acclaim in four review articles in *Le Constitutionnel*, which reproduced several stories of how to solicit successfully from his text. Reviewing the piece also presented an opportunity for the reviewer to tell his "own" anecdotes about a solicitor named Gandirac, whose slow but successful campaign to gain entry to the ministère des droits-réunis, ended with his befriending the porter's cat to convince the suisse that he belonged to the establishment. The reviewer also related how the influence of a *garçon de bureau*, whose wife's stew sustained the members of the Conseil d'État and won her husband their confidence, had once gained him a position where months of petitioning had not. Having treated the reader to both his and Ymbert's "advice", the rédacteur of *Constitutionnel* inserted a short piece entitled "On Denunciation" before the ultimate installment of its review. While the *Constitutionnel* had hitherto treated the process of solicitation flippantly (portraying its stories and the excerpts from *L'Art d'obtenir des places* simultaneously as helpful advice and experienced counsel), the article on denunciation condemned the *manie des places* in the starkest terms: it was, the newspaper claimed, a "plague which is destroying public morality, and will end by corrupting and debasing the morals of the French Nation". The review articles had, in fact, revelled in the inanity of solicitation only to reveal the amusing anecdotes and advice as, in fact, proof of rampant administrative corruption. The newspaper used Ymbert's anecdotes to lay the ground for the political article which denounced the denouncers and censured the solicitors: the story of a *pot au feu* and a porter's cat legitimised a stinging attack on Restoration Ministry of War in 1818 or becoming a Master of Requests under the July Monarchy. Both these appointments were shortlived: Bijaoui-Baron, *La Bureaucratie*, p. 306. *Le Constitutionnel*, the most fervent supporter of his work, was run by the liberal opposition to Louis XVIII. It succeeded the censured *Indépendant* and *Courrier* in October 1815, and was replaced by the *Journal du Commerce* after being shut down in 1819.

[34] [Ymbert], *L'Art d'obtenir des places, ou la Clef des ministères, ouvrage dédié aux gens sans emploi et aux solliciteurs de toutes les classes*, 2nd edition, (Paris: Pélicier, 1816).

[35] For example, the *Constitutionnel* retold Ymbert's story of a race between two solicitors – one in a hackney cab, the other in a cabriolet – to be the first man to report the death of an auditor and to be appointed in his place: *Le Constitutionnel* (3 May 1816).


[37] *Le Constitutionnel* (20 April 1816).
administration, that could not have been made otherwise for fear of the censor's wrath.

The Constitutionnel's review of Ymbert's second published work, Des Dénonciateurs et de Dénonciations, was much more muted in its appreciation of the anonymous author.\(^{39}\) The newspaper found it harder to excerpt material sufficiently light-hearted to be acceptable to the censor from this new work, a weighty classical history of the art of defamation (placing the low ambitions of administration on a single narrative tableau inspired by the classical writer, Apelle).\(^{40}\) The Constitutionnel had treated L'art d'obtenir des places as a "manual of solicitation" (which allowed it to covertly criticise the practices of the Restoration government) and wanted to treat Des Dénonciateurs similarly as a "manual of denunciation". Therefore, when it reproduced isolated snippets, like Ymbert's advice to check the handwriting of petitions against that of anonymous denunciations, it portrayed the book as "useful advice to those with favours to dispense, who do not want to favour denunciation".\(^{41}\) Yet Ymbert's second book — unlike L'art d'obtenir des places or any that followed — was not in the style of a manual but in that of an open denunciation. In Des Dénonciateurs, Ymbert presented his own opinions, casting a bitter look at the politics of solicitation and denunciation, not as an "observer" or "instructor", but as a commentator in his own right. When the Constitutionnel's review glazed over Ymbert's outspoken criticisms of administrators, when it ignored Ymbert's argument that denunciation was a sort of emulation, a rivalry where the worst sort triumphed, and when it made no mention of Ymbert's final comments — that those who won a place by denunciation would also, in their turn, be denounced — it ignored Ymbert's own outspoken views and presented the book instead as a guidebook.\(^{42}\) It could use Des Dénonciateurs' existence as a "manual" to allege that denunciation was a means of success under the Restoration government; it could not, for fear of censorship, support Ymbert in his literary battle against those who (he believed)

\(^{38}\) "De la Délation", Le Constitutionnel (30 April 1816).
\(^{40}\) The Tableau de la Calomnie, depicted by Raphael: see Fig 3.
\(^{41}\) Le Constitutionnel (15 October 1816).
\(^{42}\) Ymbert, Des Dénonciateurs, pp. 242-243.
Fig. 3, "La Calomnie peint par Appollée. Dessin de Raphael" [In Yambert, Des Démoniateurs et de Démonstrations (Paris: Péllicier, 1816)].

had ended his career in the Ministry of War. There is much to suggest that this work was written prior to L'Art d'obtenir des places, and was published five months later to cash in on the success of the manual for solicitors. Certainly, its divergence from the popular tone of Ymbert's other work marks it out as an aberration. However, it also casts new light on his satirical work, because it reveals his own distaste for the men he "encouraged" in his manuals. Blaming the "novelty" of Revolutions for creating a credulous world in which no one could be certain what was True or False, Ymbert offered his observations, not as light-hearted advice, but as a bitter commentary on the myths underlying career-making in post-revolutionary institutions, on a "bureaucracy" in which no amount of vigilance could protect against the machinations of unworthy colleagues:

if, in an office, there are some bad employees, always absent when needed and always present when not; if there are some who employ the few short hours they spend in the office commenting on journals... which fill the corridors with accounts of all the most scandalous events; if one finds [in one's office] some of those weaklings who, to excuse their laziness, have always unanticipated business to attend to... and who, as a price for such devotion and exemplary conduct, aspire imperiously to a raise in salary, how the office trembles! These clerks have only one means to obtain the advancement they demand and they employ it: they make themselves denouncers... In Ymbert's tableau, "Credulity", knowing how to take "all forms, all names, to wear all sort of clothes" transforms into a Secretary-General, a minister, and a prefect who eagerly welcomes all sorts of prejudices and false ideas sent to greet him. Charged with these spoils, he draws up an account which he transmits faithfully [to Paris]. There, it is again Credulity who receives [the account], seizing on its spirit, its principal

---

43 Not sharing the ton léger of the rest of the Ymbert canon, Des Dénonciateurs is rarely cited in accounts of bureaucratic satire, including even Bijaoui-Baron's La Bureaucratie.

44 Ymbert, Des Dénonciateurs, pp. 229-230. Ymbert recalls Louis Picard's depiction of office life during the Revolution, which blamed the reign of calumny
phrases, to arrange them in his own way, classifying and deposing them carefully in some carton to serve as information for all those who want to go awry.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 22-23.}

*Des Dénonciateurs* was no "manual of denunciation", but a denial of the very possibility of recognising intrigue in a chain of correspondence. Faked devotion made it impossible to tell a bad employee from a good clerk. Misleading reports sent to Paris made the administrative process completely redundant.

Ymbert was also explicit about how "Credulity" was rife in all post-revolutionary public institutions – in libraries, museums, and the *Athenée*.\footnote{Ibid., p. 28.} He also turned his pen against the Civil Code, alleging that, instead of uncloaking natural paternity, it brought "a cloud over the tableau of life; where open daylight would reveal defects, it spreads a favourable obscurity".\footnote{Ibid., p. 26.} Ymbert condemned the rhetoric of post-revolutionary emulation. In the Institute, "Gullibility" came "to hear eulogies accorded to the dead".\footnote{Ibid., p. 20.} He found "Envy", "armed with powerless satire, in the publishing house of certain journals, trying to defeat literary giants who, though dead, are still renowned".\footnote{Ibid., p. 45.} For Ymbert, the "art of pleasing" in the corrupt world of the nineteenth-century was a "flattery of imitation": subordinates copied the defects and vices of their superiors in order to gain promotions and advancements.\footnote{Ibid., p. 61} In *Des Dénonciateurs*, Ymbert disparaged the ghosts of literary giants and dead savants, of honest administrators and pure politicians: he offered new criticisms but no new solutions. He offered none of the hope that the reviewer of the *Constitutionnel* fabricated in calling his work a "manual". This work was neither political nor pleasing to anyone: unlike his other works, it did not appear in further editions and was soon forgotten as part of his larger oeuvre.

Even if *Des Dénonciateurs* could lambast every single area of post-revolutionary society as corrupt and false, it could not escape the paradigm of denunciation on excessive equality – which allowed the ordinary employee to have access to the ear of the minister (p. 54).
and solicitation as the means of success itself. Ymbert's "eulogy" to the skill of Apelle, whose critique of society he looked to emulate, reveals the legitimacy of his attack on denunciation as no more or less an illusion than the work of the denouncers themselves. Like the figure of "Envy" he described, Ymbert sought literary renown by arming himself with satire and going out to battle in the publishing house. Like "Credulity", he filled the corridors with accounts of the most scandalous events. With a eulogy accorded to the Dead (appealing, no doubt, to his readership's "Gullibility"), he vaunted the illusion of Apelle's authority in order to legitimise his attack on Secretary Generals and Prefects. If in Des Dénonciateurs, Ymbert neglected the "art of pleasing", he learned this lesson in his other works. L'art d'obtenir des places offered to "guide solicitors in pursuit of whatever object they desire" to codify a means of success for office workers. Ymbert's pictures of dishonesty and deceit, laziness and sloth, counterfeit and dissimulation, were not for fun: they were meant to pique the "flattery of imitation" of those craven enough to copy the defects and vices described. L'art d'obtenir des places, the first spoof manual, provided administrators with a defective model to emulate; it fabricated a code of appearances that would expose them to the revulsion of the Parisian populace.

Placing L'art d'obtenir des places in the context of Des Dénonciateurs, therefore reveals that Ymbert turned to the very practices and people he condemned in order to carve out a career as a littérateur. He used deception himself as a means to denounce the denouncers, encouraging those greedy and stupid enough to follow the line of attack outlined in his literary mystification. He therefore looked for an audience, not among Ministers and fonctionnaires, but among the dispossessed, among the men who crowded Ministry antechambers day after day, the men he hoped to deceive. His advice on comportment (to be unsoakable by rain and to learn to pass from the cold into extremely hot rooms without physical distress), on posture (intrigue compensates for lack of height and figure), and on tone of voice (those with a singing voice have more chance of success), made little sense (even the reviewer of Le Constitutionnel had some difficulty with the assertion that a nose of over three inches was an

51 [Ymbert], L'Art d'obtenir des places, p. 13
52 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
insurmountable barrier to being a successful solicitor). Yet both the Constitutionnel (as a means to bolster its attack on the Restoration government by casting aspersions on its subordinate employees) and the manual form itself presented Ymbert as an observer and instructor — his levity blurred the boundaries between what might be true and what was obviously false.®

When Ymbert counselled his reader to submerge himself in his role, verse himself in the art of dissimulation, and to put on his bravest face when faced by the worst disaster, he offered not bitter disillusion (as he had in Des Dénonciateurs) but a world of illusion in which his readers could take part.® Ymbert turned his reader into "an author" only to place him in "a vast theatre, surrounded by spectators, looking to read his emotions from his looks... and all seeking his downfall", convincing him that physiognomy not production was the basis of a successful solicitation. Turning authors into actors, and spectators into spies, at no time did Ymbert's administrative code present the offices as they were. When the Constitutionnel reviewer described how the solicitor who, having gained entry to the Ministry, found himself "within a labyrinth where he will be lost without [Ymbert] as his guide", he also presented Ymbert's L'art d'obtenir des places as the authoritative introduction to administrative practice. Therefore both politics and personal grudges combined to construct an administrative labyrinth, not in the movement of paper from province to Paris and back, but in the unfathomable depths of "bureaucratic" practice.®

The art of mystification

If the streets had become a barricade, a way to avoid or attract the public scrutiny of colleagues and superiors, they had simultaneously become a theatre, a place to display a virtuous and blemish-free exterior (or to be unmasked). During the Restoration, practical jokes, played by an anonymous assailant on the streets, became a means of social observation: the mystificateur, keeping his

® ibid., pp. 18, 19, 35-36. The reason that a solicitor should not have a long nose was for fear of it being caught in slamming doors.
®® ibid., pp. 122-123.
own intentions disguised, convinced his victims to reveal their stupidity and greed. In the summer of 1819, a party of tricksters showered money from the roofs of the rue de Montesquieu to convince the crowd below that a comet was raining gold. In the 1820s, Henry Monnier placed a love note inside the change passed by the omnibus conductor to a gentlewoman (waiting to see her reaction), replaying her coquettishness later in the company of his peers.

Between 1816 and 1830, the mystificateur usurped the art of mimesis to trap gullible gobe-mouches, tempting their victims to reveal their naivety, their idiocy or their dishonesty, standing by impassively so as not to reveal that the situation was not "real" but a practical joke. The mystification was a hoax which never revealed the truth to its victim. On the streets, mystifications, "the traps into which one makes a simple and credulous man fall, when one wishes to chaff him", found a new lease of life as a means of social critique, exposing the fantasies and self-delusions of those who had accepted ideas of "progress" and "honour" as real.
Mystificateurs also took hold of opportunities offered by the page and by the stage. In manuals of conduct, short newspaper articles and in caricatures, their *sang froid* allowed them to manipulate the "authority" of documentation, using a pedagogical or light-hearted tone to mask their disingenuousness. After the aberration of *Des Dénonciations*, Ymbert reproduced the formula of the spoof manual in *Éloquence militaire, où l'art d'émouvoir le soldat* (1818), *L'art du ministre* (1821), *L'art de faire des dettes* (1822), and its sequel *L'art de faire proméner des Créanciers* (1824). *L'art de faire des dettes* purported to educate readers in how to dodge their creditors, to exploit individualistic law for personal gain, to produce credit with no effort at "real" production.®® *L'Art de promener ses Créanciers* – dedicated to the victims of ministerial destitutions – counselled good book-keeping (not to pay back creditors, but to impress them), evasion (to wear out creditors' shoes), and the employment of a good porter (to turn debt-collectors away at the door).®° Continuing, therefore, to pitch his books to the cash-hungry, honour-grabbing administrative world, Ymbert invited the *commis* to indiscretion, to bankruptcy and, in the process, exposed them to public derision. He told his readers to wear masks, to take on disguises and, by trying openly to deceive, to reveal their lowest ambitions.®¹ Ymbert's literary *mystification* exploited its readers' anxieties with easy answers and promises of success, playing on the ambiguities of codes of behaviour and the emptiness of emulative rhetoric. His *œuvre* was complemented by guide books like Charles Rousset's

---

®® Melcher, *The Life and Times of Henry Monnier*, pp. 136-137, attributes this series, and those of the Codes and Manuals to Balzac. This provenance is due to the customary location of this literature between the years 1825-1830 (a precursor to the "realist" literature of the July Monarchy) rather than as a vibrant literature in its own right. It is also due to the tendency of Balzac to appropriate this literature in his novels, to take credit for the authorship of others, which I will discuss in Chapter Seven.


®¹ Judith Wechsler in *A Human comedy: physiognomy and caricature in 19th-Century Paris* (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1982), p. 33, cites Walter Benjamin "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century" as referring to this audience as petty-bourgeois. This label, although deterministic, is a reference to the audience's desperation to succeed (and hence their susceptibility to the literary *mystification*).
No mystification was complete unless the trickster fooled his audience completely: for the practical joker, this meant only that he had to keep his sang froid; for the literary mystificateur, this meant that he had to invent an imaginary author. The mystification of the 1820s played on uncertainties surrounding authorship on two levels. First of all, it manipulated assumptions about the composition of a love note or about the provenance of money falling from the sky to expose the coquette and the gobe-mouche. In the case of bureaucracy, it manipulated the absence of any true authors, to posit that everyone was – in his own fashion – an authority. The mystificateur also played with perceptions of himself as author and his relationship to his readers: in the second edition of L'art d'obtenir des places, Ymbert claimed that he had followed his own advice and already gained an administrative position. As he had fabricated his identity as a petitioner-made-good for the earlier spoof manual, Ymbert fabricated a role for himself as one of the "right sort" – un homme comme il faut – in his introduction.

62 Like Ymbert's backhanded reference to Administrative Codes, Rousset's work made a satirical reference to the Code Parisien of 1792, which had collected together all the decrees of the National Assembly related to Paris to make sense of the changes operated by the Revolution. See also Horace Raisson's Les Codes Littéraires, appearing between 1824 and 1830 as a parody of the Code Civil.

63 This also follows closely on Roger Picard's analysis in Artifices et mystifications littéraires (Montréal: Dussault et Pélaudeau, 1945), p. 8. Another example of a mystification in the 1820s is that of the trick played on the Société de Belle Lettres by a provincial, who, when entering his poetry to a competition, gave the impression of being a young woman. This mystification of a Society competition demonstrates how mystificateurs looked to expose not only pretences of individual merit, but also of social institutions: Laurentie, Souvenirs Inédits publié par son petit-fils, J. Laurentie (Paris: Bloud & Barral, n.d.), pp. 65-66.

64 Picard, Artifices et mystifications littéraires, pp. 8-9, also argues that there are two types of mystification – one in which authorship is unjustly claimed, and one in which authorship is unjustly attributed.
to *L'art de faire des dettes.* In his spoof biography, he alleged his honesty as an author, inviting his victims to emulate the man they thought he was, and to reveal their own cupidity. He set down the rules of a society where the only means to succeed was to be openly dishonest, avoiding the role of a denouncer by inviting his victims' belief in a mythical universe where everyone was *médiocre et rampant.*

In his description of the *homme comme il faut,* Ymbert therefore flattered his readership by portraying them as members of an elite disadvantaged by the new regime, whose profession was now to lead fashion, earning them the right to mount up debts as a creditor of society. When the *homme comme il faut* dined in the *café Tortoni* on the Boulevard des Italiens, the delicacy of his choices from the menu not only tempted others to eat, but made Italian truffles and bunting à la provençale the fashionable dishes of the day. As members of a "national elite", Ymbert told his *mystifiés* that their role as authors was to produce good taste and flaunt their urbanity. If the art of false biography and political scandal manipulated the public's need for authors as observers, the art of mystifying the Parisian clerk was to convince him he could act like a literary giant—having him demonstrate his pomposity on the boulevard and his stupidity in debtor's prison.

Ymbert was neither the *homme comme il faut* nor the guileful solicitor he pretended to be at various stages of his literary career. He worked from outside the ministries, poking fun at ex-colleagues, yet he pretended to observe life inside the bureaux. His satirical denunciation therefore differed greatly from that

65 [Ymbert], *L'Art d'obtenir des places,* pp. 7-8.
66 As noted by Jean-Claude Masson in Ymbert, *L'art de faire des dettes,* p. 88, the anonymity of his work meant that Ymbert's first names—Jacques-Gilbert—were created for him by the *Biographie Universelle Ancienne Moderne* in 1843. His real first name was Jacques-Albert.
68 See Albert Cim's discussion of false historical memoirs in this period in *Mystifications Littéraires et Théâtrales,* pp. 98-101. The bookseller Ladvocat was responsible for many of these false autobiographies: *Mémoires d'une Contemporaine,* written by Lesourd, Malitourne and Nodier, was attributed to Ida Saint-Elme, who had shared Napoleon's exile. Lamothe-Langon was the author of numerous memoirs on Mme du Barry, Louis XVIII, and Napoleon.
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of Cochaud's *Mon Appel au Peuple*, written during his dispute with Claude-Anthelme Costaz in 1808. In the case of Cochaud, everyone had known both the identity of its author and the specific brunt of its satire. Cochaud had passed his text among the "sous-chefs and bureau chiefs of the Ministry". It would have been clear to everyone that the memoir referred to Costaz when it asked if a bureau chief should keep his word, obey the orders of the Minister, and conform to the letter of the Secretary General's order. Therefore, when Lansel learned that the memoir was passing through the offices, he had no trouble in finding the culprit or understanding the nature of the work.\(^5\) When Ymbert, on the other hand, wrote *L'art d'obtenir des places*, he hid his own identity behind a fiction and made his caricatures apply in all administrations (but in no particular office) at the same time. For those seeking a position or a Ministry favour, Ymbert's manual confirmed their worst fears and suspicions about how – unless they too dabbled in nepotism and politics – they would never get ahead.

**Bureaucrats in the office**

As political and social satirists elaborated the codes developed by spoof manuals for their own ends, the office-worker, reading about the administrative purges of 1815 in his newspaper, and suspicious of the motives behind any attempt at ministerial reorganisation, applied them to his colleagues inside and outside the office, leading to the fabrication of political purges, like that of Claude-Anthelme Costaz. As the *manie des places* continued, it stoked an atmosphere of uncertainty which spread to the *café* and the *marchand du vin*, to the *boulanger* and the *épicier*, all of whom extended credit to the employees and feared that the certainty of repayment each month might evaporate.\(^7\) Neither administrator nor the man on the street could judge the moral import of individual particularities, or decide whether someone on the other side of the room held a malicious intent. The *mystificateur's* manual, in adding to the derogatory physiognomy of the

---

\(^5\) Letter, Cochaud to Lansel, 17 May 1808, A.N. fl/1bl/11-14.

\(^7\) Employees were the simultaneously best and worst debtors: state budgets guaranteed their wages, but put their places constantly under threat from re-organisation. This is more than likely one of the reasons for the amount of literature generated on life in the offices.
bureaucrat, provided a new language with which they could do so. It provided them with new means to comprehend (or justify) decisions that they could not understand or people they didn't trust.

In 1820, the Baron Rougier de la Bergerie, member of the Agricultural Society, a Correspondent of the Academy of Sciences, ex-member of the Legislative Assembly, member of the Legion of Honour, an ex-Inspector of Pools and Marshes, a former prefect and ex-member of the Bureau consultatif de l'agriculture, appealed to the Ministry of the Interior (through Richelieu, the Minister of Foreign Affairs) for financial support for his *Cours d'Agriculture pratique ou l'Agronome Français*.\(^1\) He argued that his *Cours d'Agriculture pratique ou l'Agronome Français* had been sidelined by the Ministry in favour of his ex-colleagues' journal, the *Annales de l'Agriculture Française*, and that he deserved the same number of ministerial subscriptions as Huzard, Bosc and Tessier.\(^2\) He claimed that his case was supported by a range of *haut-fonctionnaires*, including Bequey, Chabrol and Guizot, by the Secretary of State in the Department, Capelle, and by the Chief of the Division of Agriculture, Fauchat. On paper, it was a very good solicitation: he had served the Nation in a range of capacities (including in the Ministry of Interior itself) and could draw on the testimony of a number of well-connected men to intercede on his behalf.

La Bergerie's faith in his protectors was, however, wearing thin: his impressive service record had – so far – escaped the notice of the Minister. Fauchat, who had promised to support him, had been "too ill" to write a report in his favour. Richelieu had sent on his request, but had not interceded personally. This was not La Bergerie's first solicitation: he had been trying to secure the Ministry of Interior's protection since 1816, when he asked if he could hold classes in the

---

\(^1\) For a biography of Rougier de la Bergerie, see *Comptes Rendus hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, vol. III (July - December 1836) (Paris: Bachelier, 1836).

\(^2\) Letter, La Bergerie to Richelieu, 9 October 1820, A.N. f/10/203/b. The work in question was *Cours d'Agriculture Pratique ou l'Agronome Français, par une Société de Savans, d'Agronomes et de Propriétaires fonciers, dirigé par M. le Baron de la Bérgerie* (Paris: Audot, 1817 - ).
Museum on the rue des Petits Augustins. He had been unsuccessful in this attempt, and, soon, all that was left of the "Course" was a fortnightly bulletin, containing the laws and acts of government on rural economy and property, and occupying itself with current agricultural discoveries and a review of new literature on agronomy. This success of the bulletin was also cast into doubt by the Ministry's refusal to distribute it with its own correspondence (the only cost-effective means to transmit a bulletin to all the départements of France at the time). In 1817, La Bergerie asked that the Ministry take out five annual subscriptions for each département at 20 francs each, but this request was also turned down for reasons of economy. In 1818, La Bergerie, declaring that "agriculture had been abandoned to itself" in France, offered "to cease to receive [Ministry] funds, when subscriptions cover the cost of publication". This final letter was not only met with a refusal, but also with a robust denial that agriculture had been "abandoned". By quoting the Annales d'Agriculture as an example of how it already supported an agronomist periodical, however, the Ministry stepped outside the rhetoric of emulation (which emphasised the "progress" of agricultural science over the rivalries of its acolytes), which had governed its correspondence so far (and was the means by which Fauchat would try and smooth over the row once it broke out). The slip from the usual formal rhetoric of ministerial correspondence placed the Cours d'Agriculture in direct competition with a "sister" publication. In doing so, it provided an opportunity for La Bergerie's to launch a tirade against his ex-colleagues.

La Bergerie's solicitations in 1820 presented his rights, accumulated during his administrative service and by his contribution to agricultural progress in civil society. Yet, with the usual barriers to competition between authors cast down by the Ministry's mistake, La Bergerie went on to claim that he merited Ministerial

---

73 This outcome of this solicitation already revealed that Bergerie did not have the support he claimed to have. Fauchat advised the Minister to deny that any such arrangement was possible: letter, Minister of the Interior to La Bergerie, 16 February 1816, A.N. f/10/203/b.
74 Letter, La Bergerie to the Minister of the Interior, 8 February 1816, ibid..
75 Letter, Minister of the Interior to La Bergerie, 19 April 1817, ibid..
76 La Bergerie to the Minister of the Interior, 28 January 1818, ibid..
77 Letter, Under-Secretary for the Ministry of Interior to La Bergerie, 28 February 1818, ibid.
subvention "as much as Huzard, Tessier and Bosc, who do little of anything, because the Annales only contains copies of articles translated from English". Calling the merit of his colleagues' publication into question, La Bergerie launched into the overblown claims of unrestrained office politics. He was a "true agriculturalist"; he alone had "struggled against the monstrous project of surplus grain stores, which would have caused starvation"; he alone had battled against weevils; he alone had "dared to discuss underground irrigation for corn." He claimed he could send three issues of his Cours d'Agriculture to the Minister, each containing a matter of public utility; in the past ten years, he alleged, not a single useful invention had been published in the Annales.

In his report to the Minister on Bergerie's claim to merit a subscription equal to that of the Annales de l'Agriculture Française, Fauchat argued that La Bergerie had too much of a tendency to turn intellectual disputes into private vendettas. Even though the Ministry's refusals were primarily a matter of insufficient funds, La Bergerie's outspoken opposition to its expert academicians had not made him a favourite. The denunciation of Tessier, Bosc and Huzard was only one episode in a long-running battle between ex-colleagues and opposition to Ministry policies. In particular, Fauchat cited La Bergerie's critique of Decazes's latest report on Agriculture, in which he contradicted the Minister and the Conseil d'Agriculture paragraph by paragraph. Although he believed the Cours d'Agriculture contained many useful articles and precious discoveries, they were pronounced "in a trenchant tone, to which several respectable people had the right to take offence". For Fauchat, La Bergerie's arguments in the Cours d'Agriculture pratique resembled, not a scientific investigation, but "in general, a satire": the agriculturalist's mania for confrontation belonged more properly to a political rather than a scientific journal. Yet, despite La Bergerie's irritating transgressions of the protocols of civil society, Fauchat still advised that La

---

79 Letter, La Bergerie to Fauchat, 23 October 1820, ibid.
78 Letter, La Bergerie to the Minister of the Interior, n.d., A.N. f/10/203/b.
80 Ibid.
81 Letter, Chief of Third Division to La Bergerie, 17 November 1820, A.N. f/10/203/b.
82 Letter, [ ] to [ ], Councillor of State, 29 April 1820, ibid..
83 Report, Fauchat to the Minister of the Interior, 12 November 1820, A.N. f/10/203/b.
Bergerie's journal be given 1200 to 1500 francs in "encouragement", to convince him to moderate his tone and to collaborate and not compete with his fellow agronomists. Fauchat suggested that if, in 1821, the journal had stopped slandering the Bureau of Agriculture and La Bergerie's rival experts, the subscription should become a regular one. He tried to repair the damage done by the earlier slip from emulative rhetoric to incorporate La Bergerie in the protective net of the Ministry of Interior.

La Bergerie, however, was not satisfied with anything less than equal treatment. Although the rhetoric of emulation still reigned in the offices and in sociétés savantes, La Bergerie was no longer among its acolytes: he, a victim of disillusion, used the vocabulary of bureaucratic satire to accuse those he blamed for his marginality in the world of agricultural science. In the beginning of 1821, he wrote to the Ministry, complaining of "the little intrigues of bureaucracy", of "clerks used to getting ahead" and "sinecures". Fauchat, now rounding on his critic, noted that these insults do not apply to any employee of the division except its chief; there have been no new promotions [in the division] for several years, and ... this sinecure, for which he reproaches me, has required eight, ten or more hours of work a day, and sometimes night.

Fauchat, the pioneer of the Ministry's uniform means of success, the état de services, went head to head against a critic outside the bureau, turning his criticism aside with the "truth" of infrequent promotions and hard work on impossible tasks.

Fauchat did not underestimate the worth of La Bergerie's opinions and the depth of his knowledge. Tessier and Bosc had dedicated many years of their lives to advising the Ministry on agricultural matters and although their advice was sometimes faulty, this service, Fauchat believed, merited the respect of both the Ministry and their professional colleagues. Fauchat sought to "encourage" La Bergerie to work with the savants employed by the Conseil d'Agriculture, rather

84 Ibid.
85 Report, Fauchat, to the Minister of the Interior, 24 May 1821, A.N. f/10/203/b.
86 Ibid.
than against them, by promising subscriptions in 1821 if the *Cours d’Agriculture* made its criticisms in a more moderate fashion. La Bergerie persisted in seeing enemies everywhere, however, and abandoned any pretence at emulative rhetoric to mimic the accusations of the *mystificateurs*. He looked to the satirist to define the physiognomy of the administrator. As men like La Bergerie used newspaper-style satire to claim the advantages they believed they merited through their authorship, and the register created by Ymbert became institutionalised in vaudevilles and in caricatures, the satirical picture of bureaucracy took on an air of reality, reinforced by the superficial identity between the fictional bureaucrat and the administrator as seen in the corridors of ministries and in the streets of the faubourg Saint Germain. However, although La Bergerie took the language of the *Art d’obtenir* and applied it to reality in 1820, the administrators themselves still believed in the importance of respecting *ancienneté* and observing the politeness of emulation.

**The theatre of modern life**

The Division of Agriculture might not have countenanced La Bergerie's accusations, but there was another sort of office that did. During the 1820s, offices were constructed on the stage, for audiences to get a glimpse of what it was like to live inside a bureaucracy. Ymbert's anecdotes in which administrators revealed their own stupidity, with their emphases on physiognomy and dialogue, were easily adapted to this format. In particular, Ymbert's office vignettes were ideal for conversion into one-act vaudevilles, whose plots also were basic and easy to remember, and whose humour was often physical. Under the Restoration, smaller theatres like the *Gymnase Dramatique* re-opened after the lean years of Napoleonic regulation: the *Variétés* and *Vaudeville* also

---

87 Between 1815 and 1830, 369 comedies, 280 melodrames, 200 opéras-comiques and a staggering 1300 vaudevilles (more than the other three genres together) played on the Parisian stage. See Léon Metayer "La vaudeville de l'Empire et de la Restauration", *Europe*, 786 (October 1994), p. 40. Although figures do not exist for the Empire, they do for the Revolutionary period when, between the years 1789 and 1799, only 64 "vaudeville-anecdotes" appeared: Marc Regaldo "Le vaudeville pendant la Révolution", *Europe*, 786 (October 1994), p. 29.
began to attract a more fashionable crowd than the "popular" theatres of the boulevard du Temple.®® Secondary theatres broke even by producing short one-act plays which could re-run cheaply and quickly alongside others of the same genre. Each week they advertised their productions in the newspapers, listing three or four from which their audience could choose (increasing their audience potential proportionally). The vaudeville was therefore defined by the speed with which it could be produced – rehearsals could be as rudimentary as the script; in rhyming verse, it lent itself to quick retention. As there was no time to set the scene, sets became more and more specific. Characters were increasingly identified to their audience in terms of appearance or by their clothes, their expression and the objects they carried.

For that reason, the vaudeville had an immediate effect, as the Journal des Débats described in 1815: “once more, epigrams circulate to the tunes of popular songs... attacking the insolent pretensions of parvenus ... and the vanities of the bourgeoisie”.®® The spoof manual's brand of camaraderie and its satirical ton léger translated seamlessly into vaudeville airs and choruses, involving the audience in the entertainment, giving them the opportunity to sing along to familiar tunes, to shout abuse at the villain, and to groan at the naïveté of the hero. The audience's suspension of disbelief and the power of the mystification went hand in hand. The portrayal of an overblown manufacture of merit on stage manipulated the fact that the real administrator's codes of honour were no less "constructed", and no more "real". On occasion, the playwright's contrivances broke the spell, and provoked the audience's yawns. The most successful vaudevilles therefore succeeded in setting out a self-contained world in which the motives attributed to the characters were within the realm of possibility imagined

---

®® See John McCormick, Popular Theatre of Nineteenth-Century France (London & New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 24-27. McCormick notes that the Vaudeville and the Variétés were by the 1820s attracting a "bourgeois" audience, and that the Gymnase dramatique – the other theatre which successfully showed office vaudevilles – was even more "better-class" (p. 124). This is also the opinion of an American visitor to Paris, reported in Guillaume Berthier de Sauvigny, La France et les Français vu par les voyageurs américains, vol. I (Paris: Flammarion, 1982), p. 196, who classifies the Gymnase, Vaudeville and Variétés as "superior" to the other boulevard theatres.

®® Cited in Léon Métayer, "La Vaudeville de l'Empire et de la Restauration", Europe, 786 (October 1994), p. 44.
by the audience, though not necessarily consistent with the real world they satirised. The self-sufficient universe created for the mystification (to avoid the act of denunciation or simply to maintain the sang froid necessary for the trick to work) facilitated the characters' self-incrimination. It obviated the need for a Laroche to operate a "shameful proof" and to complicate the satire, as had happened twenty years earlier in Louis Picard's Médiocre et Rampant.

Vaudeville plots were therefore simple: L'intérieur d'un bureau ou la chanson (1823), written by Scribe, Varner and Ymbert, describes the employees of an office handing the authorship of a derogatory song about their Director-General up the hierarchy. The original author, the careless young rédacteur, Victor, leaves the verses at his desk. His expéditionnaire, Belle-Main, blindly copies them, mechanically reproducing the words without grasping their meaning. Finding the verses in Belle-Main's hand, their bureau chief, M. Dumont, dismisses the poor expéditionnaire. However, hearing subsequently that the Director-General is to be sacked, Dumont changes his mind about the verses, re-employs Belle-main, and in return takes credit as author. From this point onwards, the hierarchy of ministry vice unwinds. At each level, the employee adds some verses and corrects some defect, then claims the song for his own.

Other sorts of mystifications also made it to the stage in this period, including the story of the comet raining gold on the rue de Montesquieu, which was played on the 22 September 1819 under the title La Pluie d'or in the Théâtre du Vaudeville. A reviewer in the Journal de Paris, 266 (23 September 1819), however, reports that this mystification-vaudeville was, unlike the office comedies, unsuccessful. The characters encompassed a range of different professions, including the inventor of a "turned-up" umbrella, a frustrated artist who has been unable to get his paintings into the Salon, and Mile Mauvaise-Tête, an actress. Arlequin, the waiter who throws the coins from the roof of his café to attract customers and to win the hand of the proprietor's daughter, claims not to be an author but a "capitalist", with the right to deposit his funds at high or low rates of interest. The audience's displeasure, the reviewer notes, became evident when the character of Mile Mauvaise-Tête left good taste behind and the dialogue instead of being piquant, languished in absurdities.

The famous actor, Bernard Léon, played Belle-Main in this production. That it continued to be a significant role in his repertoire is shown by his taking it, along with Le Coiffeur et le Perruquier, on tour to Calais in 1825: Le Corsaire, 798 (25 September 1825).
Dumont cedes the verses to the chief of Division, M. de Valcour, who believes that the Director-General's replacement might find them amusing. However, when the original Director-General maintains his place, ownership of the verses suddenly becomes a liability: M. de Valcour promises first a promotion, then the hand of his daughter Eugénie, to Victor (to whom he has revealed "his" verses and whom he is desperate to silence). In the penultimate scene, De Valcour and then Dumont deny authoring the verses, casting blame on Belle-Main (the only man not to have re-edited the verses when copying them). Unwilling to let his comrade take the blame, Victor speaks up. The young rédacteur is rewarded for his honesty: the satire has uncovered a "truth" about the offices and Victor is praised, not punished, by the Director General.

By removing the "author" of the mystification, Scribe, Varner and Ymbert let the mediocre and crawling administrators operate their own "shameful proof". Young Victor, whose gay insouciance represents the spirit of the mystificateur, does not try to fool anyone, but simply watches in amazement as credit for his verses is passed from colleague to colleague. When he finally acknowledges his authorship, his selfless act both castigates the pretensions of his superiors and demonstrates the vacant talent of the mechanical nobody, Belle-Main. The fact that he is no longer the sole author of the verses is irrelevant: the facts of authorship are no longer in question; the end of the mystification does not reveal that everyone intended to take credit as author of the verses, but only that nobody wanted to accept the dismissal that might accompany it.

As in Médiocre et Rampant, there is no indication of the office in which the action is set. In January 1822, the play had been submitted to the Ministry as Matinée d'un bureau, but had been refused permission by the censors Lacretelle and Lémontey, who thought that it pointed a finger at government ministries. In a revised version of the play, the authors had replaced the words "His Excellency" (a Ministerial title) with the more subtle "To Monsieur Director-General" (an administrative position), the word "budget" with "council of administration", to suggest that the action took place in a commercial company. Although the plot

---

92 Report on "La matinée de Bureau: Théâtre du Gymnase-dramatique", 18 January 1822, A.N. f/21/972. See also the censor's edits in A.N. f/18/643.
had remained the same, this new version was approved. The censors remarked that how audience members might interpret the ambiguity was now beyond their control. Once overt political allusions had been eliminated, the bureau on stage no longer offered a critique of high politics but of ordinary bureaucrats: the Minister had found someone else to blame.93

The deceit of Dumont, de Valcour, and Belle-Main, centring as it does on ownership of a song, rather than a specific report, could therefore be held true for high functionaries or low employees, for commercial clerks or Ministry officials, for a notary's study or the backroom of a bank. Therefore, after L'intérieur d'un bureau proved a success, the play could be read as political – but not uniquely so. Such plays were both specific enough – and sufficiently vague – to allow the audience to read between the lines and, in doing so, fall for the plot. For the audience these satires spoke of someone else: the bourgeoisie were absolved of their own faults by watching the faults of others unmasked on stage. One could watch a play and imagine whomever one wanted as the "bureaucrat": a politician, a colleague, a neighbour, or a fellow administrator. However, when a member of the audience believed the play spoke of someone else, he became the denouncer, revealing his own political intent or concern to keep up appearances.

A reviewer in the Réveil used the moment to vaunt the play's political edge, taunting the government that its censors could never fully remove its political allusion from the play, informing it that "the shrewd spectator will be easily able to

93 Another example of a policy of government mystification is the amortissement des journaux in 1824. Villèle, as Minister of Finance and Head of Government under Charles X, engaged anonymous agents to buy up all the opposition journals in order to blunt their criticism. He continued to allow them to satirise minor officials but not high politics. When the affair came to a crashing end in 1824, however, high politics had been brought down to the level of office politics, and a dispute between the Editor and the Director of the paper. In a plot twist worthy of a vaudeville writer, a "real" edition was uncovered as the false production: Michaud, who still owned the majority of shares in the Quotidienne, realised that his editor, Simon, was in the pay of Villèle, and released a second issue on the 12 June, declaring the "official" edition a fraud and exposing the Government's deceit: Eugène Hatin, Histoire politique et littéraire de la Presse en France, (Paris: Poullet-Malassis & De Broise, 1861), vol. VIII, pp. 383-393; Laurentie, Souvenirs, pp. 63-98. Laurentie was one of the owners of La
recognise the original location. As the reviewers of the Journal des Débats or the Constitutionnel had in their reviews of Fiévée and Ymbert, the reviewer of the Réveil claimed it had been "whispered" to him that the piece was anecdotic. To absolve the play of moral ambiguity (to locate its charge outside of the theatre), the reviewer fell for the mystification. He claimed that such ignoble characters as clerks and functionaries (who had "replaced bailiffs and police commissioners as theatrical villains in the latest theatre") would normally be punished in a moral play, but that the characters in L'intérieur d'un bureau kept their places as the play's real target was outside the play. He therefore became a denouncer himself, making his allegations about the real world on the basis of a stage fiction.

With all explicit references to the Ministry removed, the tale of the maudit chanson in L'intérieur d'un bureau might also be seen to refer to vaudeville production itself. Eugène Scribe in 1823 was renowned for his tremendous output, yet this success was – to a large extent – dependent on his ability to get others to work for him. He was a play manufacturer rather than an artisan. As Benjamin reports in his Arcades Project,

[Scribe,] transferring the division of labour... to the ateliers of dramatic artists, who, before this reform, working with only their one head and one pen, had earned merely the proletarian wages of the isolated worker... chose the subject, sketched out the mainlines of the plot, indicated the places for special effects and brilliant exits, and his apprentices would compose the appropriate dialogue or verses. Once they had made some progress, their name would appear on the title page (next to that of the firm) as a just recompense, until the best would break away and begin

---

Quotidienne pressured into selling to the Ministry by a campaign of denunciation against him in the other newspapers controlled by Villèle.

94 "Première représentation de la Chanson ou l'intérieur d'un Bureau, comédie-vaudeville en un acte, de MM. Scribe, Imbert et Varner", Le Réveil, 211 (27 February 1823).

95 Scribe later became the playwright of his generation: between 1830 and 1855 he was involved in all the major vaudeville successes (and some of its failures) and was elected to the Académie in 1834.
turning out dramatic works of their own invention, perhaps also in their turn recruiting new assistants.\textsuperscript{96}

Like the "bureaucrats" that Scribe's vaudeville "firm" satirised, Ymbert had ceded ownership of his own pen to enter into "collaboration" with Scribe and Varner. As he had once passed his reports to a Division chief in the Ministry of War, he passed his verses onto Scribe for the final flourishes.

"Authorship" of the vaudeville was therefore as "imaginary" as that of the \textit{chanson} or ministerial report. Playwrights were not above manipulating appearances to generate praise for their productions and to avoid the stench of failure. Scribe, in particular, depended on the traditional anonymity offered to playwrights at the first show, to maintain his reputation as a box-office hit. On the opening night of \textit{L'intérieur d'un bureau}, the three authors took the stage when the crowd demanded a curtain call.\textsuperscript{97} Until that moment, no-one knew who had written the play. Like the clerks who claimed ownership of the verses so long as they believed their Division Chief had been dismissed (and denied all knowledge of the verses when it transpired that he remained their superior), the vaudevillist only boasted his authority as an author when it promised success, not failure. When the \textit{Petit Chronique de Paris} described a "Ministry of Gaiety" in 1818, both the pertinence of the office as a microcosm of post-revolutionary institutional production and the power of the \textit{mystification} as a means of critique were proven by the application of the bureaucratic charge to the production of vaudevilles. The piece ended with the dry observation

\begin{quote}
We are assured that [in the theatres] we will find no personnel for a bureau of invention; nevertheless, the competition to be minister has already sparked more intrigue than one ever finds in plays written by these \textit{messieurs}.\textsuperscript{98}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{97} \textit{Le Réveil}, 210 (26 February 1823). This was a time before Scribe's name was such a guarantee of success that it was appended to plays — like Molière's \textit{Tartuffe} — to guarantee an audience.

\textsuperscript{98} The term "Ministry of Gaiety" appears in a satirical piece about vaudeville production in E.T-Maurice Ourry & Balthasar Sauvan (eds.) \textit{Petit Chronique de Paris, faisant suite aux Mémoires de Bachaumont, receuil d'anecdotes comiques},
It was because the sort of critiques made by bureaucratic satire could be applied to other post-revolutionary institutions like the theatre or the press (where journalists signed their reviews with pseudonyms, claiming authorship of articles only after they had won renown), that the critique of lower functionaries took on a social, rather than political, function. Lémontey and Lacretelle, when approving the production of *L’Intérieur d’un bureau*, were content with it as long as it was set in the world of commerce, not government. Similarly, vaudevillists were happy to critique disputes over ownership of verses, as long as those disputes were set in the Ministry of Finances or the Foreign Affairs and not in the "Ministry of Gaiety". Both censor and dramatist, however, knew that a play on paper might be read differently than a play on stage, and that there was no way of controlling the message taken by the audience from the production. The power of the *mystification*, in inviting the theatre crowd to believe that all offices were bureaucracies, destroyed rather than restored legitimacy. If vaudevilles set in offices had initially been read as a means of lambasting politicians, they could also be read as a means of criticising playwrights. They had, moreover, always been a way of condemning administrators. By creating its illusions, the vaudeville slowly disillusioned its audience: by destroying the legitimacy of administrators, it destroyed the legitimacy of post-revolutionary institutions.

When Ymbert's *Le sous-chef Gautier* (a play centring on the appointment of three illiterate Auvergnats to positions within an administration, so that their brother could fill the places in a new bureau before his Director returned that afternoon) was sent to the censor in 1825, it elicited only a shadow of the reaction that greeted its predecessor. Ymbert had learned that he had to set the play in a *maison d’assurance*: a locked *caisse*, which played a part in the plot of the play, already testified to the commercial nature of Gautier's office. One of the four censors still opposed the motion of approval, believing that its intention was to generate "spiteful laughter at the expense of Ministerial bureaux, and to ridicule...

---

*galantes, satiriques* (Paris: veuve Pernonneau, 1818), pp. 313-315. This journal was published anonymously which protected the identity of Balthasar Sauvan, who was a clerk in the Ministry of the Interior.
the choices that [the Ministry] makes". Lémontey spoke for everyone else, however, when he commented that "under the guise of an insurance office, [the authors] probably intend to present some administrative details, some of which have already been staged and have proved of little importance... If some [ministerial] functionaries are as weak as Gautier, it is an abuse; and the government is as eager as anyone to see such abuses end". In two short years, bureaucratic satire had turned from high political satire into a depiction of real problems of bureaucracy.

Therefore, when Stendhal lauded Ymbert as the second funniest man in Paris (after Scribe), and praised him for presenting a "mirror of our customs and our current morals", he could still treat the play as a political charge, he was alone in doing so. Stendhal commented that "a body of seven or eight malevolent men of letters, under the direction of M. Lémontey, forbid writers from painting the present state of morals". He then drew a parallel between the character Gautier and the Prefect of Paris, the Count de Chabrol (whose brothers – one of whom was the incumbent Minister of the Marine – he painted as the Auvergnats of the play). Stendhal alleged that the public clearly recognised that the sous-chef was a Minister and the places he gave to his family were those of Secretary of State, or high positions in the Ministry. Yet perhaps the novelist, in his search for allegory, should have spent more time watching the play: Gautier was not untalented, as he suggested (at the end of the play, it was recognised that he could do the job of four men) and – contrary to Stendhal’s review – his sister was

---

100 Opinion, Lémontey to the Minister of the Interior, 3 January 1825, ibid.. The play was also in prose, rather than verse, which the final authorisation remarks is less dangerous: autorisation, 6 January 1825, ibid.. For the edited play script, see A.N. f/18/653.
102 Ibid., p. 190.
103 Chabrol is the same prefect who tried to protect his employees from the "white purge" at the beginning of the Second Restoration:
104 Ibid., p. 192
certainly not his mistress! Stendhal was out of step and out of place: he was alone in his attempt to present the play as a commentary on high politics.

*La Pandore* (for which Ymbert himself wrote), on the other hand, commented not on the politics of the play, but on "the same administrative physiognomies that one sees often in the corridors of the bureaucracy". The reviewer noted that, although the play had not been a success on the first night (the audience had begun to yawn during the play, and the authors had maintained their anonymity), the audience had picked up in subsequent showings, and the play was enjoying quite a run. The wider debate on the merits of *Le Sous-Chef Gautier* was not about high politics but about the piquancy of its portrayal of morals, the originality and finesse of its characters, and the flow of the dialogue. Citing these attributes of a good vaudeville, the *Corsaire* denigrated the confusion, extravagance and bizarrely unreal premise of *Le Sous-Chef Gautier*. Even though they disagreed as to the overall worth of the play, both papers judged the play on the accuracy of its types: as a social critique rather than a political allegory.

As Ymbert took on work as a journalist writing for the liberal journals, *Le Corsaire* and *La Pandore*, in the 1820s, and adapted his anecdotes for the vaudeville

---

105 Gauthier's sister had never been his mistress (as Stendhal maintained), even prior to the censor's edit. Tormented, perhaps, still by the doomed love affair which provoked him to write *De l'Amour* (a short sketch of the foolishness of love, which he claimed later to be the "first" physiology), Stendhal doubted that a sister could have such influence over a man. If she had been more than a sister to Gautier, moreover, her love for her young cousin, a key part of the plot, would have been somewhat problematic.


107 Ibid., 839 (31 August 1825).

108 The newspaper was in the middle of an extended dispute with the *Théâtre des Variétés* (where the play was first performed). This battle might also have contributed to the cold welcome the play received on its first showing. When the reviews of the play came out after its first night, the *Corsaire* alleged that one of its competitors in affording the play a positive review (comparing his work to Molière's *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*), hoped to mystify the author into self-revelation. The *Corsaire*’s campaign against the *Théâtre des Variétés* – and the systematic denigration of *Le Sous-Chef Gautier* as part of it – can be read in issues 774 (31 August 1825), 775 (1 September 1825), 780 (6 September 1825), 790 (16 et 17 September 1825), 799 (26 September 1825), 801 (28 September 1825), 804 (1 October 1825), 806 (3 October 1825), 807 (4 October 1825).
stage, his *mystifications* therefore changed in intent. His most famous work, *Moeurs Administratives* (1825), a two-volume exposé of bureaucratic abuses, addressed the general public and not an audience of administrators. Presenting his text in the form of letters written to a Minister's wife, Ymbert tempted his readers to believe in amusing caricatures of office shenanigans and snapshots of ministerial deceit. Although he no longer tricked administrators into unmasking themselves as bureaucrats, *Moeurs Administratives* was still a *mystification.* This time around, Ymbert portrayed himself as an "Ex-Excellence" and addressed himself to the *moutons*, the people of France suffering under a bureaucracy they could not fathom. He promised to disabuse his readers of the administration's "sorcery" and to teach his readers about their shepherds. Having fabricated his own credentials as an observer, by claiming to have once been a high official, he set the trap for the *moutons* himself, claiming his satire also had a serious edge, as an exposé of an administration that had proliferated and invaded everywhere and everything. He cloaked the purpose of the book by informing his readers that the book had been published because the booksellers found it amusing, but he had written it because he thought it would be useful. He carefully constructed the impression that his book was "true", while using his *ton léger* to hide that it was denunciation.109

109 During the 1820s, Ymbert wrote for *La Pandore* and *Le Corsaire.* From the mid-1820s, articles on "bureaucratic morals" appeared in the latter: they satirised subjects including the day in the life of a solicitor (he denounces a *receveur* and takes his position) [*Corsaire, journal des Spectacles, de la Littérature, des Arts, Moeurs et Modes* (9 June 1824)], and the day in the life of a ministry spider living in a dusty carton (its most memorable line, "we do not lack for flies in winter or in summer", was an allusion to "credulous" employees or *gobe-mouches*) [*Le Corsaire* (21 July 1824)], or figures like the bureau chief [*Le Corsaire* (28 July 1825)]. An article reprising Ymbert's list of the characteristics necessary to keep one's place appeared in *Le Corsaire* (16 October 1825). These articles were all less than a column long and presented a single anecdote of office incapacity.  

110 Ymbert, *Moeurs administratives*, 2 vols. (Paris: Ladvocat, 1825), vol. i, p. i. A reviewer in the *Revue Encyclopédique* judged Ymbert not to have been utterly successful in his "serious" study of administration: that real administration had little in common with the light-heartedness of Ymbert's book. The formalities of administration, it judged, might be sometimes amusing but, nonetheless, they were indispensable: *Revue Encyclopédique ou Analyse raisonnée des productions les plus remarquables dans les sciences, les arts industriels, la littérature et les beaux-arts par une réunion de membres de l'Institut et d'autres hommes de lettres* (Paris: Rignoux, August 1828), pp. 483-484.
In his Introduction, Ymbert claims that his "hilarity of judgement" would have been proscribed except that it had cheered up the minister's wife. He again uses this fictional minister's wife to "prove" the accuracy of his depiction of the offices in the opening dialogue, where she features, discussing Ymbert's book with her husband and his Secretary General, in the privacy of their country garden. As the conversation progresses, their words underline the vanity and nullity of the administration's claim to probity. When the Secretary General declares that Ymbert has surely fabricated the story of the minister secretly taking lessons in diction from a professor of eloquence, and practising his parliamentary speeches in an attic room, the Minister immediately corroborates Ymbert's story by muttering under his breath:

The Devil! how did the author know that? The story is true; it was necessary that I lose my accent. There is nothing funny about that!^

Similarly, when the minister launches into an impromptu oath of devotion to his King — in the chance that his neighbours might somehow overhear — the ridiculousness of the administration is confirmed by his puffed-up protestations. His wife chides him that, as they are in the countryside, there is nobody to hear, that he does not need to play his role.

This dialogue confirms the saliency of his satire and his claim to be writing a serious exposé of administrative faults. Though self-evidently fictional, it lures the reader into suspending his disbelief and swallowing the rest of the book along with the garden conversation. The minister's wife's reminder to her husband that he does not need to act out his devotion to King and Country, recalls the stereotypes of "bureaucrate" set up by the earlier literature. Moreover, the "theatrical" device which allows the readers to "eavesdrop" on a private conversation, turns them into first-hand witnesses of the anecdotes that follow, obliterating Ymbert's role as an intermediary. Having set up his novel as a self-contained universe of corruption and intrigue, akin to that which he concocted for the vaudeville stage, Ymbert dedicated the rest of his book to the miniature vignettes he wrote for vaudevilles and journals. If politics — seeking the authority of observers — had nurtured mystificateurs in the early years of the Restoration,
now mystification had become essential as the basis of political satire. Ymbert no longer purported to write for administrators, but for the general public: yet he operated in the same fashion, by enticing his readers into the scene and making them believe themselves privy to the secret of what occurred.

As a final part of his mystification, Ymbert found a new authority for his critique in the fabrication of the Napoleonic Golden Age of Administration. Cloaking the "facts" of his role as author once more, he disguised his own years as an administrator by carving out the possibility of a virtuous ministry against which the reader could compare the corrupt world of Moeurs Administratives. The myth of a Golden Age allowed Ymbert to create a dichotomy between old and new, between past and present, between true honour and the disgrace of administration under the Restoration. Under the Empire, administrators always turned up to their offices: able to survive on an hour's sleep, stretched out on an office armchair, feet flung out across cartons and papers, they were always on hand to answer a sudden summons or to write an urgent report. Ymbert, in such terms, detailed a physiognomy of administration subordinated to a single authority – the will of Napoleon. In a description of the bureau conditions supposedly generated by the Emperor's insomnia, he constructed a virtuous administration, whose ghost now poured scorn on the administration of the present. Having convinced his readers of the "truth" of this administrative utopia, Ymbert alleged that Restoration officials were the complete opposite of their hardworking Imperial counterparts. They were lazy, corrupt and incompetent: instead of catching forty winks on an office chair, the Restoration bureaucrat slept warm each night in the arms of young protectress.

112 For a similar project but with different political slant, see Alexandre Duval's notice for "La Manie des grandeurs", Théâtre, vol. VII, p. 343 (this play was first presented in the Théâtre Français on the 21 October 1817), cited in Bijiaoui-Baron, La Bureaucratie, pp. 502-503. As a royalist, Duval blames the Revolution for stirring ambitions and locates the peak of administrative intrigue during the Napoleonic empire.
114 Meals were given up, individual desks abandoned in favour of a single table; the extreme application of the Napoleonic administrator to his work made him sick and gave him ulcers: Ymbert, Moeurs administratives, vol. I, pp. 160-162.
When Ymbert depicted the minister, concentrating not on his work, but on his wife and his dinners, lavishing attention not on his duty but on his living quarters, he set the scene for the entire book. Ymbert launched his critique of Restoration bureaucracy by telling how (unlike his Napoleonic counterpart, who had often been dragged from his bed during the night to send an urgent letter), the Restoration Secretary General, like a *femme de ménage*, trades in candle wax and oak. Similarly, he accused the Minister of selling his powers of appointment to the highest bidder, trading in places, negating his own authority and abandoning the administration to intrigue, denunciation and servility. In Ymbert's *Moeurs Administratives*, the administration, denied a virtuous dictatorship, falls prey to corruption, to a malaise that stretches from the highest echelons down to the lowest agent who, to mask his nullity, invented fictional tasks from the mounds of paper. From the initial dialogue onwards, Ymbert reveals a hierarchy of vice, a physiognomic *état de services* based solely on cupidity and self-interest. Within his *mystification*, virtue no longer exists in the Restoration bureau – each cold and shivering supernumerary has the potential to be a fat and-warm Secretary General.

**The physiognomic *état de services*.**

The new bureaucratic charge was formed, not in new plots or new *mystifications*, but by developing the range of items and gestures in which one could "read" bureaucratic sloth. The increased emphasis placed on visuality and reality paralleled other developments in the forms of Restoration culture, including the emergence of lithographed caricatures as a key form of social commentary. These caricatures took on the range of physiognomic signs developed by the literary *mystificateur*. In *L'intérieur d'un bureau ou le chanson*, a cluttered but easily constructed backdrop framed the vaudeville: a table at the back of the scene was loaded with cartons and dossiers; office apparatus – cartons, papers, inkwells, pens, pocket-knives and graters – adorned a second table to the left; an old armchair and a wicker basket completed the scene. This clutter gave the immediate impression of disorder and disuse; the profusion of objects, however, served to highlight the traits of the different characters – none more than Belle-
Main, the old *expéditionnaire* who was the first person the audience saw on stage, surrounded by the tools of his trade.

The objects not only elaborated the copy-clerk's physiognomy, but also proved indispensable to the plot. Belle-Main, mechanically copying out administrative reports, blindly picks up the satirical song, which has fallen from Victor's desk into a nearby carton. The clutter is responsible for this mistake, which precipitates the movement of the verses up the administrative hierarchy. The objects surrounding Belle-Main reinforce his idiocy, a point that the script draws attention to when Belle-Main describes himself in relation to his armchair:

> You see this desk and this armchair. Twenty years ago I installed myself here, bag and baggage, that is to say with pocket-knife, pens and my umbrella... Everything has moved except for my armchair, which is still on its feet, like I am on mine. It is always there, sealed into the floor, stationary and immobile, and I try to be like it: I don't go forward but I stay where I am.\(^{115}\)

From Belle-Main's physical environment, the audience could recognise the mechanical employee whose perfunctory zeal was encapsulated by his armchair, gelled to the same spot after twenty years of continuous use. The audience therefore was asked to recognise Belle-Main, from the beginning of the play, as the long-serving employee, inseparable from his desk and with no hope of advancement. Spending an elaborate amount of time covering his cuffs before proceeding to write, his actions all underscored his assertion that he never read or remembered what he copied.\(^{116}\)

The playwrights furthermore played with the contrast between Victor, the dandy young man who carelessly leaves his hat behind to signify his presence in the office, and the decrepit old copy clerk, who pays obsessive attention to his cuffs and who remains glued to his armchair.\(^{117}\) They manipulated Belle-Main's rapid transformation from despair to expectation (from destitution to promotion),

---


\(^{116}\) Ibid., p. 7.

\(^{117}\) Ibid., p. 10.
however, to demonstrate that every clerk is potentially corrupt. Belle-Main is shaken out of his torpor by the dream of buying a wedding-suit and proposing to his girlfriend, Mademoiselle Charlotte. As he thinks he is progressing up the hierarchy, his zeal for his work subsides as he rushes from the office to buy a new coat and trousers. On returning, he regards his "threadbare clothes" with "tenderness and pity". Belle-Main's desire for advancement (which he denies in the first act) is revealed by his dream of marrying Mademoiselle Charlotte (as Victor dreams of marrying Eugénie de Valcour), and signified to the audience by a rush to buy Louvier cloth. After his dismissal, Belle-Main brandishes his writing equipment, the tools of his trade, his hat and his umbrella, to focus attention on his plight. Through the machinations of the plot, reflected in his different relationships to the office furniture and his own clothes, each element of Belle-Main's persona is elaborated. Ymbert, Scribe and Varner located the whole range of bureaucrat physiognomy within a single man, who turns from a decrepit honest clerk into a dandified parvenu and back again.

As time progressed, the vaudeville became more and more precise in the list of objects to be introduced on stage, its dialogue emphasising their importance and identifying how they should be read. Slowly but surely, the range of visual signs by which bureaucracy could be seen and understood took shape. In *Le Sous-Chef Gautier*, the objects in Gautier's office are even allowed to speak for themselves. As Gautier's superior, M. de Héricourt, surveys his new office, fully staffed by the ever-effective Gautier, he is pleased by the swish of leaves as the illiterate Auvergnats turn them "like real clerks" (M. de Héricourt is blissfully ignorant, as the country cousins are, that there is more to being an administrator than turning pages at a leisurely pace). It is only when he questions the Auvergnats that their accents give them away, and a peaceful scene of activity turns into a hostile encounter between ex-farmers and garçons de bureaux. D'Héricourt is fooled by the "air of an office", which Gautier has constructed in the space of seconds: tables, inkpots, registers and paper were enough to persuade Gautier's superior that this was a real setting that one might find "in the corridors of any bureaucracy".

---

118 Ibid., p. 12.
119 Ibid., p. 30.
By 1828, the set of a stage office was reassuringly familiar. *Les Employés*, a comedy-vaudeville by d'Allarde and Alhoy (under the pseudonyms, Francis and Maurice), presented its audience with a *sous-chefs* bureau, looking into a *surnuméraire*’s alcove (where a hat hung to indicate an employee’s absence), a cash room and a general office filled with tables laden with writing equipment.120

*Les Femmes d’employés*, in 1832, also set the scene as an office, with a *secrétaire* on the left, a table on the right, and a coat thrown lackadaisically over a chair. Yet this was no office but the home of Blondel, a Ministry employee. The play begins with him casting an exasperated eye at the papers arranged in the *secrétaire*, heaving a sigh of relief and declaring:

> Finally my papers are arranged! It’s been eight or nine months since I’ve looked them over... The used paper will do for my wife’s food wrappers, and the unused sheets, for accounting and drafts. Even though my office furnishes me with paper and pen when I need them, one must still have order. Now, my coat: it hasn’t been brushed down.... [calls his maid] Félicité! Bah! I'd have it brushed down as soon myself [brushes and beats his coat]. The employee has to be like a soldier, strict with time and with his appearance. If I'm late five minutes to my office, they think I'm sick.121

In *Les Femmes d’Employés*, the office is transposed into the employee’s house, and the audience is introduced to the character through his concern for his appearance and the order of his papers. By invoking his fetish for pen and paper (and his grumpy care for his appearance), the dramatist introduces Blondel and his wife solely in their relationship to paper, appearance and promptness. Blondel’s home became a surrogate office to make him legible to the audience as a “bureaucrat”. A range of signs, repeated over and over, merged the figure of

---

the administrator with the denunciation of bureaucracy, the tools of his trade with the proof of his incapacity, his ambition with greed.\(^{122}\)

Caricatures, like vaudevilles, developed by retracing well-worn lines and regurgitating the same themes. Caricatures were not a solitary enjoyment, but a shared experience in a *cabinet de lecture* or in the office: shared consumption, as in the theatre, allowed readers to relate subject matter to their own experiences and to verify that others were doing similarly. With the invention of lithography in Munich in 1798, and its communication to Paris under the Empire, prints could be produced by the artist himself with special ink on a flat stone – without the specialized skills of a woodcarver or copper engraver. The significant increase in the speed with which lithographs could be produced both increased the volume of prints and made it viable economically to produce shorter runs of more specific images.\(^{123}\) When Henry Monnier began his work as an illustrator, the majority of his work was in producing lithographs of actors and actresses for the theatres, taking the world of costumes and characters off the stage and back onto the page. He worked, in particular, for the Gymnase where he produced several portraits of Bernard Léon (who had played Belle-Main in *L'Intérieur d'un bureau*), for the Vaudeville, where he sketched Lepeintre (who played Blondeau in *Le Déjeuner des Garçons*, 1823), had also taken the employee out of the bureau. Its authors, Gabriel and Edmon, describe a meal hosted by Auguste, Ministry of the Marine employee, attended by comrades from the Ministries of the Interior, War and Food Supply. The picture of greed is confirmed by both bureaucratic physiognomy and inappropriate luxury when Michelin, recently offered the position of *sous-caissier* in an insurance company, sings of how this promotion will secure his and his wife's fortune: Powder, penknife, ruler, grater / Are prepared for this intention; / Carrying my arsenal and baggage / Tomorrow, I'll enter the new position. / More exact than ever. / My dear, after being / Retired the last twenty months/ [You will] judge the ardour of my pen / Restored to activity. Denied the loan which would underwrite his new job, he proceeds to steal chicken legs to bring home to his starving wife. Turned down the chance to ply his fare with the tools of his trade, he fills his pockets with the luxuries that "all" clerks aspire to: he therefore combines the physiognomy of a pen pusher with that of a poultry pilferer: Gabriel & Edmon, *Le Déjeuner d'Employés, comédie-vaudeville, en un acte, représentée, pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le théâtre de vaudeville, 18 juillet 1823* (Paris: Mme Huet, 1823).  

\(^{122}\) The physiognomy of the bureaucrat could also intersect with the other physiognomies developed by mystificateurs. *Le Déjeuner des Garçons*, in 1823, describe a meal hosted by Auguste, Ministry of the Marine employee, attended by comrades from the Ministries of the Interior, War and Food Supply. The picture of greed is confirmed by both bureaucratic physiognomy and inappropriate luxury when Michelin, recently offered the position of *sous-caissier* in an insurance company, sings of how this promotion will secure his and his wife's fortune: Powder, penknife, ruler, grater / Are prepared for this intention; / Carrying my arsenal and baggage / Tomorrow, I'll enter the new position. / More exact than ever. / My dear, after being / Retired the last twenty months/ [You will] judge the ardour of my pen / Restored to activity. Denied the loan which would underwrite his new job, he proceeds to steal chicken legs to bring home to his starving wife. Turned down the chance to ply his fare with the tools of his trade, he fills his pockets with the luxuries that "all" clerks aspire to: he therefore combines the physiognomy of a pen pusher with that of a poultry pilferer: Gabriel & Edmon, *Le Déjeuner d'Employés, comédie-vaudeville, en un acte, représentée, pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le théâtre de vaudeville, 18 juillet 1823* (Paris: Mme Huet, 1823).
in Les Femmes des Employés) and the Théâtre des Variétés (where he made his own debut with La Famille Improvisée in 1831, and where Ymbert had shown Le sous-chef ou la famille Gautier in 1825).124

The portraits of stage bureaucrats Monnier did for the theatres contributed to his portraits of "real" bureaucrats in Moeurs administratifs, two albums of lithographs printed in 1828.125 Liberating caricature from the confines of a vaudeville plot, this album allowed Monnier to display all the levels of the physiognomic hierarchy in order. The first series provided a sense of contemporaneity by picturing examples of administrative corruption existing simultaneously but independently of one another. Whereas vaudevilles could only show a single vista, Monnier's Moeurs Administratives focused on what seemed like the entirety of administration, from the garçon de bureau's vestibule to the Division Chief's office. In the second series, Monnier took its audience on an hour-by-hour tour of the offices he had just surveyed, showing personnel trapped in flagrant abuse of their duty to the public. His caricatures codified the physiognomy of the vaudeville, reproducing the same relationship of administrator to object. While his portraits might be taken for unimaginative reality by those whose only experience of the office was of its depiction on the stage, this was a wholly negative means of judging office life which had no equivalent in the real world. There was no physiognomic hierarchy of virtue in the offices to match Monnier's hierarchy of bureaucratic vice.

124 Melcher, The Life and Times of Henry Monnier, pp. 41; Aristide Marie, Henry Monnier, 1799-1877 (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1983), pp. 236-239. Although Marie does not list any portraits of Léon or Lepeintre in any bureaucratic roles except that of Brunet as a procureur in L'intérieur d'un étude for the Théâtre des Variétés in 1828, his bibliography of Monnier's lithographs is neither complete nor verifiable. Monnier was certainly working as a theatre illustrator in the Gymnase in the period prior to the production of L'intérieur d'un bureau (Monnier executed a lithograph of Dormueil in the role of Vauberg in Les Grisettes in 1822). He was also working in the Théâtre de Variétés in the period before the production of Le sous-chef Gautier, as he produced two lithographs of Léon in the roles of Michel in Emprunts à la Mode and as Franval in La Mansarde des Artistes in 1824.
125 I have placed reproductions of this series in the Appendix.
Monnier's caricatures, ranging from the *garçon de bureau* to the division chief, display a progressive diminution of ability and zeal, matched by a progressive inflation of greed. The corpulent *garçon de bureau* begins the series by stoking the stove, wiping his hands in his apron, and invoking the impression of a man hardened to the dirty customs of the bureau, but willing to serve nevertheless. Next, Monnier pictures the *sumuméraire*, haggard and pale, driven by his zeal to be entered on the payroll and surrounded by the paraphernalia of the office – inkwell, pen, open cartons, hat and scarf on a peg. Monnier also identifies the *employé* by his inkwell and pen: crouched over his desk, he seems congealed to the spot and shrouded in a thick coat. He is distinguishable from the *sumuméraire* by the immobility of his pose and by the loaf of bread perched on his desk – his existence not quite as lean as that of the unpaid intern. Little luxuries are again used to depict the increase in avarice as Monnier's caricatures ascend the administrative hierarchy: the *sous-chef* reclines to have his beard trimmed by his *garçon de bureau*; the Bureau Chief sits on a comfortable armchair, legs crossed, reading, his office adorned with carafes and not cartons; finally, the Division Chief is caught red-handed enjoying a glass of wine.

The second series of *Moeurs administratives*, which claims to represent a normal working day and to detail the fashion in which the employees fill the hours between eight and four, seek to confirm the hierarchy as "real". From the *garçons de bureaux*’s idle chit-chat at eight o'clock onwards, it chronologises a life of idleness and inability. During the course of the day, the employees read journals, feign zeal for the entrance of the division chief, and transmogrify the bureau into a café. The second series is crowned by Monnier's depiction of the office at two o'clock, instantly remarkable by its uncluttered atmosphere and its ordered interior. Not only devoid of clutter, but also of personnel, this depiction of the bureau heightens the effect of the other caricatures by showing only objects and no bureaucrats. The stove occupies centre place in a bureau populated by discarded hats. Radiating heat to empty desks, it accuses the luxury of the bureaucrat, the wastage of the government funds to keep hats, not bodies, warm.

The depiction of administrative hours in the second series of *Moeurs Administratives* therefore solidified the move from a condemnation of individual
characters (or politicians) to depict the "bureaucrat" as a social type. Four extra lithographs complemented the hour-by-hour pictures of idleness, depicting "special" events in the bureau schedule. First of all, a young woman — overlooked by a stern chaperone — solicits an unspecified favour from the Director. At another occasion, employees fall over each other to greet a new Minister. Next, Monnier shows us the bored inhabitants of the solicitors' waiting room, whose dour figures seem to form the furniture of the antechamber. Finally, an employee, in the process of demanding a pay-rise, enters the Director's office: his meek, obeisant physiognomy is in marked contrast to the proud, disdainful figures of the men surrounding him — the Director, his private secretary, and the garçon de bureau bringing up the rear. By placing these significant moments of solicitation alongside the chronology of an office day, Monnier alleged their routine nature, turning them into a daily part of bureaucratic life. By presenting them within a series noting more generally avarice and sloth, Monnier conflated greed with solicitation, turning the protestation of virtue into an indicator of vice. Like Ymbert and the other vaudevillists, who had already made solicitation a byword for avarice and stupidity, rather than intrigue, Monnier denuded the offices of wider political significance by structuring them explicitly as an exposé of petit commis and not of men of state.

By transforming an entire administration into bureaucrats, Monnier no longer pictured individual characters, but instead described a "type": he had determined an active register of luxury and laziness with which each member could immediately be identified and classified by the observer. This physiognomic état de services identified the merit of each employee in relation to the hours they served each day (the Division Chief arrived at midday; the clerks left the ministry at four, but had all disappeared from their offices at two o'clock) and by their attitude while sitting at their desk (sitting straight, hunched useless, reclining languidly). Their physical presence defined their worth. By placing the zealous sumuméraire within this physiognomic hierarchy, Monnier indicated that he was merely a bureaucrat-in-the-making, and that he would soon be reading newspapers like his colleagues at eleven o'clock. There was no physiognomic hierarchy of virtue for the bureaucrats (as the office état de services had no means to represent vice): a class of lazy and greedy bureaucrats found
themselves regimented and catalogued by the shrewd observer. They found themselves castigated and scorned at each rung.

When Monnier produced a new edition of his *Scènes Populaires dessinées à la plume* in 1835, he included a sketch entitled "Scènes de la Vie Bureaucratique". Meant to be read rather than performed, this sketch tried to leave the office stage behind: its action moved in direct contravention of theatre rules. Monnier intended to put his caricatures back into a real office, putting real-life dialogue into the mouths of dummies, and, by doing so, reprise the role of *mystificateur*. The introduction to the first edition of the *Scènes populaires* pretended that such characters were "sketched from life": "the author is absolutely nothing but the editor of the deeds and actions of his characters... it is with that intention that he has written his book, that his compositions have been lithographed". Monnier reinvented his time in the Ministry of Justice in the early 1820s, to cast himself as a scorned clerk, who had suffered under a bothersome *commis d'ordre*, M. Vaudremer. In his autobiography, written in 1855, he further told his audience that his promotion had been blocked by bureaucratic nepotism. He was furthermore doomed to remain a copy-clerk on account of his stylish handwriting. Like Ymbert, he fictionalised his time in the "bureaucracy", to give

---

126 Cited in Melcher, *The Life and Times of Henry Monnier*, p. 89.
127 According to Champfleury, Monnier claimed that his most famous character, the pompously naive Monsieur Prudhomme (who Monnier introduced on stage in *La Famille Improvisée* in 1830 and who was portrayed by Daumier in over sixty sketches between 1852 and 1870) was modelled directly on Boniface Petit, his bureau chief. He also claimed that the tyrannous principal clerk, M. Doutremer, in the *Scènes de la Vie Bureaucratique* was a thinly disguised copy of his old *commis d'ordre*, Vaudremer. However, Anne-Marie Meininger's introduction to Henry Monnier, *Scènes Populaires. Les Bas-Fonds de la Société*, (ed. Anne-Marie Meininger), (Paris: Gallimard, 1984), p. 13, disputes both these assertions. Petit did not enter the bureau until June 1823, after Monnier had left: A.N. BB/30/516/1 [Petit, Boniface]. The "myth" of Monnier is also illustrated by E. de Mirecourt's *Henry Monnier* [Les Contemporains, 11] (Paris: G. Havard, 1857), p. 15, written while Monnier was still alive. De Mirecourt tells his readers that Monnier's job in the office was to correspond with executioners, where, in fact, Monnier drew up the payrolls of Councillors of State and the judiciary (Meininger "Balzac et Henry Monnier", p. 220).
weight to his authority as an observer. Nevertheless, the detailed "biographies" of all his characters in "Scènes de la Vie Bureaucratique" are of the "bureaucrats" he had taken from the theatre stage.

Each character description in "Scènes de la Vie Bureaucratique" outlined a particular bureaucratic physiognomy. M. de Saint Maur, the Division Chief, who frequented sociétés savantes and owed his position to a maternal cousin, wore black or royal-blue clothes, a black cashmere waistcoat, dark-coloured trousers, a gold chain, pince-nez glasses, a cambric handkerchief, and patent-leather boots (which creaked on the parquet floor). He was

- a bachelor, egotistical and vain, quick-tempered, a gourmand and a libertine. Supple when occasion demanded it, he was, as a result, proud and haughty, disdainful of his inferiors ... dining every all the year in town, except on holy week, when he did penance in a booth in the café Anglais.\(^{129}\)

Doutremer, Monnier's commis principal, the dull and haughty tell-tale, who, like a fly, buzzed around self-importantly, was a pedant and a tease, the terror of expéditionnaires and surnuméraires over whom he exercised an absolute power. He was fifty or fifty-two, thin and withered, with grey frizzy hair, a low forehead, thick eyebrows, an aquiline nose, pinched lips, and a bilious colour. He wore a brown costume, a black waistcoat without a watch, brown trousers, black silk stockings, and low shoes (that were always cleaner than he was).\(^{130}\)

M. Riffé, the bureau's pedant, had worked in the office for thirty-two years, was a former librarian, and demonstrated a fanatical respect towards his superiors. He had survived the Terror, but was now exposed to the persecutions of the young men of the Division. He regulated his life like a music score, and, since coming to Paris, had written down all his daily activities in his diary, day by day, week by week and year by year. He was therefore a man of extreme habit and had worn


\(^{130}\) Ibid., p. 228. Monnier also told his audience that Doutremer moved house frequently, a reference to another well-established sign of bureaucratic greed.
the same hat for seven consecutive years. A *mystification* served as the means for Monnier to expand on Riffé's frugality: he told how Riffé's colleague, Desroches, had profited from the siesta Riffé took every day after breakfast to pare the brim of his hat bit by bit, until all that was left was the crown. Riffé, after grudgingly buying a replacement, now kept his hat locked in a box, away from the office trickster. Riffé was the first to the office, the first to read the journal, and always the first to leave: his desk closed on the first chime of four sounded by the ministry clock. This physiognomy, because it was so unremarkable, was remarkable: he was sixty five, bald, with excellent teeth. Like Belle-Main, he wore a threadbare coat and always had an umbrella in the office. Riffé was the debris on which "bureaucracy" was built.

Monnier's *Scènes*, organised in hour-by-hour segments like his vignettes, presented an office as a site of dull boredom, staffed by men with lengthy service to self-indulgence carved into their features. Doutremer's petty concern for the nomenclature of married women (*demoiselle* or *femme*) and the employee's discussion of trivialities are interesting only for their embellishment of the biographical data Monnier provided at the outset. These were scenes Monnier developed to play at parties: they were character charges against bureaucratic types, *desinées à la plume*. There was therefore little to no attempt at a narrative plot: Desroche's hot-headed disagreement with Doutremer for "playing the bureau chief" moved off-scene to be resolved, while Monnier continued to depict the other clerks discussing trivialities. Yet, even if Monnier's intention was to only represent chronologised bureaucratic vice, the limits of his final *mystification* are still revealed in his failure to have his clerks do any real work. The *Scènes*, unlike even *L'Intérieur d'un bureau* and *Le Sous-Chef Gautier*, do not engage with authorship or administrative production. If Ymbert made actors into authors in the advice he gave in his spoof manuals, Monnier was content to let them remain actors, trapped forever in the physiognomy of the vaudeville stage.

from *L'art de faire proméner des créanciers*. By moving house, Doutremer could dodge his debts.

Chapter Seven

From Prudhomme to Professionalisation: Realism and Administrative Reform in the 1840s.

The Physiology of Administration

The Physiologies parisiennes, launched by Aubert in the late 1830s, made their way into popular culture through the pages of La Caricature, enjoying the peak of their popularity between 1841 and 1842.¹ If their sales figures attract the attention of historians and literary critics, this does nothing to change the fact that they were still vignette-sketches and parodies like the Manuals, Codes and "Art de..." volumes that preceded them: the physiologies appeared as separate fascicules of the Bibliothèque pour rire, and then as a series of small illustrated books, each volume describing two "specimens" of Parisian occupational and social types, looking at their "habitat", "morphology", and organising them into "classes" and "types". In the physiologies, objects like the umbrella or the pipe, or social practices, like marriage or usury, were investigated in little "scientific" monographs, printed on cheap paper. They appeared with a uniform format (in-32°, and about a hundred pages long) and at the same price (1 franc).² Illustrations were abundant (30 to 60 engravings in each edition, although their piquancy was somewhat devalued by the tendency to re-use them in several productions) and loosely related to the paragraphs interspersed around them.³ In the physiologie, as in the spoof manual, the mystificateur was attempting to find a new way to penetrate his victim's culture of appearances, confusing it with

¹ Critics have stuck firmly to the early 1840s as the highpoint of the genre, ignoring similarities between physiologies and the literature of the Second Restoration: see, for example, Andrée Lhéritier Les Physiologies, 1840-1845: Bibliographie descriptive (Paris: Service International de Microfilms, 1966), p. 8. An exception is often made, however, for the Physiologie de la Poire, by Peytel in 1832, for reasons of its political significance, p. 8.
² Ibid., pp. 18-19.
³ For example, Porret's illustrations in Physiologie du Curé de campagne reappeared incongruously in the Physiologies des Tuileries. The majority of physiologies were illustrated by Henry Monnier, Traviès, Maurisset, Trimolet, and Emy, although Daumier and Gavarni also contributed: ibid., pp. 18-19.
medical and military metaphors and guiding it with axioms. When it spoke to the public, it asked them to believe that its frivolous tone concealed important "truths". Despite their maintenance of the mystificateur's trademark frivolity and caricatured charge, the popularity of the physiologies in the end turned Ymbert and Monnier's malicious guidance for "bureaucrats" and the "bourgeoisie" into mere description. With their faux-scientific "analyses" turned into "reality" by a new generation of realist novelists, the physiologies became nothing more than manuals of looking: "real" dictionaries for the amateur observer of Paris life.

Balzac wrote one of the first physiologies in 1826 (although it was only when he re-released it in 1829, that it adopted the "classic" tropes of the genre). In 1841, he released his Physiologie d'employé, illustrated by Trimolet, as a pseudo-response to the pamphleteer, Louis-Marie de Lahaye, the vicomte de Cormenin, whose exposé of the wastage of the July Monarchy in Lettres sur la Liste Civile, contributed to the reduction of court salaries from 18 to 12 million francs. Balzac claimed (disingenuously) to be making a case on behalf of bureaucrats, by demarcating employees from functionaries, and by arguing that it was because

---

4 Brillat-Savarin's Physiologie du Goût ou Méditation de gastronomie transcendentale (1826) and Balzac's Physiologie du Mariage both lay claim to being the "first" physiologies. As with all his books, Balzac continued to make revisions, both to the text and to the order of the chapters, publishing a new version in 1829. Balzac was also, at this time, collaborating with Horace Raisson on the various Codes Littéraires: his first published work, in 1824, was entitled the Code des Gens Honnêtes. It is no surprise therefore that the introduction to the 1830 edition of the Physiologie du mariage (dated 5 December 1829) "reported" (or rather, fabricated) a statement made by Napoleon to the Conseil d'État during its deliberations on the Code Civil: "Marriage in no way derives from Nature. The oriental family is utterly different to the western family. Man is the Minister of Nature and society grafts itself onto it. Laws are made to match customs, and customs vary" ["Physiologie du Mariage", in La Comédie Humaine, vol. XVI (Paris: Plon, 1846)], pp. 337, 338-345. It was no more or less of a mystification than earlier works, twisting his reader's perceptions of post-revolutionary codes of behaviour, to convince them that the only "honest woman is she whom one is afraid to compromise". Balzac's construction of his own authority in this introduction (as a literary pioneer, the author of the "first" physiologie and an "authority" on marriage) is as contestable as Ymbert's and Monnier's constructions of their time as clerks, or Scribe's self-fashioning as an "author" of vaudevilles; nevertheless, the mania for Balzacian authenticity has been "inherited" by many twentieth-century critics of the genre: see Natalie Basset, "La Physiologie du Mariage: est-elle une Physiologie?", L'Année Balzacienne (1986), pp. 101-114; Maurice Bardèche, Honoré de Balzac, Physiologie du Mariage, pré-originale (Paris: Droz, 1940).
the state robbed its employees that they, in turn, robbed the state of their time and effort.\footnote{Honoré de Balzac, Physiologie de l'Employé (Bordeaux: Castor Astral, 1994), p. 104. In another formulation, Balzac pronounced that "Aujourd'hui, le plus mauvais État, c'est l'État". (p. 35).} To argue that the "physiology" of bureaucrats was formed by their environment – the bureau – Balzac described how they dressed, ate, and socialised. He told his readers of their aspirations and – in particular – of how they compromised to achieve them. The "horizon" of the offices was the stack of green cartons piled to one side; its atmosphere was infected by the masculine exhalations of unventilated rooms, the smell of paper and pen; their sky was a ceiling to which they addressed their yawns; their habitat was dusty and only dampened by the garçon de bureau's watering can.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 41-42.} To the casual observer, who went to the ministry to solicit the smallest favour, the "cretin's barracks" was made up of obscure corridors, ill-lit corridors, and doors labelled with incomprehensible signs.\footnote{Ibid., p. 44.}

Balzac's portrayal of the office purported that these "conditions" had produced the different "wheels" of the administrative machine (physiological metaphors are few and far between in Balzac's physiologie): the surnuméraire, the expéditionnaire, the commis, sous-chef, chef de bureau, chef de division and garçon de bureau.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 61-64 (surnuméraire), 87-89 (chef de bureau), 91-94 (chef de division), 95-97 (garçon de bureau). The other employees were grouped under the eight "varieties of clerk".} In addition, the office spawned eight "varieties" of ordinary clerk: the dandy, imbecile (ganache), collector, usurer, flatterer, commercial agent, slogger (piocheur), and the pauper.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 67-82.} On top of the "standard classification", Balzac also identified some more exotic office types: the librarian, the private secretary, the treasurer, the architect and the official envoy. Without any of these "screws, nails, iron rods, washers, steel blades", without these "baubles" the "machine wouldn't work".\footnote{Ibid., p. 23.} Despite this claim to be "scientific", to analyse administration as a "machine", Balzac described the offices as they would be seen on the vaudeville stage: a garçon de bureau's "corridor" lay adjacent to the main office (where the ordinary employees worked); through a
door, Balzac could see another office, from which the sous-chef surveyed his subordinates.\textsuperscript{11} He also told his reader that, if for some reason they found themselves inside a ministry, they could look through little the oval windows on the bureau doors, which, like theatre lodges, would reveal fantastical scenes of office life.\textsuperscript{12} Here, he reproduced the restricted viewpoint of Ministry visitors, denied access to the offices and oblivious to what really went on inside, who, nevertheless, made bureaucratic customs a source of gossip and tittle-tattle and made observations on the most tenuous evidence. Even the passport office, an exception made by Balzac in description of "normal" offices, was a site of public theatricality. Its desks were lined up along the side of a gallery, facing three banks of seats on which respondents sat. For Balzac, this was a sort of an arcade, where the "corridor" stretching from entrance to the bureau chief (the illustrious "Porte\textsuperscript{13}") could be traversed by the observer.\textsuperscript{14} Balzac's offices were, therefore, a conflation of stage and street. His investigation of "bureaucrats" built, not on any new exploration of the themes and vocabulary of real administration, but on an agglomeration of tales of office life told by his fellow littérateurs.

Balzac, in such a manner, began his Physiologie by developing a description of an employee that could have been taken from Ymbert's portrayal of Belle-Main in L'intérieur d'un bureau. He was a "man who needs his salary to live and who, unable to renounce his place, doesn't know how to do anything except build up paperwork".\textsuperscript{15} Balzac continued in a similar vein: not a centime was circulated in France, without being documented in a letter, proved by a document, produced and reproduced on balance sheets.\textsuperscript{16} In faux-Ymbertian style, he declared, however, that the influence of an employee was not guaranteed by his success as a number-cruncher, but by finding a protector to represent himself in the furore of the manie des places. Here he referred directly to Ymbert's "golden age" of Napoleonic administration: since the fall of Bonaparte, Balzac alleged,

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., pp. 47-48.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 44. The accompanying illustration shows a solicitor peering through the window of a "Cabinet Noir" with theatre glasses.
\textsuperscript{13} The French for "door".
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., pp. 48-49.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 18.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 24.
places had become the "invisible money" by which ministers could pay off their backers in the Chamber (the employees therefore concentrated on counting the worth of their protectors, rather than the worth of the French economy). He parroted Ymbert's contention that, since the Restoration of Louis XVIII, there had been no single authority at the heart of administration: that a thousand sovereigns and a thousand chances decided the lottery of solicitation.

Balzac, however, went much further than Ymbert in painting the misery of an honest clerk: he drove a satirical dagger into the heart of the employee's problem of self-representation by alleging that the worth of an employee's service could only be judged by the capital generated by it. He therefore denied the worth of employees' honour as servants of the Nation, to focus instead on their lack of financial means (ignoring the fact that many clerks were willing to trade off financial remuneration for accumulated honour in the early decades of the nineteenth century). In a characteristic comparative sketch, Balzac noted that, in twelve years, a grocer would have made 10,000 francs; a painter would have painted a kilometre of murals, received the Legion of Honour cross or become an unsung "genius"; a vaudevillist would have become respectable even though he had never written an entire play; and even the most unlucky worker would have had a chance at becoming a manufacturer. The employee, alone, had no means of controlling his fate: his social mobility was in the hands of the newspapers, the ministers and the Chamber of deputies. Balzac's Physiologie de l'Employé therefore turned Ymbert's ton léger into bitter mockery, choosing to revel in his role as a satirist rather than hide it under pleasantries and "friendly advice", decrying the honest administrator as a simpleton rather than merely uncoiling the "bureaucrat" as a fraud and a trickster.

Nevertheless, Balzac's Physiologie de l'Employé remains a treasure-trove of the words most commonly associated with "bureaucrats" in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. His penchant for faux-statistical analysis and sociological claims – comparing the salaries of various professions, or proclaiming that the

---

17 Ibid., p. 31.
18 Ibid., p. 32.
19 Ibid., pp. 33-34.
number of administrators employed by the state was grossly out of proportion to its budget — was enveloped into reform efforts of the 1840s. His description of a bureaucratic "machine" in which the clerks are wheels, Division Chiefs are motors, and Ministers are "mechanic" has become so popular that "organic" metaphors now seem out of place in depictions of administrative organisation. On the other hand, his use of theatrical metaphors — introducing his readership to the offices via the oval window of an opera box — reveals that he engaged not with reality but with earlier representations of the bureaucrat by journalists, caricaturists and vaudeville-writers.

Balzac's *physiologie* (like Monnier's *Scènes de la Vie Bureaucratique*) marks the extent to which the physiognomic *état de services* could be pushed. His and other *physiologies* succeeded in bringing the vocabulary used to describe Parisian social types to an enormous audience (half a million copies of this pulp literature were bought in the early 1840s, one for every reader in Paris). Yet the genre had, in fact, only a very short shelf-life, condemned as devoid of spirit even before it had risen to the height of its popularity. The *Charivari* in 1837 derided the writers of the *physiologie* as simple hacks,

> a kind of La Bruyère at so much a line, who takes on, in the newspapers, the observation and study of private and public manners. The Physiologist is above all a sceptic, and has never believed in virtue, least of all in the virtue of women; he says that he is paid to be like that. The physiologist is grave and dignified; when asked the reason for his sadness, he responds modestly that it is the mark of perceptive spirits and cites Molière and Deburau.

---

20 Ibid., pp. 51, 85.
21 Judith Wechsler, *A Human Comedy*, p. 34.
22 *Le Charivari*, 19 March 1837, cited in Wechsler, *A Human Comedy*, p. 34. Molière needs no introduction. Baptiste Deburau was an acrobatic mime, who became famous for his melancholy long features and his studied nonchalance. He played Pierrot, the "straight man" for the jokes of the other characters. Deburau transformed this stock character, however, into a wily creature, always able to get the better of his master (Cassandre) at the end of the play. Deburau became, moreover, an iconic figure in the history of theatrical gesture, ibid., pp. 44-45.
The La Caricature also sounded the death knell of the physiologie in an article entitled the "Physiologie-morbus" on the 26 September 1841.\(^23\) The writer of the Physiologie des Physiologies staged the death of the genre the same year, but observed wryly that its drunken authors would be found the morning after the funeral oration, drunken and depleted, but fathers of some "new discovery".\(^24\) Last but not least, Balzac abandoned the genre as enthusiastically as he had grabbed hold of it. His Monographie de la Presse Parisienne, published in 1843, rounded on the petits journalistes in their entirety. Nothing more or less than a physiologie of journalists itself, the Monographie exposed their failings and foibles, condemning the authors of vaudevilles, petit chroniques and caricatures as creators of nothing but disillusion.\(^25\)

Balzac and Monnier

At the end of the Monographie, Balzac lambasted the various "varieties" of petits journalistes, hack writers who "take jealousy as their muse", among them the Bravo (a bully or braggart), the Blagueur (the joker) and the Anonym. These writers, he alleged, when trying to move from the columns of a petit journal to writing a book, dry up and collapse, and become instead feuilleton directors, Maître Jacques (the journalist responsible for collecting articles from other newspapers and reorganising them as faits divers), or ministry clerks. His comments about the blagueur bore this out: this "variety" of petit journaliste mocked for the sake of mocking, using the public to denounce public stupidities. The joker, Balzac wryly commented, "shook old men to see if they could stay on their trees; if they fell, he passed to the next, congratulating himself that he could, in such a fashion, topple Parnassus, the home of the Muse".\(^26\)

\(^{24}\) Physiologie des Physiologies (Paris: Desloges, 1841), pp. 64-65.
\(^{25}\) Paul Aron also treats the Monographie as a physiologie that makes criticisms of specific people in "Le Pasticheur pastiché ou Janin, Balzac et Reybaud", Histoires littéraires, 1 (2000), pp. 72-76. He suggests that Balzac's portrait of a feuilleton writer was part of a personal battle between him and Jules Janin.
In his description of the *petit-journaliste* bully, who denounces others to make his own reputation, Balzac related how this "type" of journalist hides underneath a language of honour, and takes revenge on those who refuse to employ him. In attacking the *bravo* and *blagueur*, Balzac also attacked the genre of the *physiologie*. The *Bravo*, whose *Physiologie du Cigare* is refused by a publisher, writes the next day in his journal how the *physiologie*, "is the art of speaking and writing nonsense ... in the form of a little blue or yellow book costing twenty sous, and under the pretext of either making you laugh or making your jaw drop...". Awarded the commission by the browbeaten publisher, he immediately changes his tune, and proceeds the day after to inform his readers that Paris was fighting to get hold of the latest *physiologies* which "for twenty sous provide more spirit than a spiritual man might have in a month." Balzac used both condemnation and praise for the *physiologie* to complete a picture of its moral vacuity. When the bully comments that *physiologies* were like "Panurge's sheep, running one after the other", it is not simply a reference to their popularity and uniformity, but an insinuation that the *physiologies* would inevitably drag their authors to disaster. In Rabelais' *Garguanta and Pantegruel*, Panurge had disposed of unwelcome guests on board his ship by sending their sheep following one another into the sea. When the shepherds caught hold of their rams to stop them, they were pulled to their watery grave. Like "Panurge's sheep", therefore, the *petite journaliste* drags everyone and everything down with him. He mocks "generous acts and crimes, business, loans, everything that is good and everything that is bad." He "devalues ideas, ridicules honourable men and thwarts business... hardly aware of the damage he is doing, ... [he] smokes his cigar on the boulevard, his hands in his jacket, looking to make a killing, by looking for imbeciles to kill".

---

27 Ibid., p. 69.
28 Ibid., pp. 70-71.
29 Ibid., p. 71.
Balzac's disavowal of the work he was keen to claim credit for a few years earlier does not diminish the power of the *physiologie* in creating new "Parisian" types. Indeed, his *Monographie de la Presse Parisienne*, his last work in the form of a *physiologie*, completed the panorama of social types, by adding the journalist, whose cynicism and constant state of disillusionment, like the bureaucrat's pettiness and attention to unimportant detail, are purely caricature. Nevertheless, as "realism" took on the form of a "movement", the technology of its construction had to be disavowed. The "realists" could capitalise on the

---

30 The use of *physiologies* as a bank of social types in Balzac's realist novels is also recognised by Jules Bertraut, *'Le Père Goriot' de Balzac* (Amiens, 1928), cited in Walter Benjamin *The Arcades Project*, p. 761.

vocabulary outlined by predecessors, like Ymbert and Monnier, while simultaneously condemning them to the dustbin of literature as a "romantic" or "sub-" genre of nineteenth-century literature. Balzac and other members of the "generation of 1830" gave up manuals of conduct and "scientific" investigations of social customs, in favour of the intertwining tales of the serial novel, promising to depict "reality". Yet, they retained the same social types, giving names to the mystificateur's faceless bureaucrats. In 1847, a member of the "generation of 1830" approached Henry Monnier to compliment him on his excellent dictionaries, useful as a "vocabulary" for modern-day artists and poets. The edge had gone off Monnier's dinner-time scènes: his audience wanted the "real" dialogue to present a further message, not merely to destroy the legitimacy of its characters, but to give moral closure, to restore their illusion that — even if his characters had no saving graces — that, elsewhere, morality was possible.

Monnier was therefore, by the 1840s, a man out of his time, derided in society and among his own friends, and having lost his piquancy. Increasingly criticised by the "realists", and abandoned by his former protégés, he spent another thirty years, traipsing from dinner table to dinner table, prey to the incomprehension of the hosts and the sarcasm of his fellow guests. Théophile Gautier, after watching the mystificateur put on his makeup before a stage performance in 1848, wrote in La Presse that "the smallest detail has its importance in Monnier's roles: the writer observes, the painter sketches, the actor executes. Hence, that perfect harmony, that absolute illusion...", yet shattered Monnier's importance as an author by continuing, "his bourgeois — and nobody has painted them justly, not even Balzac — bore you just as real bourgeois do, by unstoppable waves of and external social phenomena as a devise to epitomise society as a whole, and to demarcate a "good society" outside of the novel.

32 Another case in point is Flaubert, whose did not write any other pseudo-physiological portraits of social types after Leçon d'Histoire Naturelle (Genre Commis). The bureaucratic type, however, reappeared in his unfinished novel, Bouvard et Pécuchet (Paris: Pockt, 1997).
34 Ibid., pp. 245-246.
35 Criticism of Monnier by his colleagues reached its full height around 1850 as the Realist "movement" took centre-stage in the world of art and literature.
commonplaces and solemn stupidities. It's no longer comedy, it's stenography."

The story of how Monnier became a dictionary writer, a stenographer, and a bore began when Balzac published the first serialised novels in *La Presse* (after it had been taken over by Girardin in July 1836). Even before the highpoint of the *physiologie*, physiognomic critique was already being superseded by a new "realist" literature, which presented a "multi-layered" society – in which characters inhabited an infinite and diverse urban landscape rather than the narrow confines of the stage. Girardin, having cut the cost of each edition, depended on raising subscription rates to make ends meet: not only would selling more copies make up for the loss in per-issue income, but advertisers would be attracted by the potential of reaching a larger audience. His paper was therefore a commercial, rather than a political, venture, treating the "citizen" not as a producer but as a consumer. In order to attract an extended – and repeat – readership, he

---

36 *La Presse* (8 July 1848). Gautier was one of the most committed realists during the July Monarchy, describing in *La Presse* (23 February 1837) his belief in the communicative power of the "physiognomy of things", in vision as the key to all true knowledge.

37 This change in the newspaper philosophy is most usually told with reference to the famous duel between Girardin and the editor of *Le National*, Armand Carrel. Their disagreement, begun when Carrel accused Girardin of "reducing the noble mission of the journalist to that of a news-merchant", was a face-off between two conceptions of civil society – one in which opinion mattered and the other, in which financial success told the story of one's merit. Nevertheless, *La Presse* had not yet taken on the form that causes Richard Terdiman to remark that every line was paid for, "publicity" was sold to the highest bidder, and advertisement was disguised as "fact": *Discourse / Counter-Discourse: The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca and London: Cornell U.P., 1985), pp. 123-124. The crassly commercial market of news reporting – described famously in Balzac's *Illusions perdues* – had not yet overcome an older form of news reporting which prioritised political over commercial interest. Terdiman's examples, in fact, come from the Second Empire, when Villemessant was editor of *Le Figaro* and Moïse Millaud's *Le Petit Journal* (1863) asserted the spatial difference in the newspaper column between "reality" and "fiction" (pp. 132-133). Therefore, while the story of the Girardin - Carrel duel makes the transition of newspapers from organs of political opinion to bastions of commercial calculation look as immediate as a bullet to the head of honourable society, the transformation itself was much slower, and depended – as much as anything else – on the serialised novels which appeared in newspapers over the coming decade, written by a new generation of "realists", like Balzac and Eugène Sue, who "sold" this idea of commercialism in their
published serialised novel segments. It was not enough for these serialised stories to pour scorn on bureaucrats or other social types; they could no longer expose the fabrication of post-revolutionary honour, without visualizing new forms of authority and new illusions to which the reader could return. Their sketches had to constantly displace the reader's tired recognition of the illegitimacy of lazy bureaucrats, by embroiling them in a narrative driven (not destroyed) by their cynicism.

The "reality" of these stories came not only from their revivification of social types, using their physiognomic états de services to further larger plots (rather than, as Monnier did, as entertainment in itself). Girardin's decision to produce his paper without a political brand meant that he also had to organise his news reportage outside of the usual rigmarole of charge and counter-charge. Girardin therefore recast the role of journalist – hitherto opinion writers – as news reporters. He also treated the novel instalment as a news story; not only would it lose its value when superseded by the next issue (the newspaper was printed on highly perishable paper and meant to be thrown away), but there was little to no differentiation between genres of article, between real politics and literary representation, except in the article heading itself. As novel instalments sometimes spread over three of the newspaper's four pages (as in the case of five of the last seven instalments of La Femme Supérieure, which I shall discuss below), article headings did little to prevent the blurring between news reportage and novel. The instalment took on the form of a literary "vignette", its edges blurred enough to encourage the reader to buy the paper the next day as they "followed" the item, but concrete enough to allow the reader to enjoy the caricature as a stand-alone piece. This was necessary because otherwise one quarter of the newspaper would be alien to the reader buying La Presse for the novels. It could be argued that Balzac's depiction of newspapers in Illusions perdues (begun in 1836) was a caricature of Carrel's response to Girardin's commercialism, blowing his condemnation of Girardin's dependence on advertising out of all proportion. The idea of rampant commercialism during the July Monarchy was also fostered by Alfred Nettement's Études critiques sur le feuilleton-roman (Paris: Perrodil, 1845) and his two-volume Histoire de la littérature française (Paris: Jacques Lecoffre, 1853). Nettement, a legitimist journalist who founded the "Opinion Publique", had political reasons for decrying encroaching commercialism in the late 1840s and early 1850s, but, nevertheless, took his caricatures of feuilleton-writers from the feuilletons themselves.
first time in the middle of the series, or maybe coming to the story late after hearing of it from his workmates or friends.

Presented within the text of a newspaper, the serialised novel was instrumental in transforming "caricature" into "reality", sketches of office politics into unrepentant descriptions of bureaucracy. Balzac's *La Femme Supérieure* appeared in fourteen instalments between 1st and the 14th July 1837 in *La Presse* and changed the conventions of bureaucratic satire forever. This serialised novel owed far more to Monnier than Balzac would ever admit: it took on Monnier's translation of the nuances of accent into written dialogue, his abandonment of conventional form to express the incoherence and confusion of social relationships, and his penchant for reusing characters (like Prudhomme) in a range of different storylines.  

Des Lupeaulx, Balzac's Secretary General, was based on Monnier's Chief of Division, M. de Saint Maur, both in temperament and appearance. M. Doutremer, Monnier's *commis principal* was transformed into Baudoyer. "Papa" Riffé was the spitting image of "young" Poiret in Balzac's novel, although the accident that befell his hat was the result of a judicious trimming of the brim rather than of Bixiou's lump of lard. Nevertheless, *La Femme Supérieure* turned Monnier's squall of sedentary office workers in *Scènes de la vie bureaucratique* into a vibrant world of intrigue and suspense. Balzac turned plagiarism into an art: he took physiognomic signs and character traits from Monnier, but recast them in a new story - not one about whether a married woman should be called *demoiselle* or *femme* - but one about greed and the power of money.

The reader's access to the logic of the bureaucrats' actions gave them new life. Each character was a type, yet also a completely defined personality which seemed to develop as the story progressed. Balzac's readers could believe that

---

38 Balzac first used dialogue in this fashion in *La Vieille Fille* (1836), the first of his serialised novels. Earlier articles using dialogue attributed to Balzac were in fact written by Monnier: Meininger, "Balzac et Henry Monnier", pp. 227, 233. See Edith Melcher, *The Life and Times of Henry Monnier*, pp. 174-175, for a more detailed comparison of Balzac's and Monnier's styles.


40 "Old" Poiret, his brother, has a cameo in *Le Père Goriot*.
they enjoyed unmediated access to the "real" as the characters developed via the narration (rather than through a narrator). Nevertheless, by selecting those aspects of his subject which were comprehensible and significant to himself and his audience, Balzac uncloaked a "reality" that had been constructed and not one which appeared "naturally". His hid his role as narrator by letting the characters speak for themselves (although claiming recognition as an "author" on the byline). Whereas Monnier had only looked to unmask the stupidity of self-important ministerial officials, Balzac turned the physiognomic characters he inherited around to explain the reason for their self-importance. The characters' actions, placed within a richly described Ministry, demonstrated how the conditions of office life combined to turn ordinary men into machines of government, innocents into crooks.

Balzac provided "objective" reasons for office intrigues, a feat which administrators themselves could not manage. He de-cloaked the mysteries of office life; however, these mysteries were not those of real offices, but merely those which had been created on stage. Balzac filled in the stories missing from Monnier's physiognomic état de services (not those of the real état de services), explaining how incapacity could be favoured over intelligence, how a femme supérieure could only win by selling herself to the highest bidder. Balzac described a world where office workers had read – and acted out – Ymbert's L'art d'obtenir des places. He appealed to an audience which had seen L'Intérieur d'un bureau or Monnier's Moeurs Administratives and accepted them as accurate representations of office life. He built on a disillusion that already existed, moving from describing the clerk's stupidity to analysing their motives. Yet, to ascertain that his readership knew and understood the basic stupidity of the genre commis, he inserted a mystificateur in the novel, whose practical jokes exposed his colleagues inside the novel itself, spreading disillusion and (eventually) promising new hope outside the ministry.

A similar point is made by D.A. Miller in "Balzac's Illusions Lost and Found", Yale French Studies, 67 (1984), p. 178.
The inclusion of the *mystificateur* in the novel turned Monnier into a caricature of himself. In 1877, the artist Berthall (writing Monnier's necrology in *L'Illustration*) quoted Balzac as saying:

Henry Monnier is a very curious person, very strange and very witty. But with him everything is superficial, he represents better than anyone our unbelievable, mocking era, sceptical and unaware of its own significance. Without guidance, without criterion, and without a goal, when he makes fun of Monsieur Prudhomme, he does not even know he is making fun of himself.  

Berthall argued that the success of Prudhomme intoxicated Monnier, until one day he no longer spoke, no longer dressed, no longer even thought, but as the type which he had created. He began by resembling Napoleon; later, he resembled Thiers; he finished by resembling the naive pompous professor of writing whom he had once used to attract the *gobe-mouches*, to mock the "Prudhommes of finance, politics, literature and art" who invited him to their table and laughed at a satire aimed at themselves. Berthall ignored that it was Daumier who made Monnier into Prudhomme, rather than Monnier himself. The decline of Monnier into self-caricature was not a personal failing but a consequence of the break made by "realist" art with Restoration mimicry and *mystification*.

When Monnier himself drew a self-portrait with M. Prudhomme as his twin in 1873, it was his admission that his character had become more important (and more known as an "author") than himself. On the other hand, Monnier never acknowledged that he was Bixiou, a character in Balzac's *Comédie Humaine*, an alter-ego with a faked biography manufactured for him by Balzac, not taken from Monnier's own portfolio. Berthall nevertheless turned Monnier into Bixiou in the *mystificateur's* necrology, quoting Balzac as saying:

You will see how precious he has been to me in giving to my work the physiognomy of the times. You will find him everywhere, mingled with the action, and you will hear his mocking laugh.

---

42 Berthall, *L'Illustration*, 1768 (13 janvier 1877) [vol. LXIX, p. 27].
43 Ibid.
44 Daumier drew Prudhomme regularly between 1852 and 1870.
sounding at every moment through the anthem of passions, sentiments, and dreams. My Blixou is Henry Monnier; I have emphasised certain of his traits; I have enlarged him a little, but he is himself.  

Balzac therefore recognised that Monnier was "of the times", both in sketching (in ink or in theatrical scenes) the physiognomies of the various social types and in representing the mystificateur, whose mocking laugh pierced the illusions of the social world and was involved with everyone. By making the mystificateur a type, however, Balzac found a mechanism to use the lack of legitimacy afforded to bureaucrats and épiciers for his own purposes. He manipulated the faked biographies of the writers of Restoration manuals and July-Monarchy physiologies as a means to rehabilitate an economy of illusion.

When Balzac wrote his own appreciation of his erstwhile friend in 1832, he summed up Monnier's art in a single sentence: "He dislikes old men, he dislikes pen-pushers, he detests grocers; he makes you laugh at everything, even women; and, in doing so, he offers you no consolation". He noted that Monnier addressed himself to all men strong enough and mighty enough to see further than the others, to scorn others, never to be bourgeois, in short to all those who would find in themselves something left after disillusionment, for he disillusions. Now such men are rare, and the higher Monnier rises, the less popular he is.

While Balzac's novels also hinge on disillusionment, the process by which authors are unmasked as frauds leads to a new identification of characters with their social function, albeit a cynical one in which they aim to make the most of an "economy of illusion". The mystificateur within the novel strips the other

---

45 Berthall, L'Illustration, 1768 (13 janvier 1877).
46 As did Daumier with Prudhomme or Henry Macaire.
characters of their illusions, but his actions, instead of just disillusioning them, endows them with a new understanding of how society works. Similarly, Balzac did not take away his readers' dreams: he disabused them of their illusions as to the means of success, but then described a new means by which they could succeed. The readers therefore delighted in being lead down false paths, suspending disbelief and engaging with the story, knowing that they were being mystified, but content as long as they were let in on the mystery at the very end, even if it shocked their moral expectations.⁴⁹ Notions of honourable conduct and honest authorship were stripped away, to be replaced by a world where renown could be bought and sold, yet still sought by those who dreamed of it.

The Balzacian Means of Success.

The first episode of *La Femme Supérieure* appears on the third page of *La Presse* on the 1 July 1837. It describes the household of the bureau chief, Rabourdin, and the aspirations of his wife, Celéstine. The article ends by introducing a reform project, which Rabourdin hopes will propel him to the heights of success expected by his wife.⁵⁰ The second instalment, spilling from page two onto page three of the next day's edition, describes the "plan Rabourdin", noting (à la Ymbert) the absurdities of office life. Rabourdin's plan proposes to remedy this by a progressive reduction in the numbers of employees and a proportional increase in their salaries: he is waiting only for a competent minister to whom he could present this plan. Célestine, on the other hand, sees an immediate opportunity with the approaching death of Rabourdin's Division Chief, La Billardière. Rabourdin is - on a reckoning of his ancienneté - next in line for promotion. Célestine, knowing that this is not enough, begins her own

⁴⁹ Alain [a.k.a. Emile-Auguste Chartier] *Avec Balzac* (Paris: Gaillimard, 1937), p. 39, makes a similar point about the action in *Une Ténèbreuse Affaire*. Balzac could also write as a mystificateur in a more basic fashion: see Frédéric Masson, "Une mystification: Balzac et Napoléon", *Le Gaulois* (29 August 1909). This article describes how Balzac produced his *Maximes et pensées de Napoléon*, attributing authorship to a "grocer" and manufacturing Napoleon's sayings from Prudhommeries.

⁵⁰ *La Presse*, 351 (1 July 1837). Translations of this novel are adapted from Katharine Prescott Wormeley's version, available as a "Project Gutenberg" Etext. I have seen fit, however, to change these translations where I think necessary.
plan of campaign, going into debt to redecorate their home, and laying out sumptuous dinners every Friday for assorted deputies and *bon viveurs*. She also invites anyone who could serve her interests into her salon for a cup of tea the Wednesday after: Balzac promises, for his next instalment, a second chapter on one of her regular Wednesday guests, M. Des Lupeaulx (her husband's Secretary General).  

The next instalment therefore consists of a portrait of des Lupeaulx. At the end of his description, taken almost word for word from Monnier, Balzac livens the action by introducing another conspirator: the Ministry treasurer, Saillard, father-in-law of Rabourdin's main rival, the dullard Baudoyer. Saillard, invited to a Ministerial function, overhears the Minister's secret opposition to Des Lupeaulx's candidature for the Chamber of Deputies. Immediately, some more of the mystery of Des Lupeaulx's character unravels: Balzac lets his reader know that the Secretary General is torn between his love of women and the parvenu's love of money and power. Balzac also begins to explain why it is that Rabourdin (a completely honest man) is destined to be superseded by a nincompoop. A sordid coalition of interests in his office coalesces around Baudoyer, which will eventually be whipped into action by Des Lupeaulx. The "spy", Dutocq, steals Rabourdin's highly incriminating plan, and copies it on a lithograph press. It contains succinct analyses of their co-workers (for example, it describes Des Lupeaulx as "above a common spy, for he is able to understand a plan; he could skilfully carry through a dark piece of work and cover his retreat safely"). This plan is enough to provoke Rabourdin's downfall; however, greed and not simply malice must be invoked before it is released. Although Rabourdin, "knowing the spirit of official life better than any one, recognised that [the bureaux] would never pardon ... what looked like espionage or tale-bearing..." he is initially saved by Des Lupeaulx's interest in Célestine. The Secretary General dismisses Dutocq with a brusque warning to keep the memoir to himself; only later, when greed for

---

51 *La Presse*, 352 (2 July 1837).
52 *La Presse*, 353 (3 July 1837).
53 *La Presse*, 358 (8 July 1837). Balzac looks to give the impression that he, as an author, is largely reproducing Rabourdin's description of Des Lupeaulx.
54 Ibid.
power and wealth has triumphed over his illusion of having Célestine as a mistress, Des Lupeaulx recalls Dutocq and tells him to do his worst.

Baudoyer's place is ultimately won, not by the weasel Dutocq or by the greedy Des Lupeaulx, but by the machinations of Baudoyer's wife, Elisabeth. While Madame Rabourdin merely flirts with the Secretary-General, Elisabeth Baudoyer organises a loan from the usurers, Gobseck and Gigonnet, for Des Lupeaulx to buy sufficient property for election to the Chamber of Deputies. When Des Lupeaulx realises that the "profit" of entering the Chamber of Deputies is dependant on Rabourdin's downfall, he cynically engineers Baudoyer's promotion. He is abetted by others who stand to gain financially from Rabourdin's disgrace. The mystificateur, Bixiou, realises that he can reap both the "profit of promotion" and a hundred francs from Dutocq by sketching out a caricature of Rabourdin preparing an "Administration Execution". Rabourdin's fate is sealed, therefore, not by the contents of his memoir, but by the way in which Ministry organisation encourages profiteering in another's downfall. The usurer, Gobseck, sums up the entire enterprise at the end of the novel as a "victory for those with écus".57

The story of La Femme Supérieure is therefore a story of office politics, but – unlike in real offices – one in which the petty day-to-day squabbling of office workers affects the Ministry's wider policies. To create a means of success for the "bureaucratic type", Balzac considered the entirety of society as a game of politics on one level or another: the quest for power is inseparable from the desire for money, and – in the end of the day – everyone and everything has a price. For Balzac, capital is key to displaying merit, not control over production: the power of the écu, trumpeted by Gigonnet, easily wins over the honest power and wealth has triumphed over his illusion of having Célestine as a mistress, Des Lupeaulx recalls Dutocq and tells him to do his worst.

Baudoyer's place is ultimately won, not by the weasel Dutocq or by the greedy Des Lupeaulx, but by the machinations of Baudoyer's wife, Elisabeth. While Madame Rabourdin merely flirts with the Secretary-General, Elisabeth Baudoyer organises a loan from the usurers, Gobseck and Gigonnet, for Des Lupeaulx to buy sufficient property for election to the Chamber of Deputies. When Des Lupeaulx realises that the "profit" of entering the Chamber of Deputies is dependant on Rabourdin's downfall, he cynically engineers Baudoyer's promotion. He is abetted by others who stand to gain financially from Rabourdin's disgrace. The mystificateur, Bixiou, realises that he can reap both the "profit of promotion" and a hundred francs from Dutocq by sketching out a caricature of Rabourdin preparing an "Administration Execution". Rabourdin's fate is sealed, therefore, not by the contents of his memoir, but by the way in which Ministry organisation encourages profiteering in another's downfall. The usurer, Gobseck, sums up the entire enterprise at the end of the novel as a "victory for those with écus".57

The story of La Femme Supérieure is therefore a story of office politics, but – unlike in real offices – one in which the petty day-to-day squabbling of office workers affects the Ministry's wider policies. To create a means of success for the "bureaucratic type", Balzac considered the entirety of society as a game of politics on one level or another: the quest for power is inseparable from the desire for money, and – in the end of the day – everyone and everything has a price. For Balzac, capital is key to displaying merit, not control over production: the power of the écu, trumpeted by Gigonnet, easily wins over the honest

55 La Presse, 358 (8 July 1837). A "reproduction" of Bixiou's caricature of Rabourdin plucking feathers from his colleagues (their faces superimposed on turkeys) and feeding them into a stove marked "Administrative Execution" (fig. 4) appeared in La Presse, 364 (14 July 1837). The actual author of the caricature was Daumier. See fig. 4.

56 It is important to remember, however, that the intention behind the état de services was to eliminate this sort of competition. Balzac does not credit the bureaux's development of non-competitive ways to manage solicitation and denunciation.

57 La Presse, 362 (12 July 1837).
Rabourdin's *ancienneté* and talent. Célestine's *mystification* - allowing Des Lupeaulx to show his true colours in his pursuit of a married woman - is easily disrobed by Des Lupeaulx' realisation of her greed.

Rabourdin might still have been saved, if his wife had been willing to "buy" the place with her infidelity. Madame Rabourdin, who never lets Des Lupeaulx do anything more than take her hand, is driven by her defeat to ponder: "If I had behaved like a low woman, we should have had the place." When realising that his wife has been working behind the scenes to realise his promotion, Rabourdin, however, cautions her that "the game you are playing is just as dishonourable as the real thing that is going on around us. A lie is a lie..." Because Célestine does not "sell" herself, she remains a *coquette*, not a prostitute. Des Lupeaulx, to gauge her commitment, pretends to offer friendship in place of love, and to help her seduce the minister. When she falls for his offer, he realises that he has been up-to-now been played by a "superior" woman. This moment of disillusionment - when the *coquette* is unmasked - is nevertheless a moment of liberation for Des Lupeaulx. He summons Dutocq: Rabourdin's plan is over the offices the next day and the dishonoured chief stands on his honour, resigning his position to begin a new career in commerce. Baudoyer, whose promotion has been achieved by the most dishonourable means, is nevertheless showered with honours, "winning" the Legion of Honour Cross, and promoted again six months later as "just" reward for incompetence. Bixiou's part in the dishonourable affair, like that of Des Lupeaulx and Baudoyer, also pays dividends: he is promoted, given a thousand francs by Dutocq for the caricature, and wins a 500-franc dinner at the *Rocher de Cancale* by betting on Baudoyer's success.

Bixiou is not a politician, believing neither "in France, nor in God, nor in art, nor in the Greeks, nor in the Turks, nor in the monarchy,—insulting and disparaging

---

58 *La Presse*, (364) 14 July 1837.
59 *La Presse*, (361) 11 July 1837. This injunction to his wife to remain out of the affair suggests that Madame Rabourdin's approach to Des Lupeaulx, although the caricatured entreaty of a coquette, might be "transformed" into reality if it were to become a matter of public renown. This is, of course, one of the key messages of Balzac's *Physiologie du Mariage*, a spoof code on how not to be cuckolded.
Quand après s'être assuré, moyennant quelques pièces d'or, que sa lettre était entre les mains du ministre, Rabourdin revint dans la cour ; il trouva Sébastien en larmes ; qui lui présenta la lithographie dont voici le principal trait rendu par ce léger croquis.

Fig. 4. Daumier, "Exécution Administrative" [in Balzac, "La Femme Supérieure", La Presse, 364 (14 July 1837)].
everything that he could not comprehend." He is not a bureaucrat, but, instead, "the only official of the ministry whose dress did not lead outsiders to say, 'That man is a government clerk!'". Instead, Bixiou represents the impersonal lure of commercial greed: he is a "thorough egoist, extravagant and miserly all at once - that is to say, spending his money solely on himself". He is a bon viveur, a wastrel, a flâneur: "a man, all sense and all wit, who abandons himself to a mad pursuit of pleasure of every description, which throws him into a constant round of dissipation". Although Balzac uses the mystificateur to reveal the inanity of the "bureaucratic type", it is clear that he things that Bixiou is out of place in the offices, that his "virtues" would be better rewarded elsewhere. For that reason, the serialised La Femme Supérieure ends with Bixiou (disillusioned with his role in the conspiracy by Rabourdin's accusation that he had used his talents "against a man who could not be judged in such a fashion, or in the bureaux at all") re-evaluating his position, and foreswearing his promotion to leave the Ministry. He is disillusioned by his part in the petty conspiracy, and turns to the world of the theatre to wage war against more worthy targets than bureaucrats. He remains, however, a mystificateur, and remains driven by his greed. Yet, it is hard to see what this illusion of moving on will bring Bixiou: although abandoning the Ministry to make his fortune by denouncing social types in the journals and on the stage, he continues to fish in the same gutter and swim in the same slime.

The Petty Bourgeoisie

La Femme Supérieure, initially re-entitled Les Bureaux, was intended in 1834 to serve as an introduction to Balzac's Scènes de la Vie Politique. In the end, the release of the same novel under the title Les Employés in 1844 was as part of the Scènes de la Vie Parisienne. By then, it had developed a sister novel tracing the progress of the lesser clerks of Rabourdin and Baudoyer's office, Les Petits Bourgeois (begun in 1843, but never completed). The progress of Les Employés as a purely social satire was determined by its filtration through the Physiologie de l'Employé (1841), Balzac's own code of practice for the bureaucratic social

---

60 La Presse, (357) 7 July 1837.
61 La Presse, (364) 14 July 1837.
type and a projected play. The "bureaucratic type" no longer belonged to any one or to any one time: it had been confirmed and reconfirmed in being turned from type to personality to type once more. In such a fashion, Doutremer, from Monnier's *Scènes de la Vie Bureaucratique*, was reborn as Dutocq in *La Femme Supérieure*, turned into the "flatterer" in *Physiologie de l'Employé*, and, finally, restored as Dutocq (working as a legal clerk) in *Les Petits Bourgeois*. In a similar fashion, as vaudevilles about administration in the mid-1820s had already ceased to be politically controversial for the censors or theatre reviewers (except, of course, Stendhal), the "bureaucratic" type in its literary incarnation ceased to have a political edge during the July Monarchy.

Balzac's development of *La Femme Supérieure* as part of a social "history" of Paris was, first of all, encapsulated in his additions to the role of Bixiou in the 1844 edition. In a new ending, Bixiou teaches his own lesson to the dullard Poiret, who asks, "Will any one tell me the moral behind all that has happened here today?" Bixiou obliges, infuriating Poiret with an exposé of the distinction between functionaries and employees, between administrators and bureaucrats, and benefiting from his stupefaction to cut the buttons from his waistcoat, one by one. He begins by telling Poiret that the entirety of administration is a mystification, a means to fool the populace into believing in progress and enlightenment:

---


63 For a detailed observation of occurrences of the figure of Minard, the "poor employee", who left the office each evening to go home to his small apartment and his flower-seller wife, Zélie, see Meininger, *Les Employés par Honoré de Balzac*, vol. III, p. 20.

64 In a letter to Hippolyte Castille in 1846, Balzac commented that his *Comédie Humaine* was "the history of the whole of society... a drama of four of five million living beings": cited in Paul Louis, *Les Types Sociaux chez Balzac et Zola* (Paris: Éditions du Monde Moderne, 1925), p. 24.

God made this epoch of the world for those who like to laugh. I live in a state of jovial admiration of the spectacle that the greatest joker of modern times, Louis XVIII, bequeathed to us. Gentlemen, if France, the country with the best civil service in Europe, is like this, what do you suppose the other nations are like? Poor unhappy nations! I ask myself how they can possibly get along without two Chambers, without the liberty of the press, without reports and memoirs, without an army of clerks?...

After spending several minutes explaining exactly what a government official is, he tells Poiret that all he has proved is that nothing is simple, that definitions and axioms only lead to muddles (cutting off Poiret's final button as he pronounces this "truth"). After playing his practical joke, he then, however, relieves Poiret's annoyance by spelling out that the only moral he could find in their experiences was that "while ministers start discussions in the Chambers that are just about as useful and as conclusive as the one we are engaged in, the administration cuts the buttons off the tax-payers." Balzac, by closing Les Employés with this scene confirms that debates about honour are worthless: the only reality he offers his reader is the greed and avarice of modern life. The "poor employee" Minard, however, realised this at the beginning of Bixiou's assault on Poiret, and went off to make his fortune. Taking to heart Bixiou's initial comments to Poiret that there was little to choose between a state which employed a few hardworking employees and paid them well, and a state that employed a large number of lazy employees but paid them badly, Minard became an entrepreneur, importing tea and chocolate and adulterating them (which meant that he was selling a bad-quality product, but at a vastly reduced price). When Minard returned to the Comédie Humaine in Les Petits Bourgeois, it was as the richest man in the Latin Quarter.

The second addition to the end of Les Employés was a conversation in the minister's salon, where Rabourdin's plan is discussed to show (as Balzac puts it)

---

66 Ibid., pp. 277-278. A version of this passage appears as a sort of conclusion to Physiologie de l'Employé, pp. 104-105.
67 Ibid., p. 284.
68 Ibid., p. 285.
69 Ibid., p. 95.
"how great ideas are allowed to perish in the higher regions of State affairs, and in what way statesmen console themselves."\(^{70}\) The Minister listens to his private secretary, De La Brière, expanding on Rabourdin's idea that one hundred clerks with a salary of twelve thousand francs would do better and quicker work than a thousand clerks at twelve hundred. The plan is derided by Des Lupeaulx, who argues that it is a project of "centralisation". Yet the Minister recognises the worth of Rabourdin's plan, as he also recognises the dangers of "bureaucracy":

> You may perhaps render the theft of a penny actually impossible, you cannot prevent the buying and selling of influence, the collusions of self-interest. The day will come when nothing will be conceded without secret stipulations, which may never see the light. Moreover, the clerks, one and all, from the least to the greatest, are acquiring opinions of their own; they will soon be no longer the hands of a brain, the representatives of governmental thought...\(^{71}\)

It is all too late for Rabourdin who has already been dishonoured and his plan burned. The Minister comments to his private secretary, however, that Rabourdin's disgrace has made little difference: he would never lack reform plans, but only men to execute them. The second addition to *Les Employés* therefore asserts that "bureaucracy" is a social institution, rather than an individual malady, and that Ministers or Division Chiefs are powerless to change their employee's practices even if they wanted to. Rabourdin is confirmed as the exception that makes the rule: in the absence of others like him, corruption will continue to be unchecked in the Ministry.

The third addition, a scene describing the return of Rabourdin to the Ministry at the end of December 1830, however, places the story outside of the political context of the Restoration and makes its "reality" timeless, part of a chronology of administration, stretching into the July Monarchy. Rabourdin hears two garçons de bureaux complaining that their new Chiefs do not understand the traditional protocol of the ministry. Their dialogue illustrates that, although everyone and everything had changed, characters are being reformed in the mould of their

\(^{70}\) Ibid., p. 285
\(^{71}\) Ibid., pp. 286-287.
predecessors. The garçons de bureaux discuss how they will "form" their Chiefs, teaching them where their writing paper, their envelopes, their wood and their business is kept. If they lack in the "dignity of office", it will not be long until things return to normal again. The scene Rabourdin overhears is, in fact, one of Monnier's political pieces, which appeared in La Caricature in 1830. Balzac keeps their dialogue largely intact, replacing Monnier's character names with his own. Yet, by transferring the dialogue from journal to novel, he depoliticised it. Monnier's Scène de la Vie Politique paradoxically turns Les Employés into a Scène de la Vie Parisienne: ministry shenanigans were no longer political, but a part of modern life, the reality of living in Paris.

Les Employés' sister novel, Les Petits Bourgeois, furthermore confirms that the mean spirits and petty intrigues of Balzac's offices are not confined to the Ministries alone, as Balzac traces the careers of the clerks of Rabourdin and Baudoyer's bureaux in their "second" careers under the July Monarchy. Balzac intended that this work would put further distance between the "realist novel" and the caricatured "bureaucratic type". Preparing the way for Les Petits Bourgeois, he removed an allusion to the caricaturist from La Femme Supérieure before publishing it as Les Employés:

The characters that this story describes exist in a world where the pen of the observer has rarely penetrated: the crayon of the caricaturist has drawn some administrative heads, but he left the employee in his environment, while explaining his home life by his office life.

---

72 Because of its appearance in Les Employés, this article has been attributed to Balzac (and is included in Balzac, Oeuvres complètes, vol. XXXIX [Oeuvres diverses II], p. 538). However, Anne-Marie Meininger shows that Balzac had this article copied by his secretary, Belloy. The corrected copy still exists in Bibliothèque Louvenjoul, "Fragment d'un version de Les Employés", A 166, feuillets 10,11,12: cited in Meininger, Les Employés par Honoré de Balzac, vol. III, p. 15. The original text of the caricature and the changes made by Balzac are reproduced in Meininger's "Balzac et Henry Monnier", pp. 235-236.

73 Les Petits Bourgeois, published posthumously, is the second book of the third volume of Balzac's Scènes de la Vie Parisienne, following Les Comédiens sans le Savoir, an account of a mystification played by Bixiou.

Unlike the authors of Les Femmes d'employés, who made the home of its lead character Blondel into a surrogate office, or the writers of Le Déjeuner des Garçons, who populated a dinner table with chattering employees and served them with a garçon de bureau, Balzac was not content to bring the accoutrements of the office into the home, but read the "spirit" of office life into bourgeois customs more generally. He therefore set Les Petits Bourgeois in the home of the Thuilliers, where the "air of bureau" was thin, but the air of imbecility was thick and choking.

Thuillier, an ex-clerk of Baudoyer's office in the Ministry of Finances and another cretin par excellence, had had only a minor role in Les Employés. Existing mainly as a foil for the anagram-enthusiast and collectionneur, Colleville, "the handsome Thuillier" lead an idle life, putting none of the energy he had once put into his conquests into occupying his place or making his fortune. Colleville, on the other hand, was a government official during the day and first clarinet at the Opéra-Comique at night, as industrious as his friend was incapable. Thuillier, according to Les Petits Bourgeois, retired in July 1830, knowing that he might lose his position in the political upheaval and realising that the new Minister would expedite the paperwork, with the intention of vacating a place for one of his protégés. Unfit for any other occupation or business, Thuillier then turned to petty concerns and neighbourhood intrigues. He lived with his wife, Céleste, the daughter of a banker, and his sister, Brigitte, a cunning spinster, who had amassed a fortune by thrift and intelligent investment, and who ran her brother's life. It was Brigitte who advised Thuiller to marry Céleste, to cement an alliance between the Ministry of Finances and the Bank of France and - before her father was the victim of a daring robbery which bankrupted him and drove him to an early grave – to give Brigitte control of her dowry. Despite the initial setback, the alliance had been a financial success: the power of the family's credit, however, only strengthened Brigitte's despotism over Thuillier and his wife.

---


76 Ibid., pp. 81-83.
Bourgeois is set in 1840, by which time it had become apparent that Céleste would not be bearing an heir to Thuillier's sister's fortune. Instead, Céleste-Louise-Caroline-Brigitte Colleville, the daughter of "that little slip of a coquette, Madame Colleville" (and Thuillier's natural child), had become the centre of the Thuillier clan's domestic ambitions.\(^{77}\)

Les Petits Bourgeois takes place within a very concise social and geographical landscape. Balzac claimed that the sketch was "historically faithful", showing "a social stratum of importance in any portrayal of manners and morals, especially when we reflect that the political system of the Orléanist family rests upon it".\(^{78}\) Certainly, the personalities of those who frequent the Thuilliers' salon, the circumstances that bring them together, and the "spirit of their society" all frame the novel. The ménage Thuillier (run by Brigitte) and the ménage Colleville (which had been regulated with extreme piety since Madame Colleville "found" religion upon the death of a young suitor in 1824) are close to one another on the rue d'Enfer. Dutocq, who had been so instrumental in betraying Rabourdin and who is now a clerk of the justice of peace, lives on the third floor of the Thuillier's house. Phellion, another member of their division, and now one of the most respected men in the arrondissement, is also a regular visitor, as is Phellion's eldest son, a professor of mathematics in a royal college, and suitor of Céleste Colleville. Finally, Minard, the poor clerk who had abandoned the Ministry of Finances to make his fortune in the aftermath of Rabourdin's disgrace, and now the richest merchant in the region of the Place Maubert, attends their salon in a more irregular fashion. He is rich beyond imagination, with a handsome house in the rue des Maçons-Sorbonne, a carriage, and a country-place near Lagny; his wife wears diamonds at the court balls. In 1839 he was elected mayor of his arrondissement and judge in the Court of Commerce: he prides himself on the rosette of an officer of the Legion of honour in his buttonhole. While Thuillier has also renewed acquaintance with the Saillards and Baudoyers – all respectable bourgeoisie of the Palais-Royal – and often invites them to dinner, they do not appear in the novel in person.\(^{79}\)

\(^{77}\) Ibid., pp. 89-90.
\(^{78}\) Ibid., p. 100.
\(^{79}\) Ibid., pp. 94-97.
As Céleste Colleville nears the age where she might get married, Minard and Pheillon make their visits more regularly, to sound out the Thuilliers' plans for her dowry (knowing something of the conditions of the child's conception, it was clear to them that the Thuilliers, not the Collevilles, would decide her destiny). From the beginning of the novel, it is clear that Céleste Colleville favours Félix Pheillon, although her religious upbringing clashes with his materialism. Nevertheless, if all things remained equal he would have become her principal suitor. *Les Petits Bourgeois* is, on the surface, the story of star-crossed lovers thwarted by the ambitions of a médiocre et rampant: the ability of an unscrupulous rival to disrupt an honest affection is graphically illustrated when the hopes of the Minards and Pheillons are thrown into turmoil by a new actor on the scene – Théodore de la Peyrade, a young barrister and tenant of the Thuilliers. This "advocate for the poor" is allied with Dutocq and with Cérizet (David Séchard's traitorous print worker in *Les illusions perdues*, now reduced to working as a usurer in the neighbourhood), who established him in the Thuillier household in a plan to get their hands on part of Céleste Colleville's dowry. La Peyrade first of all destroys any hope Céleste Colleville might have had to marry a haut bourgeois suitor by engaging Thuillier's petit bourgeois jealousy (this is made all the more piquant as de la Peyrade has to hide his origins in the Provençal nobility to play a petit bourgeois role). With the competition thereafter limited to the Pheillons and Minards, de la Peyrade begins to weave a "bourgeois spider-web", to lay an invisible trap for the Thuilliers and to win Céleste Colleville's dowry.

Convincing everyone that he is a "superior man", De la Peyrade flatters Thuillier by promising to help him gain the Legion of Honour cross – which Colleville had been awarded as a reward for his wife's profligacy, Minard for his wealth, and which Thuillier wishes to gain by writing a pamphlet on economics. He plays to the vulgar minds of the Thuillier salon, wooing Madame Colleville and organising a financial scoop for Brigitte. Although his plan is prepared with the connivance of Dutocq and Cérizet, De la Peyrade intends only to use these ignoble associates to escape the unfathomable depths of poverty, and then to rise in

---

80 Ibid., p. 107.
society, washing off the "filth and impurity clinging to his clothes". De la Peyrade, although a "cousin-germain to Tartuffe", is driven by his hatred of "people who make capital out of their honesty and coin money from fine sentiments". De la Peyrade is "the artist repressed by all these bourgeois; silent before them because I feel misjudged, misunderstood, and repelled". Nevertheless, he does not hesitate to deal with the subjects of his hatred, preying on their naivety to try and make his own fortune.

Dutocq is also a "great knave", Cerizet a "comic actor". For De la Peyrade to delude the Thuilliers was one thing; but to delude such consummate actors (Balzac compares them to Mademoiselle Mars, Frédéric Lemaitre, Potier, Talma, Monrose) was the "acme of art". De la Peyrade is therefore a truly malicious Bixiou, who also turns his mystification not to social commentary or harmless fun but to finding the financial means of success, causing his landlords to reveal both their stupidity and their greed, and — in the process — hoping to take from them their one true prize, the truly pious and worthy Céleste Colleville. His role — and that of his collaborators, Cerizet and Dutocq — is to unmask bourgeois pretension. The villains of the piece are no less melodramatic than their victims: Cerizet tricks and swindles only to realise the glorious dream of finding a way to do honest business, and to become a bourgeois "like Thuillier, like Minard, and like so many others". La Peyrade, similarly, wants to escape from debts and obscurity: he continually looks to liberate himself from his links with Cerizet and Dutocq. Looking for diamonds in the slime in which they paddle, all of Balzac's villains hope to raise themselves up to be bon bourgeois, to turn from schemers into respectable men.

In *Les Petits Bourgeois*, mystification has become a natural means of success. Swindling and tricking one's way to financial rewards is the only means to become truly respectable. De La Peyrade is constantly cancelling the debts of

---

81 Ibid., p. 131.
82 Ibid., p. 138.
83 Ibid., p. 149.
84 Ibid., p. 160.
85 Ibid., p. 176.
86 Ibid., p. 219.
the past with money, escaping the snares laid for him by his nefarious acquaintances, by "borrowing" money from Thuillier. Therefore, when Balzac remarks that "a book might have been made in comparing the ... enormous preparations of Théodose and the simplicity of Felix: one was nature, the other was society – the true and the false embodied"\(^7\), he suggests that La Peyrade's approach for Céleste Colleville's hand, gilded with human ambition and caprice, was "natural", and the approach born by a dullard passion was a social affectation. The young mathematician's refusal to pretend to be religious to please an impressionable young girl – a declaration of his materialist principles – was not merely farcical, but a cretinous example of petit bourgeois pretension.

While Félix Pheillons "principled stance" was a moment of classical melodrama, in Balzac's novel "good" does not triumph over "evil". Instead, those like La Peyrade, who eschew codes of honour are those who succeed; wholly cynical, they are not bound by principles and can fake melodramatic gestures to win the day.\(^8\)

*Les Petit Bourgeois* therefore both created and condemned a new social class by populating the streets of Paris with bureaucratic characters and letting them play the roles given to them in the theatre. Balzac turned physiognomic signs into social statistics, glossing over the dislocation between the realities of office life and the caricatured bureaucratic type by using a *mystificateur* to confirm his characters as social miscreants inside the office. He then posited the existence of a petit bourgeoisie by painting a picture of the fictional bureaucrats' conduct in their homes and allowing them to intersect with other "types". Already in *Les Employés*, domestic virtue is turned upside-down in the Saillard apartment, when the concerns of the office are brought home, and when the home, in turn, interferes with office politics. This intersection of types was already manifest when Célestine Rabourdin threw open her parlour doors to high society (and to

---

\(^7\) Ibid., p. 164.

\(^8\) Peter Brooks, *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess* (New Haven & London: Yale U.P., 1976) argues that the extravagance of Balzac's representations is indeed melodramatic, that the nineteenth-century novel needed theatricality to get its meaning across, "to invest in its renderings of life a sense of memorability and significance" (p. 13). Brooks also equates Balzac's characters' success with melodramatic consciousness (pp. 140-141).
Balzac's readers). The minute description of her apartment on the rue Duphot – her concern for display and her desire to organise her guests to further her ambition for fortune and position – develops not only the bureaucratic type (represented by her husband), but links it to a new bourgeois social type (one befitting the daughter of an auctioneer).

In Balzac's novels, the authority of the observer is no longer assumed in the faked biography of the author (as for Ymbert and Monnier), but in the authority of the bureaucratic character and the caricatured Paris of the physiologies. His novels do not try to "command" bureaucrats, like the spoof manuals had done, but made the types "work" for him. Rabourdin had provided the character profiles in his administrative plan in Les Employés. The two garçons de bureaux provided the picture of the Ministry of Finances post-1830. In Les Petits Bourgeois, the lawyer, Desroches (another ex-clerk from Les Employés), coming to present Théodore de la Peyrade with bills of exchange on which he owes twenty-five thousand francs, takes one look at the interior of the Thuillier's house (noting Celeste, with red eyes after a dispute with Félix Pheillon) and understands immediately the young barrister's scheme. The reader, in fact, never sees further than Desroches. The Thuilliers' salon, and not Balzac, reveals their character: portraits by Pierre Grassou, "the artist par excellence of the modern bourgeoisie", look over card-tables, consoles, and a hideous sofa of gnarled mahogany, covered in chocolate-coloured painted velvet. Redundant wardrobes obscure the panelled walls of the vestibule. The doors leading to the garden and the courtyard have been reinforced by sheet-iron doors: fear has led the Thuilliers to replace fine wood with common metal. Balzac never takes his reader beyond the Thuilliers' salon, building his portrayal of the Thuillier household on an architectural account of their surroundings, rather than an intimate history of their private life. Thus a caricatured Paris also lends authority to Bazac's narrative: the house on the rue Saint-Dominique d'Enfer, described

---

86 Ibid., pp. 214-215. Desroches here takes the role usually given to the porter (or garçon de bureau) in Balzac's novels. Balzac glorifies the porter as an observer of bourgeois life, which he not only takes from the description of the porter in Le Flanéur à Paris, ou le livre des cent-et-un (Paris: Ladvocat, 1832), but also from Scribe's Le Loge du Portier (1823), which described the petty intrigues of middle-class families as observed by their servants.
as a relic of a better age, had had its majesty soiled by Brigitte Thuillier's ownership and "a perfume of the petit bourgeoisie".  

Balzac gave the appearance of judging the social relationships of the Thuilliers behind closed doors, but in fact merely populated a seventeenth-century mansion with Prudhommes. As he wrote to Madame Hanska in 1848 outlining a project for a play of the same title: "Les Petits Bourgeois are three different Prudhommes, full of honour, of virtue, but ridiculous like Prudhomme, a little stupid like Prudhomme ...". The play – which concerned three Prudhommes' attempts to save a favoured son from a life of debauchery – had much in common with the novel (which treated the debauchery necessary to win a favoured daughter's hand in marriage). While it was never written, the play projected by Balzac ended with the petit bourgeois trio with their eyes opened to the ways of the modern world. The son's corruptor eventually sorts out the debts they have accrued in trying to tame the young lion, and – although the cause of their troubles – is welcomed as a son-in-law. If a similar end were to have been considered for the novel, De la Peyrade might have taken Thuillier for everything he owned, before being welcomed back as a saviour and married to Céleste. The petite bourgeoisie's penchant for self-deception was therefore, in itself, sufficient condemnation of their "class". In the same way as Berthall described Monnier as a self-caricature, Balzac let his characters prove their "own" stupidity by working within the narrative to deceive themselves. His

---

90 Ibid., p. 70.
91 "Notice sur "Les Petits Bourgeois", in Douchan Z. Milatchitch, La Théâtre de Honoré de Balzac, d'après des documents nouveaux et inédits (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1973), p. 193. The letter was written on the 31 May 1848 and can be found in the Bibliothèque Louvenjoul, MS. A.303, fol. 459.
92 Or, at least, it was never produced for the stage and no manuscript (outside of a list of characters) remained among Balzac's papers after his death: Milatchitch, La Théâtre de Honoré de Balzac, p. 196. Maurice Bardèche, Une Lecture de Balzac (Paris: Les Sept Couleurs, 1964), p. 209, reports that Balzac had declared on several occasions that the subject of Les Petits Bourgeois was that of Tartuffe, translated into a different social milieu.
93 I ignore the ending for the novel written after Balzac's death by Charles Rabou, and which he completed arbitrarily, when Balzac left no indication of its ending. Rabou's version appeared between 1856 and 1857, entitled "Les Parvenus".
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bureaucrats, therefore, declared the existence of a very petty bourgeoisie in their parody of the worst aspects of the "bureaucratic type".\footnote{While it has been unusual for historians to treat ministerial clerks as members of petite bourgeoisie, this has been largely due to a research agenda dominated by the need to explain shopkeepers' adhesion to fascist politics in the 1930s. For an outline of this literature, see the Introduction, note 40. On the other hand, Nicos Poulantzas' Les Classes Sociales dans le Capitalisme Aujourd'hui (Paris: Seuil, 1974), a re-reading of Marx, has spearheaded the recognition of clerks by sociologists and political theorists as members of a "new petty-bourgeoisie". Poulantzas argues a negative definition which makes the petty bourgeoisie a class in themselves but not a class for themselves in capitalist society.}

A Human Comedy

Les Petits Bourgeois was never finished: only the beginning was found among his papers after his death. The story of the petite bourgeoisie had been harder to tell than Balzac envisioned: turning bureaucratic caricatures into "real" bourgeois characters required a whole new narrative of success which applied equally to manufacturers and merchants as it did to Ministry employees. To create Les Petits Bourgeois, Balzac had to give Henry Monnier's sketches of bureaucrats a whole new life, animating them in new contexts and bringing different types together to generate new clashes outside the office. The true test of his Comédie Humaine, "the history of the whole of society"\footnote{Letter, Balzac to Hippolyte Castille, 1846, cited in Louis, Les Types Sociaux chez Balzac et Zola, p. 24.}, was to turn his bureaucrats into real people, to create an unassailable narrative of virtue and vice in the offices, and to end the need to tell tales about office deceit by means of a plan Rabourdin and a narrative driven by the tricks of a mystificateur.

Although Les Petits Bourgeois, his most explicit characterisation of the society of the Latin quarter proved stillborn, Balzac nevertheless succeeded — in the chapters he completed — in describing a world where laissez-faire competition had been completely denuded by deceit and where naked financial transaction had triumphed over honour. All that was left of the vestiges of a by-gone age of virtue and probity in the Thuillier's salon were wood carvings hidden behind wardrobes and doors concealed behind sheet-iron for fear of robbery. Objects,
clothing and physiognomic signs were therefore accessories to "types", to "social conditions" and, most of all, to an "economy" of deceit. Balzac's criticisms, learned from the inhabitants of the antechamber or copied from the vaudeville stage, assumed that the administration was a bulwark against the citizenry rather than a means to listen to them, the machinery of a "state" rather than an active participant in civil society. He obliterated the formulae of administrative and civil co-operation, the belief in oaths and the \textit{état de services}, in his surety that everyone and everything could be bought and sold.

Balzac's characters appeared in real life more frequently after his death: Edouard Dumont suggested in 1900, that "the people of the Second Empire wanted to be characters from Balzac".\textsuperscript{96} Paul Bourget, in 1887, noted that Balzac's characters were more true for 1860 than for 1835.\textsuperscript{97} Sainte-Beuve tells how, in Venetian salons during the 1840s, aristocrats took on Balzacian roles, keeping in character for better or worse until the bitter end. This was a dangerous pastime, as so many characters from the \textit{Comédie Humaine} were from the depths of society.\textsuperscript{98} While Balzac's unfinished \textit{Les Petits Employés} never completed its narrative of petty-bourgeois self-disillusionment – and \textit{La Comédie Humaine} never completed a narrative of an entire society, having foresworn the need to describe a society of producers\textsuperscript{99} – his stories nonetheless provided a means for people to play out their own lives. It is a moot point whether Balzac knew the difference between fact and fiction himself: his audience certainly were thoroughly convinced by the authenticity of his characters and looked to use his insights to understand the society in which they lived.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{96} Cited in Benjamin, \textit{The Arcades Project}, p. 760.
\textsuperscript{98} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{99} Both the labouring classes and the honest bourgeois are conspicuously absent as main characters in Balzac's novels.
\textsuperscript{100} Léon Gozlan, "Souvenir des Jardies", \textit{Revue Contemporaine}, vol. X (November 1853), pp. 454-468, describes how Balzac's imagination, accustomed to creating fictions and persons, often confounded the real world with the world of his novels. He also, however, describes how Balzac engaged consciously with textual fantasies, scribbling words on walls in the place of furniture at his country house, \textit{les Jardies} (p. 460).
As the line between reality and fiction blurred, Balzac became a key influence on the social politics of the July Monarchy. Claiming to demystify the contradictions of post-revolutionary society for his "bourgeois" readership — slowing unveiling the plot within his novel to allow his reader to feel as if they themselves were de-cloaking the mystery or observing a real bourgeois drama — he gave them a means to explain the radical changes to Old-Regime social position and status caused by the institutionalisation of the "public sphere" during the French Revolution. Armand Baschet noted in 1852 (soon after Balzac's death) that Balzac's *Comédie Humaine* divided the world into two: those who laughed and those who excited the laughter of others.¹⁰¹ Those who had laughed with Monnier had been men who scorned to be "bourgeois", who delighted in exposing their shortcomings. Those who laughed at Balzac's satire, on the other hand, were those who embraced the caricatured depiction of the petty-bourgeois social world as proof that their own fortune was respectable, that they were themselves bourgeois. In *Les Employés* and *Les Petits Bourgeois* the deceitful are depicted in a particularly satisfying fashion, so that the *haute bourgeoisie* could imagine themselves insulated from the gutter of office politics and financial intrigue, mediating their experience of these exotic realms through the pages of a novel.¹⁰² It did not matter that the bureaucratic characters Balzac described were taken from spoof manuals and vaudevilles rather than real life: his readership found comfort in the illusion that they lived on a higher plane than his thieves, lawyers, entrepreneurs and bureaucrats.

The change in emphasis from destruction to rebuilding, from disillusion to illusion, which distinguished Balzac from Ymbert and Monnier, also distinguished the

---


¹⁰² Taine reputedly made such a remark on Balzac's penchant for deceitful characters: Louis, *Les Types Sociaux chez Balzac et Zola*, p. 25. Jacques Chaudes-Aignes went further in his *Les Écrivains modernes de la France* (Paris, 1841): "Dungeons, brothels, prisons would be asylums of virtue... compared to the civilised cities of M. Balzac... The banker is a man who has enriched himself through embezzlement and usury; the politician... owes his stature... to cumulative acts of treachery; the manufacturer is a prudent and skilful swindler; ... the man of letters... is always hawking his opinions and his conscience... The world as painted by M. Balzac is ... a cesspool" [cited in Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, pp. 768-769].
reform plans of the late 1830s and early 1840s from their predecessors. After
the publication of *La Femme Supérieure* in 1837, the "abuses" of administration
identified by Balzac were taken on by the Chamber of Deputies: budget reforms
in 1838 and 1839 sought to eliminate "inherited" raises and promotions from
departed colleagues and "the caprice and irresolution of individual wills" from
Ministerial organisation. While these plans retraced old ideas of simplification
and the imposition of a uniform hierarchy, they also broached new ideas of
professionalisation. Rabourdin's plan, which proposed to "employ fewer men, to
double or treble salaries, and do away with pensions, to choose only young
clers (as did Napoleon, Louis XIV., Richelieu, and Ximenes), but to keep them
long and train them for the higher offices and greatest honours..." became a
subject of debate in the legislature, the newspapers and the offices. Reforms
plans varied in their approximation of Balzac's actual ideas; all, however, treated
the administrator as a "bureaucrat" and ignored the real practices of the offices.

Emile de Girardin conceived the first of these new reform plans, a tantalising
glimpse of which appeared in the pages of *La Presse* six months before the
publication of *La Femme Supérieure*. Responding to proposals in the
Chamber to reform the laws on administrative pensions, his first article discussed
pensions – as a politician would – in purely financial terms. He treated them as a
mutual life assurance policy, rather than as a reckoning of virtue. Yet, while
ignoring the importance of the 1807 pension legislation as a means of creating
order in the bureaux, he put himself on the side of administrators by arguing
against the reduction of their salaries as "anti-economical". Like Balzac, he
proposed an increase in administrative salaries and a reduction in the personnel
receiving them: by paying administrators more, one could expect a higher
standard of service. His plan, therefore, proposed a re-organisation on the lines
of the plan Rabourdin. By printing Balzac's serialised novel in his newspaper six
months later, he turned what was just another reform plan into something more

---

105 The exact nature of any relationship between Girardin's plan and Balzac's
plan Rabourdin is unknown: see Hervé Donnard, *Balzac: Les Réalités
Économiques et Sociales*, p. 280.
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tangible, into a reform that would impinge directly on "real" people. Yet Girardin also exceeded the plan Rabourdin by proposing that the *surnuméranat*, as it existed, should be abolished: the current *surnuméraires*—free labour for the ministry—were, he argued, taken on with "closed eyes". Girardin proposed that the *surnuméranat* be replaced by fixed entry requirements for each administrative post: new administrators should be employed to fulfil particular tasks for which they had a particular capacity or expertise.

In successive years, Girardin continued to develop his thoughts on administrative reform. On the 17 September 1837, he took up Balzac's notion of there being need for only three ministries, although he redistributed the various tasks of government in a new, novel, fashion, between the work of organisation, of finance and of public service. The Ministerial crisis of 1840 also occasioned a series of articles on the roles of *hauts fonctionnaires*. In December 1840, Girardin wrote his most complete piece on the reform of ministerial personnel in an article entitled "Centralisation de la Centralisation". Like Balzac, he compared the progress of administration to the progress of French industry since 1814 and found it wanting. Girardin therefore advocated a capitalist organisation of the offices, a further centralisation of control to make the state more efficient, and the use, not only of new technological advances in lithographic and typographic presses (as Balzac had done), but also the creation of a single administrative building (an *atelier* or *palais administratif*) where the business of government could be transacted with the utmost speed and efficiency. He suggested open-plan offices, to facilitate the surveillance of *expéditionnaires*, and to simplify the chain of production in the bureaux of the central administrations. His *atelier administratif* (for which he engaged an architect to draw plans) was treated as a workshop, a factory floor, where the administrative report could be processed in

---

106 It must be noted, however, that Girardin did not know the content of *La Femme Supérieure*, until receiving it for publication in June (Balzac had only begun the novel in May 1837, five months after Girardin's article). See "Notice" in Balzac, *Les Employés*, pp. 305-306.

107 "Des Employés — Des Pensions et Retraites (premier article)", *La Presse* (12 January 1837).

108 *La Presse* (17 September 1837).

109 *La Presse* (29 October 1840). Girardin went on to treat Director-Generals on the 30 October, Ministers of State on the 31 October, and the High Dignitaries of State on the 1 November 1840.
the space of a single day. The wings of the "administrative Louvre" housing the Ministry of Public Finances and Ministry of Public Service were linked by the Présidence du Conseil, situated in the main building: reports would progress towards this centre, where they would be debated and communicated to the Imprimerie Nationale and the Direction of Posts and Messages.110

When Girardin returned to the need for conditions of entry into the administration, he recalled Balzac and earlier bureaucratic satire by arguing that such a plan was imperative to "dissipate the hoi polloi of solicitors". The sursumérariat, he argued, was a means to allow laziness and incapacity into the administration, urged on by protectors and vested interests. He envisioned a radical reform of administration, which pushed Balzacian logic to the limit: with the removal of the need for expéditionnaires, the "division of labour" would not only become more simplified, but "professionalism" and "expertise" could become means of recruitment. The science of administration he advocated was a discipline: any argument for "useful latitude" was overturned by his emphasis on efficiency and the technical superiority of a centralised organisation. He analysed those who worked within the ministries, not as potential individual producers, but as wheels in a machine. The morass into which employees had fallen could be drained, and the employee restored to his rightful role as the servant of the Nation and the effective arm of government action.

The discipline of scientific administration, imagined by Girardin, was seen in the offices as a means to rescue the reputation of bureaucrats, allowing them to claim to be professional administrators instead of bureaucratic frauds.111 Jean

110 This might be seen as the first "proletarianisation" of the fonctionnaire: see Judith Wishnia's The Proletarianizing of the Fonctionnaires: Civil Service Workers and the Labor Movement under the Third Republic (Baton Rouge & London: Louisiana State U.P., 1990). Needless to say, no such "reform" was ever carried out. As I will show, rival attempts to staff low-level administration with "qualified professionals" also failed. The reaction of "bureaucrats" to such measures, in fact, cements their place in a "petty bourgeoisie" who are not a class in themselves but - in their resistance to such measures which denuded their status - a class for themselves.

111 Similar moves towards "professionalisation" occurred elsewhere in this period: see my earlier comments on the transformation of "journalists" into "news reporters" in the late 1840s and early 1850s. See also, Jan Goldstein, Console
Delbousquet, an employee in the Ministry of War, who, in 1843, wrote *De l'organisation des Administrations Centrales des Divers Ministères*, reiterated many of Balzac's and Girardin's ideas, as he responded to budget debates on the need to reorganise central administration and pension regulation.\(^{112}\) Like his predecessors, Delbousquet did not want to destroy "bureaucracy" but to rebuild it.\(^{113}\) Like Rabourdin, he did not want a "Saint Barthelemy's Day for Employees".\(^{114}\) Outlining the "The Rights and Duties of Employees", he proposed that administrators should be given regular time off (a month's holiday every two years), but that, otherwise, their time should be disciplined more thoroughly, by timing each task the administrators performed. Each employee was responsible for his work, in that he could fulfil his quota. The close surveillance of ordinary employees by their superiors would "encourage zeal, awaken emulation and lead to more appropriate behaviour in the offices."\(^{115}\) Proposing the imposition of tighter time discipline in the ministries, Delbousquet removed the emphasis from the means of manufacture and placed it firmly on the need for "professional" conduct.

If Girardin had needed a serialised novel to make his exposé of administrative corruption realistic, Delbousquet was more explicit in criticising the ministries through the lens of satirical axiom. The Ministry-of-War employee began by

---

\(^{112}\) In particular, the debate on ministerial budgets for 1839: see *Archives Parlamentaires*, vol. CXIX, pp. 568-574 for Léon de Maleville's report on the Ministry of the Interior. Delbousquet agreed with all of Girardin's ideas, except that of increasing employee wages.


\(^{114}\) Ibid., p. 101. Balzac, in the course of writing *La Femme Supérieure*, moved from favouring an immediate reform to a slow process of rebuilding administration, from a "Saint Barthelemy's Day for Employees" to a twenty-year process. Balzac changed this aspect of his plan on the third copy-edit: Guy Robert, "Naissance d'un texte de Balzac", p. 176.

\(^{115}\) Delbousquet, *De l'organisation des administrations centrales*, p. 100.
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challenging the "general opinion" of an employee (derived clearly from bureaucratic satire) as a
privileged mortal... whose mission it is to go to his offices every
day at ten or eleven o'clock, and who, once there, has nothing
better to do than read his journal, wander in the neighbouring
bureaux to learn the day's news... who, before beginning work,
sets about trimming his pen, ... [he] takes his hat as soon as four
o'clock sounds, and retires home, convinced that he has
effectively contributed to the administrations activity and has
conscientiously paid his debt to the Nation.  

Nonetheless, he ended by using a similar caricature of administration himself.

His description of the Ministry of Interior recalled Le Sous-Chef Gautier's
attempt to create a bureau out of nothing: "You provide one or two rooms, put in a table,
an armchair, a few other chairs; you send a few files in, ... employ two or three
sumumériaires and there's your bureau.. You give it some name or other and
install the chief". As evidence of bureaucratic nepotism, Delbousquet cited the
example from Les Employés of the Minister of Finances' "adopted" daughters, for
whom there was always a respectable dowry in the offices.  

When Delbousquet noted that a trumped-up bureau chief had rank in the world, but little
credit, he furthermore copied Balzac's irony, conflating honour and financial
success in a witty bon mot. 

Like Girardin, Delbousquet called for radical changes to the surnumériariat to
dissipate the "obscure influences" within the ministry that hitherto informed the
politics of personnel changes. He proposed a system of recruitment that
distinguished between technical staff (the expéditionnaires) and experts (the
rédacteurs), by proposing separate entry examinations for the two grades. This
meant an end to the system whereby young men would form a "general idea" of

---

\[116\] Ibid., p. 10.
\[117\] Ibid., pp. 43-44.
\[118\] Delbousquet acknowledged the axiomatic nature of his work in his description of the Ministry of Interior: "It is an axiom to say that this ministry is in chaos", ibid., p. 42.
\[119\] Ibid., p. 44. This point is also made by Bill Reddy, The Invisible Code, p. 178.
\[120\] Ibid., p. 29. Delbousquet also thinks that examination will put an end to the problems of solicitation (p. 40).
administration, first of all in the *surnumérariat* and then as *expéditionnaires*, before rising through the ranks to become (potentially) bureau or division chiefs. *Expéditionnaires* who wished to rise through the hierarchy would, under Delbousquet's programme, compete with *surnuméraires* who had served a minimum of two years in the office in a separate competition for placement as a *rédacteur*. This cut-off point between copy-clerks and the writers of administrative reports, created in the imposition of different ("higher" and "lower", as Delbousquet put it) criteria of entrance, manufactured an artificial boundary between those who controlled administrative production and those who laboured under their control.

The means to create a body of capable administrators to fill the higher positions was, Delbousquet suggested, the creation of a School of Administrative Science, from which *surnuméraire-rédacteurs* could be primarily chosen. In the absence of such a school, *surnuméraires* preparing to compete to become *rédacteurs* had at least to have received the degree of Bachelor of Letters. While earlier plans to create a school of administrative science, like that proposed by Cuvier in 1820 to the Minister of Justice, had sought to train *hauts fonctionnaires* (sub-prefects, masters of requests, and Councillors of State), the plans of the late 1830s and 1840s considered education as a credential, as a necessary entry condition for any level of public administration. In 1837, Macarel, the Ministry of Interior's Director of Departmental and Communal Administration (a lawyer and an ex-professor in the Faculty of Law in the Collège de France), proposed the creation of a *haut enseignement des sciences administratives*, obligatory for all *surnuméraires* and lasting two years. Salvandy, as Minister for Public Instruction, set up the *Commission des Hautes Études de Droit* in 1838 and proposed the creation of an *École Normale ou École Polytechnique des services administratives où politiques* so that certain degrees could be made mandatory for state professions. In 1845, Salvandy, restored

---

121 Ibid., p. 85.
122 Ibid., p. 87.
123 Ibid., p. 88.
125 Ibid., pp. 64-65.
126 Ibid., p. 66.
to the position he had lost in 1839, once more tried to establish an École Spéciale des Sciences politiques. This time around, he was thwarted by the 1848 Revolution. Nevertheless, the Republican government took on the advice given to their predecessors: an École d'Administration was opened on the 8 July 1848 by the Minister of Public Instruction, Hippolyte Carnot.127

It is part of the irony of the real-world "Human Comedy" that it was the son of Lazare Carnot who now attempted to create conditions of employee security in the ministries. Like Balzac's attempt to transpose bureaucratic caricatures into petty-bourgeois reality (or like Lazare Carnot's attempt to create a political test for ministry clerks), Hippolyte Carnot's school, which sought to make educational qualifications for all new administrative recruits mandatory, was a failure. Separating entitlement to administrative placement from the "facts" of administrative service, did nothing to blunt the clamour of office politics, the accusations of deceit and indolence and counter-claims of incapacity and ignorance.128 The school closed on the 9 August 1849 and put a definitive end to any attempt to reform the offices in the nineteenth century.129 As the use of educational qualification as a means to judge administrative capacity collapsed before the first class even graduated from the École d'Administration, 'bureaucracy" was cast outside the professional sphere. The illusion of corporation, envisaged in the École polytechnique de l'administration, which would allow them to feel the bond of a common education even if their duties took them to the four corners to France, was - like the illusion of the emulative rhetoric of the état de services - denied to administrators: they remained Messieurs les Ronds-de-Cuir, the bureaucrats who could never prove themselves as useful members of bourgeois society.

127 Ibid., pp. 83-84.
128 Its demise was brought about by the politicisation of administrative disputes in the presidential election campaign of December 1848 by the criticisms of the journals, La Réforme administrative and La Tribune des Employés. Existing administrators protested that the cost of attending Carnot's school would create an administrative elite. The pupils complained about the need to become part of a surnuméariat, after receiving their degrees. The victory of Louis Napoleon over Cavaignac (who supported the school) led to its demise. See Thuillier, L'E.N.A. avant l'E.N.A., pp. 90-91; Hippolyte Carnot, D'une École d'Administration (Versailles: E. Aubert, 1878), pp. 22-23.
129 Its successor, the E.N.A., was created in 1945.
Conclusion

What is petty about being a bureaucrat?

Balzac's condemnation of the bourgeoisie marked the birth of nineteenth-century social ideology. His "realist" description of society proved fertile ground for theories of social development and programmes of political action. Frederick Engels, in a letter to Margaret Harkness in April 1888, referred to Balzac as

a far greater master of realism than all the Zolas, past, present or future, [who] gives us in his Comédie Humaine a most wonderfully realistic history of French "society", describing, chronicle fashion, almost year by year from 1816 to 1848, the ever-increasing pressure of the rising bourgeoisie upon the society of nobles... ¹

Although Balzac was himself a legitimist, and his sympathies were with "the class that is doomed to extinction", Engels saw him as compelled to go against his own class sympathies and political prejudices, to foresee the necessity of the downfall of nobility, because he "saw the real men of the future ... – that I consider one of the greatest triumphs of realism, and one of the greatest features in old Balzac".²

Marx, on the other hand, believed in a Balzac who "thoroughly studied every shade of avarice".³ If Balzac's views of country life were for Marx elucidating in the breakdown of feudal agricultural relations, his depictions of Parisian moeurs confirmed the effect of the (1789) "Bourgeois Revolution" on the emergence of new relations of production in France.⁴ Moreover, Balzac's

depiction of the petite bourgeoisie, the "social stratum" upon which he believed the political power of the July Monarchy rested, informed Marx's "Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon". When Marx introduced the 1848 Revolution as a farce, a caricature of its predecessor, and a mere hiccup in the progress of history, the jokers were men like Bixiou or LaPeyrade. Indeed, the "preacher of morals" of the Society of December 10 was none other than "Véron-Crevel", an amalgamation of the real-life editor of Le Constitutionnel and Crevel, the dissipated former commis-voyageur, épiciers and perfume merchant in Balzac's La Cousine Bette. For Marx, the "tradition of dead generations weighed like a nightmare on the brain of the living" in 1848; the Revolutionaries, in mimicking the men of the 1790s, conjured up "the spirits of the past to their service... to present the new scene of world history in ... time-honoured disguise and ... borrowed language". Louis Napoleon similarly was a caricature of his uncle. Yet, Marx was no more or less a dupe of caricature and borrowed language than the peasants who voted for "the Nephew" in 1848: he was simply fooled, not by political tradition, but by social satire. He had allowed himself to find hope in Balzac's disillusionments: even if bourgeois types had triumphed (with the help of the petty bourgeoisie) in 1848, and even if swindlers had stolen power in December 1852, Marx still believed that the ghost of "the social republic of February", which had been "drowned in the blood of the Paris proletariat" had intended to write about Balzac's Comédie Humaine, but that this project — "like so many others" — was never started.

5 Balzac, Les Petits Bourgeois, p. 100.
6 Véron had supported Louis Napoleon's coup d'état in 1851, and was elected to the Chamber as a government deputy in 1852. He had been Director of the Opera during the July Monarchy and an editor of the Constitutionnel (in which La Cousine Bette was first serialised in 1846). Balzac therefore had not meant Crével, a "bourgeois calculator", to be a character sketch of Véron: Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon", p. 196; Balzac, La Cousine Bette, in Œuvres Complètes de M. de Balzac (Paris: Furne, 1848), vol. XVII.

7 Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon", p. 104.
8 In 1843, Marx had already written a piece on Prussian bureaucracy in order to "denounce one of Hegel's mystifications", to unmask his "illusion". Hegel looked to administration to reform and renew the Prussian state after 1806. Marx argued that Hegel's typification of administration could be taken word-for-word from the Prussian Civil Code, and that it was necessary to look at "social reality" instead of "formulae empty of any signification". See Guy Thuillier, Témoins de l'Administration, pp. 264, 268.
during the June Days, would continue to haunt France and lead inexorably to
the proletarian revolution he desired.  

For Marx, the state "revealed" itself as an independent power in 1848, "when
its chief no longer requires genius... and its bureaucracy no longer requires
moral authority in order to justify itself".  

When Marx claims that Louis Napoleon turned the "instruments of state" into a new Society of December
10, he is more than ready to believe that cold poultry and garlic sausages
were all that was needed.  

Here, Marx treats bureaucrats as members of les petits bourgeois, as a class in themselves but not a class for themselves.

Like the peasants, who are also "fooled" by the "trickster" Louis Napoleon, their relationship to the means of production is outside of the dichotomy of
labour and capital.  

Denied entry to any "class", administrators are cast outside of society, derided as "bureaucrats", and used as marionettes in a
battle of social politics.

Marx therefore sees 1848 through the lens of a Balzac novel. He explains
that only a mystificateur of the ability of Louis Bonaparte could convince so
many moutons to support his ambition, and to believe his parody of his uncle,
Emperor Napoleon.  

Indeed Marx's description of the lumpenproletariat who rally to the pretender – decayed roués with dubious means of subsistence and of
dubious origins, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of
the bourgeoisie... vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged...

---

9 Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon", pp. 181-182
10 Ibid., p. 186. This sentence, appearing in the 1852 article, was omitted
from later editions.
11 Ibid., p. 150. Marx agrees with Balzac's idea that the state is about nothing
more or less than domination.
12 Ibid., pp. 187-188. Marx describes the peasantry as a class in themselves,
but not a class for themselves: "Insofar as millions of families live under
economic conditions of existence that separate their mode of life, their
interests and their culture from those of other classes... they form a class.
Insofar as there is merely a local interconnection among these small-holding
peasants, and the identity of their interests begets no community, no national
bond and no political organisation, they do not form a class. They are
consequently incapable of enforcing their class interests in their own name...
They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented."
13 Louis Bonaparte was wearing "an iron mask which prevented him from
displaying a physiognomy of his own": ibid., p. 138.
jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, rogues, mountebanks, 
lazzaroni, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, maquereaux, 
bradel keepers, porters, literati, organ-grinders, rag-pickers, 
knife grinders, tinkers, beggars – in short, the whole indefinite, 
disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither, which the 
French term \textit{la bohème}\textsuperscript{14} – 
reads like a genealogy of the \textit{Comédie Humaine}. Marx, like Balzac, saw that 
the "bureaucrat", an "offshoot of the bourgeoisie", naturally belonged in this 
rogues' gallery, as both victim and participant in their attempt to crawl out of 
the gutter.

In the mid-1830s, the "bureaucratic type" had been purged of context, leaving 
Henry Monnier's \textit{Scènes de la Vie Bureaucratique} concerned, not with 
authorship (like the earliest vaudevilles), but with the inanities of day-to-day 
conversation and detailed physiognomic description. Balzac filled Monnier's 
"chronicles" with economic and \textit{faux}-sociological analysis. Balzac, indeed, 
turned social charge into a social politics. If Marx and Balzac did not share 
the same political perspective, the legitimist and the socialist revolutionary 
shared a social critique, one that has been reproduced ever since in histories 
of nineteenth-century bureaucracy and bourgeois society. Like Marx, social 
historians have reproduced the depth of caricatured description in Balzac 
and other realist writers, filling it out with economics and demography. 
Administrative historians, too, have used Balzac to indicate what they should 
be investigating, rather than letting the sources speak for themselves.

If nineteenth-century realists and contemporary authors of urban social 
history depend on the same caricatures to marshal their facts, both always fall 
back on the authority of the "observer" to legitimise their perspective. 
Although Louis Chevalier, the author of \textit{Les Classes Laborieuses et Les 
Classes Dangereuses} in the 1950s\textsuperscript{15}, debated Balzac's own claim to be the 
historian of his times, he ended by declaring the victory of Balzac over the 
computer.\textsuperscript{16} He had found that no historian, no matter what methodology he

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 149.
\textsuperscript{15} In \textit{Les Classes Laborieuses et Les Classes Dangereuses} (Paris: Plon, 
1958), Louis Chevalier reads "in the margins" of Balzac's descriptions of 
"bourgeois" faubourgs, to glean information about the working class (p. 472).
\textsuperscript{16} For Chevalier, Balzac's accuracy should have become something to be 
challenged with the advent of the computer age.
applied, could produce anything more than a pale version of what the great
novelist had already written: "inquiries and statistical verification are
superfluous before Balzac's experiences (which recall our own experiences)
and images (which, in one way or another, make the reader complicit)." 17
Chevalier therefore resigned himself to reproducing the authenticity of the
Comédie Humaine, and demanded of literary experts that they analyse the
conditions of Balzac's intuition, the secret of the creation of the Comédie
Humaine. 18

Adeline Daumard, in her masterwork, La Bourgeoisie Parisienne de 1815 à
1848, also translated the "truth" of Balzac's description into a minutely
detailed quantitative social history. 19 To describe the classes that made up
the Parisian population, she used financial records and the documents of the
état civil to evaluate the different levels of fortune and revenue in Paris
society. However, having collected these sources, she based her categories
of analysis on the "spheres" outlined by Balzac a hundred years earlier. 20
She therefore reproduced the novelist's emphasis on the linkage between
professional and economic status in her analysis of the first half of the
nineteenth century largely uncritically: after all, the realist novelist's task, like
the historian's, is to create a living society from boring details. For the social
historian, therefore, the links Balzac makes between different social types and
different social milieu have been impossible to prove or disprove. 21 Yet this is
- at least in part - due to a choice of sources. Daumard's bibliography, citing
both works of literary critique and social science, indicates that she uses the
former to describe the July Monarchy and the latter to describe the Second
Empire. As the "scientists" who investigated French society in the 1850s and
1860s were, like Daumard, searching for confirmation of the answers that
Balzac had given them, this literature fits seamlessly together. Like Balzac,
the historian of the nineteenth century does not look to penetrate beyond the
salons and antechambers of his subjects without the mediation of an

17 Louis Chevalier, "La Comédie Humaine: document d'histoire?", Revue
18 Ibid., p. 48.
19 Adeline Daumard, La Bourgeoisie Parisienne de 1815 à 1848 (Paris: Albin
Michel, 1996). This study was first published in 1963.
20 Daumard, La Bourgeoisie Parisienne de 1815 à 1848, p. 6. She cites the
introduction to Balzac's Fille aux Yeux d'or as her inspiration.
21 Chevalier, "La Comédie Humaine: document d'histoire?", p. 36.
"observer": without Balzac's guidance, facts and figures confuse, rather than clarify, our sketches of Parisian life behind the bourgeoisie's sheet-iron doors.

To make Balzac an "eye-witness", literary experts, in their turn, have sought to identify individuals who inspired Balzac in his creation of the characters of La Comédie Humaine. Suzanne Bérard on the characters of Les Illusions perdues pioneered the search for "figures of inspiration". Anne-Marie Meininger has since inherited her crown (her "Qui est Des Lupeaulx?", published in L'année Balzacienne, the home of so many of these articles, is a perfect example of the genre). Another notable example, Hervé Donnard's Les Réalités économiques et sociales dans La Comédie Humaine, places Balzac within a specific political and journalistic milieu. Like Meininger, however, Donnard does little to interrogate the conditions in which this milieu operated outside of Balzac's novels, or to ask what inspired its pre-occupation with financial abuses and administrative mediocrity. Only those inspired by structuralism and post-structuralism, who abandon authenticity to argue that "Realism" is a form of representation rather than a mode of description, can escape self-reflexivity in their literary critique of Balzac.

An examination of the reoccurrence of the question of authorship between the 1790s and 1830s in employee's solicitations, in examples of office politics, and, in the bureaucratic satire of the 1820s, however, has suggested new categories of analysis with which both bureaucracy – and the "bourgeoisie" more generally – can be viewed. Even though the institutions of the post-revolutionary public sphere were unable to reward individual production, time discipline, ancienneté, honour, and paternity – alternative means of judging individual worth – provided a currency of self-representation. However, as none of these categories were watertight, they all depended on the preservation of a rhetoric of emulation to prevent open competition from denuding their legitimacy. In the early years of the nineteenth century, bureaucrats felt alienated from control over their own production as keenly as the nineteenth-century working class ever did. For that reason, the language

---

22 See her notes and comments on Balzac's Illusions perdues, le manuscrit de la collection Spoelberch de Lovenjoul; thèse complémentaire pour le doctoral ès lettres (Paris: A. Colin, 1959).
24 See Chapter Seven, Note 31, for an overview of this literature.
developed by bureaucratic satire, which allowed them to blame someone else, provided a useful safety valve to explain why decisions went against them. They displaced their anxieties about control by imagining bureaucratic villains and petty colleagues at whom they could laugh – and by laughing condemn. Yet bureaucratic satire had a wider audience among the *bourgeoisie*, who, when they flocked to the vaudeville, saw *all* administrators as "bureaucrats". That some bureaucrats could be authors and some could be *médiocre et rampant* was lost on these crowds, as the "bureaucratic type" became more and more focused on physiognomic type and less on office parody.

Bureaucrats (and the other members of the nascent *petite bourgeoisie*, the grocers) were a buffer against the "dangerous classes", a meta-world of intrigue which they could understand but yet satisfactorily keep themselves separate from. Before the bourgeoisie could imagine a working class, it had to first de-proletarianise itself. For that reason, there is little mention of a working class in Balzac's novels: the gutters of his Paris hold only disenchanted authors and ambitious *mystificateurs*. His "proletariat" are thin shadows of *le peuple*, as described in the pittoresque accounts of Louis Sébastien Mercier. To console his bourgeois readers, Balzac emphasised not control over individual production, but the financial means that made this control unimportant. He assured his readers that they were not members of the *petite bourgeoisie*, full of the worst types, of those who looked to cheat their way to success because they did not have the wits to succeed in a truly competitive (capitalist) world. His bureaucrats were therefore the most abject of the *petite bourgeoisie* as there was simply no means to become a financial success as a Ministry clerk; they were "owned" by the government, by their protectors, and manipulated at will. Balzac delighted in the interchangeability of bureaucrats: treating them as part of a machine, he looked forward to when a ministry, divided into a set of coherent specialist areas (as envisaged by the *plan Rabourdin*) would it fulfil its potential as a machine of state, in which clerks had been reduced to mental labourers, their brains the hands of government.25

---

25 Indeed, in the final scene of *Les Employés*, the Minister remarks that employees should be the "the hands of a brain", not brains in their own right.
For Balzac, bureaucrats lived in the muck through which one should rise if one was to become wealthy enough to be *bon bourgeois*. While the wage-earning *petite bourgeoisie* were still distinguishable from workers by their dress, education and other marks of distinction, low salaries meant that they were constantly in danger of becoming mixed up with the flotsam and jetsam of the Parisian netherworld. They therefore had to scheme their way out of the gutter. When Marx and Engels described the *petite bourgeoisie* in their *Communist Manifesto* as fluctuating between proletariat and bourgeoisie and ever renewing itself as a supplementary part of bourgeois society. The individual members of this class... are constantly hurled down into the proletariat by the action of competition, and, as modern Industry develops, they even see the moment approaching when they will completely disappear as an independent section of modern society, to be replaced in manufacture, agriculture and commerce, by foremen, bailiffs and shop assistants, they confirmed Balzac's view of the position of the bureaucrat as a buffer between the *haut bourgeoisie* and the labouring classes. For Marxist socialists, as for Balzac, bourgeois society was to be judged neither by its consumption or production, but by the means by which it controlled the production of others: its Capital.

What both Balzac and Marx ignored was that control of the means of production had hitherto not necessarily implied its ownership. The bureaucrat for them was a marionette: he was subservient to the ruling class who controlled his financial security. Yet, "ownership" of production had never been a "natural" category in early nineteenth-century institutions like the Ministry, the *société savante*, or marriage. "Control" of collaborative efforts was instead managed by a social mathematics based on emulation, documentation and the reckoning of accumulated honour. For Balzac, this social mathematics was a form of petty-bourgeois self-delusion. In *Les Employés*, he derided *ancienneté* in the figure of "young" Poiret, the oldest and most stupid man in Rabourdin's office, whose routines and habits meant

---

that no other life was so well ordered. In Les Petits Bourgeois, he called into question virtuous paternity in his account of the torturous conundrum faced by Phellion when deciding whether to compromise his principles in favour of his son's prospects of marrying Céleste Colleville's money. Balzac further gutted the principle of emulation with his account of how Phellion's wish that his son would have the "honour" of becoming a government clerk, following in the footsteps of Monsieur Rabourdin. In a comprehensive indictment of a class that did not exist, the realist novelist turned the office worker into an emblem of self-delusion, of thwarted ambition, and of the bitterness of lost illusions. Abandoned to the realm of the "petty bourgeoisie", the white-collar worker, both employee and manager, both wage-earner and capital investor, stands at the nexus of nineteenth-century class identities. The ghost of a forgotten social revolution stands with him.

28 Balzac, Les Petits Bourgeois, pp. 139-142
29 Balzac, Les Employés, p. 120.
Moeurs Administratives, dessinées d'après nature, par Henry Monnier
(Paris: Imp lith. de Delpech, 1828)
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Garçon de Bureau
Surnuméraire
Employé
Sous-Chef
Chef de Bureau
Chef de Division
Huit heures.
Balayage des bureaux, discussions politiques entre MM. les garçons de bureau
Neuf heures.
Arrivée des employés. Changements de Costumes, Petit Tour de Poêle
Dix heures.
Lecture des journaux, déjeuner, taille des plumes.
Dix heures et demie.
Ouverture des Tiroirs, Conversations Particulières.
Midi.

Arrivée de M. le Chef de division. Travail Obligé.
Une heure.
Visites, Digestions du déjeuner, Invitations à dîner.
Deux heures.
Promenades dans l'Intérieur du Ministère, les chapeaux remplacent les absens.
Un Jour d'Audience
M. le Chef de Division donnant une audience.
Quatre heures.

Départ des employés, oubli jusqu'au lendemain de toute affaire bureaucratique.
MM. le Directeur, Chefs, Sous-Chefs, Employés, Surnuméraires &c. &c. &c. allant complimenter une Nouvelle Excellence.
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Personnel Dossiers: première série:

vol. 31 [Besson] vol. 113 [Durant Nicolas, Pierre]
v. 17 [Barbié du Bocage, Guillaume] vol. 160 [Hauterive Maurice]
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vol. 24 [Dhermand, Emmanuel, Louis, Joseph]
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f/1bl/9/2 [Personnel des diverses divisions, 1823-1844].
f/1bl/10/1 [Personnel: Correspondance et Arrêtés, an VIII-1810].
f/1bl/10/2 [Personnel: Correspondance et Arrêtés, 1811-1814].
f/1bl/10/3 [Personnel: Correspondances et Arrêtés, 1815-1818].
f/1bl/10/3 [Personnel: Correspondances et Arrêtés, 1815-1818].
f/1bl/10/4 [Personnel: Correspondances et Arrêtés, 1819-1828].
f/1bl/10/5 [Personnel: Correspondances et Arrêtés, 1829-1836].
AD/l/78 [Collection Rondonneau: Organisation du Ministère]
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f/1bl/51 [Commission de Commerce et Approvisionnements et Commission des Subsances, an II – III].
f/10/230/b [Correspondance de la Commission d'Agriculture et des Arts, an II – III].
Bureau des Archives

f/1a/590-2. [Archives, Objets généraux et diverses, 1790-1837].

Bureau d'Agriculture

f/10/211 [Sociétés diverse, 1812-1815].
f/10/225 [Notes, petitions, correspondance concernant le personnel, an III-1808].
f/10/252 [Bureau d'Agriculture: affaires Diverses an X-1815].
f/10/253 [Papiers et Correspondance du Bureau d'Agriculture].
f/10/287-288 [Mélanges an X-1811 (rapports et mémoires sur le Code Rural)].
f/10/296 [Ministère de l'intérieur - Comptabilité an IV-1807].

Bâtiments Civils

f/13/504 [Améliorations des arrêtés du Directoire, Copies de lettres du ministre de l'Intérieur, relatives aux dits arrêtés, et ordres courans].

Police (Ministry and Division of)

f/7/3006 [Organisation des bureaux du Ministère de la Police Générale, an VII, an VIII -1815].
f/7/3007 [Ordre de service des Bureaux, an IV-VIII].
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f/1bl/6 [Personnel du Ministère, an VIII-1807].
f/1bl/15 [Bureaux consultatifs d'Agriculture, Commerce et Arts].
f/1bl/45 [Ponts et Chaussées].
f/1bl/55 [Bureau particulier du Commerce].
f/1bl/531 [Personnel de l'Administration Centrale (registre intégral)].
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Ministry of the Interior

f/1bl/11-14 [Personnel du ministère (série alphabétique, 1792-1822)].

f/1bl/261 – 283 [Personnel de l'administration centrale]

f/1bl/261/1 [Allard, Charles Marie Auguste]
[Andrieux]
[Angot, Jean Nicholas]
f/1bl/261/2 [Arnould, Ambroise Athanase]
[Auclair, veuve]
[Augé, Pierre-César]
[Auger, Louis Simon]
f/1bl/262/1 [Barbier de Neuville]
f/1bl/262/2 [Bastier, Jean]
f/1bl/262/3 [Beaurepaire, François Ensèbe Chacheré de]
[Belnos, Jean Jacques]
[Benoist, Pierre Vincent]
[Béranger, Jean Baptiste]
f/1bl/262/4 [Berny, Etienne Charles Gabriel de]
[Berthier, Gilbert]
[Bertrand, Dominique]
f/1bl/262/5 [Blanchard, François Claude Victor, père]
[Bocquet, François Nicolas]
f/1bl/262/6 [Bonneau, Etienne]
[Bouchitté, Jean Pierre]
f/1bl/262/7 [Bourgogne, François]
[Bosquet, Jean]
[Boyelleau]
f/1bl/262/8 [Briquet, Michel]
f/1bl/263/1 [Cahusac, Armand Jean François Marie]
[Campagne, Edmond de]
[Canque, François]
[Carouaille, Barthélemy Jean]

f/1bl/263/2
[Castel, Guillaume]

f/1bl/263/3
[Chartier, Bonaventure Joachim]

f/1bl/263/4
[Cindrieux, Jean Baptiste Punctis]
[Cluny, Denis]
[Cochaud, Antoine François Rambert]
[Conný, Jean François]
[Coquebert de Montbret, Barthélemy Eugène]
[Coquebert de Montbret, veuve]
[Costaz, Claude Anthelme]

f/1bl/264/1
[Deberny, Etienne Charles Gabriel]
[Decoisy, Joseph Martin]

f/1bl/264/2
[Degérando, Joseph Marie]
[Delangle, Jean Cécile]
[Delaunay, Clement Richard]
[Delétang, Edme Michel]
[Delétang, Félix Sebastien]
[Delétang, Louis Emile Julien]

f/1bl/264/3
[Dépéry, Charles François]

f/1bl/264/4
[Deshayes, Pierre Marie]
[Despréaux de St. Sauveur, Louis Grégoire]
[Domagget, Nicolas]
[Dosda, Claude]

f/1bl/264/5
[Ducreux, Jean Marie]
[Ducros, Théodore]

f/1bl/264/6
[Durand, Gabriel Guillaume Jacques]
[Duval, Amaury]

f/1bl/266/1
[Fauchat, Nicolas]
[Favreau, Louis]

f/1bl/266/2
[Feval, Louis Theodore François]
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Goujet, Pierre Barnabé
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Henry, Pierre Joseph
Isnard, Joseph Paul Bathélemy (veuve)
Joannès, Jacques
Lacroix, Veyron
Lacivier
Laffon-Ladebat
Sylvestre Laforest, Antoine
Lafosse, André Alexandre
Laigneau, Jean Baptiste Nicolas
Lallemand
Lamy, Etienne
Lansel, Jean Antoine
Lebas, Nicolas François
Legendre, Louis, Jean, Baptiste
Léger, Vadam
Lemoine, Jacques Joseph
Letellier, Antoine François
Leterreur, Réné Hilaire Félix
Levrault, Joseph Gabriel Gaston
Locard, Jacques Etienne
Loiselet, Edouard Ignace Joseph
Mardelet, Pierre
Normand, Joseph
Paris, veuve
Pétel, Vital
Petit, Charles André
Petit, fils
Petit, Jacques
[Petit, Jean Baptiste François]
[Petit, Jean Emmanuel Hippolyte]
[Petit, Jean Louis François]
[Petit, Pierre Alexandre Stanislas]
[Petit de Lavieville, Jean Pierre]

f/1bl/276/3
[Piher, Jean François Eugène]
[Pillerault]
[Plaine-Ligny, François]

f/1bl/276/4
[Ponsignon, Adolphe]
[Prévost, Claude Charles]
[Prévost, veuve]

f/1bl/278/1
[Rabajoie, Louis]
[Raboteau, Pierre Paul]
[Raoul, Nicolas]
[Rateau, Charles François]
[Raulin, André Jean]
[Ravot de la Vau, Etienne]
[Realier-Dumas]
[Regnier, Pierre Charles]
[Remondat, Jean]
[Remuzat, Etienne François David]
[Renauldson]
[Rendu, Pierre Sébastien]

f/1bl/278/2
[Reslon du Guénon, Marie Armand]
[Ricateau, Jacques François]
[Richard, Didier]
[Richard, Etienne Louis]
[Richard, Julien Etienne]
[Richemont d'Esparbère]
[Riffé, Jean]
[Rigollet]
[Rigueur du Parc, Jean Baptiste]
[Rivolet, François]
[Robin, André Théodore]
[Rochefort, Claude Louis Marie Armand, de]
[Rocher, Antoine]
[Rode, Charles Martial]
[Rogier, Pierre-Claude]

f/1bl/279/1
[Sabatier, Barthelemy]
[Sabatier, Maurice]
[Sambucy, A. de]
[Saqui Destoures, Louis Charles Hylarion]
[Sausseret, Julien Nicolas]
[Sausseret fils, Alphonse Hypolite]
[St. Fal, Auguste]

f/1bl/282/2
[Sauvan, J. Baptiste Balthazard]

f/1bl/279/1
[Silvestre, Augustin François]
[Sommerson, Ambroise François]
[Sorel]
[Suan]

f/1bl/280/1
[Telmon, Jean]
[Tener, Melchior]
[Thibault, Denis Elysée]

f/1bl/280/2
[Thomy]
[Tinel, Pierre Alexandre]

f/1bl/280/3 & f/1bl/281
[Treuil, Marie Gabriel Augustin]
[Tripier Lefranc, Claude François]
[Turgot, Aimable Georges]

f/1bl/282/1
[Vaillant, Jean Nicolas]
[Valat, Jean]

f/1bl/282/2
[Vée, Louis-Jean-Mathias]
[Vial, Jean Victor Auguste]
[Vibert]

f/1bl/282/3
[Villemont, Jean Pierre]
[Vincent, Jean Louis Simon]

f/1bl/283-286
[Watrin, Antoine Marie]
[Watrin, Nicolas Joseph]
[Wauthy (dit Wauthier), Jean Marie Eugene]
Instruction Publique

f/17/20084 [Alexandre Barbié du Bocage].
f/17/20539 [Degérando, 1821, professeur à la faculté de droit de Paris].

Ministry of Justice

BB/30/516/1 [Boniface Petit].

d) Clubs and Societies:

f/17/1097 [Societies et corps savants divers].
f/7/6700 [Associations, loges maçonniques, 1814-1830].

e) Theatre:

Censors' Edits

f/18/643 [La matinée de Bureau ou la chanson, 3 février 1823].
f/18/653 [Le sous-chef ou la famille Gautier, 22 janvier 1825].
f/18/660 [Les Employés, 6 avril 1828].
f/18/655 [Le Protecteur, 3 août 1826].
f/18/596 [Le Mari et Le Protecteur, 14 août 1828].
f/18/1068 [Les Employés ou Une soirée bourgeoise, octobre 1835].

Censors' Reports

f/7/4334 [Médiocre et Rampant, 11 pluviôse an IV].
f/21/972 [La matinée de Bureau, 22 mars 1822].
f/21/987 [Le Sous-Chef ou la famille Gautier, 6 janvier 1825].
f/21/987 [Le Protecteur, 1826].
f/21/990 [Les Employés, 6 août 1828].
f/21/966 [Le mari et le protecteur, 14 août 1828].
f/21/985 [Les Employés ou une Soirée Bourgeoise, 2 novembre 1835].

f) Police Records:

Investigations, 1790s

f/7/4588, plaq. 2 [Arrestation de l'Abbé Barthélemy].
f/7/4620 [certificat de civisme: Brunet, Léon Joseph fils].
f/7/4673 [Arrestation de Félix Desportes].
f/7/4673 [certificat de civisme: Despréaux St. Sauveur, Louis Grégoire].
f/7/4707 [certificat de civisme: Fleurigeon, Rémi].

Investigations during the Restoration

f/7/6283, dossier 5775 [Laborie, Ministry of Foreign Affairs].
f/7/6572, dossier 2885 [Soulavie].

g) Building works

Ministry Building Plans:

f/31/35 pièce 357 [hôtel de Labriffe]
f/31/36 pièce 329 [hôtel de Labriffe]
f/31/35, n. 235 et 236 [l'hôtel de Galliffet]
f/31/37 pièce 189 [hôtel Conti-Brissac (Forbin-Janson), 1839]
f/31/92 [Plan de Vasserot; quartier Saint-Thomas d’Acquin, îlot 11]

N III Seine 1106 [Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, rue des Capucines]
N III Seine 1107 [Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, quai d'Orsay, 1845].
N III Seine 1108 [Ministère de Commerce et des Travaux Publics, 1836-40].
N III Seine 1113 [Ministère de l'Instruction publique, 1845].
NUI Seine 1114 [Hôtel de Conti, rue de Grenelle [n° 101], pre-1819, 1829, 1839]
N III Seine 1137 [Hôtel de la Briffe: Conseil des bâtiments civils]
N III Seine 1207 [Ministère des Finances, rue Neuve-des-Petits-Champs, c. 1800]
NIII Seine 1335 [plan cadastral de l'hôtel de Conti, la Ministère du Commerce, et l'École des Ponts et Chaussées, règne de Louis-Philippe].

Estimates, Requests and Related Correspondence:

f/13/203 d. 24 [Projet de Construction d'un galerie nouvelle dans l'hôtel du ministère de l'Intérieur, 1811].

f/13/204 [Lettres de Poyet sur les travaux d'aménagement, an XI; Dépenses pour l'installation de Montalivet dans l'hôtel Brissac, 1809; Project de construction de l'hôtel des Affaires Etrangères du Royaume d'Italie, 1809].

f/13/205 d. 23 [Projet de construction du ministère des Affaires Etrangères (1810 et 1824)].

f/13/206 d. 14 [Ministère de l'Intérieur 1810-1820].

f/13/207 [Ministère de l'Intérieur, hôtel Wagram, 1819-1820; Ministère de l'Intérieur (avant les Commission exécutives), rue Neuve des Petits Champs; Ministère de la Guerre, hôtel Tessé].

f/13/320 [Mémoires relatifs aux travaux exécutés dans les hôtels occupés par les Ministères ou les commissions exécutives, 1789 - an IV].

f/13/496 [Mémoires de travaux relatif au Ministère de l'Intérieur (1811-1820)].

f/13/740 [Travaux dans divers bâtiments de Paris 1811-1832: Hôtel Tessé occupé par les Bureaux de l'administration de la Guerre].

f/13/883 [hôtels du Ministère de l'Intérieur].

f/13/884 [Travaux de Paris, an IV – 1825: Ministères].

f/13/887 [Hôtel du Ministre de la Police générale, sur la quai d'Orsay].

f/13/1206 [Hôtel de l'Instruction publique].

f/13/1207 [Maisons occupées par le Ministère de l'Intérieur, 1786-an VII].

f/13/1208 [Maisons occupées par le Ministère de l'Intérieur, ans VI – IX].

f/13/1209 [Maisons occupées par le Ministère de l'Intérieur, an IV-VII].

f/13/1210 [Maisons occupées par le Ministère de l'Intérieur, an X – 1810].
f/13/1212 [Maisons occupées par le Ministère de l'Intérieur, an V-1836].
f/13/1213 [Maisons occupés par le Ministère de l'Intérieur et le Ministère des Travaux publics et du Commerce, 1822-1833].

Private Dwellings

f/31/7, 154. f/31/23, 140. f/31/34, 169.
f/31/8, 17. f/31/30 bis, 32, 38. f/31/35, 89.
f/31/10, 172. f/31/31, 70. f/31/37, 133.

h) Minutier Centrale

Arnould, Ambroise Athanase

ET/XIV/529 [Abstention de Arnould, Marie Thérèse et Ambroise Athanase à la succession de Jean-Baptiste Arnould leur oncle; 28 fructidor an II]

Auclair, Jean-Baptiste

ET/XLVI/611 [Contrat de mariage; 16 ventôse an VI]
ET/XLVI/645 [Inventaire après décès; 1 floréal an XII]
ET/XLVI/739 [Mariage entre M. Grégoire et veuve Auclair; 28 septembre 1816]

Augé, Pierre-César

ET/XVIII/1054 [Procuration donnée à Joseph Gabriel Gravier, employé au ministère de la justice; 12 mars 1812]

Barbié du Bocage, Jean Denis

ET/CXII/820 [Contrat de mariage; 8 février 1792].
ET/CXII/829 [Quittance de M. et Mme Delahaye; 25 fructidor an II].
ET/VI/949 [Inventaire après le décès de sa mère, Marie Martin Delafosse; 18 mai 1814].

ET/VI/952 [Procès verbal d'adjudication des deux maisons rue du plâtre St Jacques; 28 février 1815].

ET/VI/952 [Procès verbal contenant adjudication définitive; 28 mars 1816].

ET/VI/959 [Partage de la succession de ses père et mère, et de son soeur, Louise Adelaide; 1 avril 1817].

ET/VI/959 [Liquidation et abandonnement du partie du prix desdits maisons; 1 avril 1817].

ET/XLII/741 [Alienation des maisons de leur communauté de biens; 21 et 22 mai 1824].

ET/XLIII/741 [Vente de la maison n° 19 par M. et Mme B. de B. à Maurice Nicolle et Marie Catherine Detelle, sa femme; 21 et 22 mai 1824].


ET/XLIII/744 [Acte de mariage entre Adelaide Augustine et M. Aime Lemoine; 18 octobre 1824].

ET/XLIII/753 [Inventaire après décès; 29 mars 1826].

ET/XLIII/797 [Inventaire après le décès de son fils, Isidore; 23 octobre 1834].

**Barbier-Neuville, Jean Pierre**

ET/XXXI/477 [Inventaire après décès; 12 janvier 1822].

ET/XXXI/477 [Dépôt de l'acte de décès; 15 janvier 1822].

ET/XXXI/477 [Dépôt de testament de M. Barbier de Neuville; 29 janvier 1822].

ET/XXXI/477 [Consentement à l'exécution du testament de M. Barbier de Neuville; 1 février 1822].

**Bastier, Jean**

ET/XXI/607 [Mariage entre Charles Louis François Joseph Barbier (fils de François Antoine Barbier, employé au ministère de la guerre, et Jeanne Françoise Bourgeois) et Marie Bastier, fille de Jean Bastier et Anne Louise Henry; 6 frimaire an II].
ET/XXI/610 [Mariage entre Alexis François Bastier et Marie Anne Rosalie Pianelli, fille de Simon François Pianelli, décédé, et Euphémie Louise Lepicq; 29 prairial an II].
ET/XV/1211 [Quittance par Bastier à Messant; 15 septembre 1808].

Chacheré de Beaurepaire, François Ensèbe

ET/VI/922 [Mariage, voir: Lampinet, François Marie; 30 septembre 1806].
ET/XVI/990 [Délivrance de legs, Vinot; 8 et 10 mars 1813]
ET/XVI/992 [Autorisation à Vinot, Françoise Cunégonde, sa femme; 8 septembre 1813].
ET/XVI/922 [Procuration déposée donné par le Général Vinot au S. Corcellet; 4 novembre 1813].
ET/XVI/933: [Liquidation et partage de la succession de Antoine Nicolas Vinot; 8 & 17 mai 1814].
ET/XVI/994 [Ratification de F.C. Vinot; 17 septembre 1814].
ET/I/833 [Consentement de mariage de Appoline Marie Chachère avec Gaillard; 16 juillet 1828].

Beinos, Jean Jacques

ET/XXXII/224 [Inventaire après décès de Mme Beinos; 21 avril 1818].
ET/XXXVII/311 [Inventaire après décès; 25 février 1823].

Benoist, Pierre Vincent

ET/XVIII/911 [Bail d'une maison; 1 brumaire an II].
ET/XIII/507 [Transport Rigaub; 6 ventôse an VII].
ET/VIII/1356 [Quittance donnée à Antoine Jean Charles Blondel; 12 décembre 1807].

Béranger, Jean Baptiste

ET/XII/772 [Procuration à Hielard, François Charles; 26 pluviôse an III]
ET/XVIII/954 [Procuration à Jean Joseph Marie Blondel et à Claude Hugon; 19 frimaire an IV].
ET/I/714 [Donation à Marie Anne Terlin, son épouse; 14 juin 1809].

Blanchard, Jean

ET/I/719 [Inventaire après le décès de Marie Thérèse Wauthyer, femme Blanchard; 17 août 1810].

Bouchitté, Jean Pierre

ET/XII/766 [Inventaire après décès de Jeanne Champion, femme Bouchitté; 8 prairial an II].
ET/XII/766 [Contrat de mariage, Bouchitté et M.C. Pélicier; 14 prairial an II].
ET/XX/864 [Mainlevée Pelicier; 28 octobre 1817].
ET/I/830 [Transaction – Jacqueminot; 24 & 29 janvier 1828].

Brûle-Lecomte, Nicolas

ET/XII/771 [Certificat de vie; 7 frimaire an III].
ET/XVIII/1014 [Transfert voir Vincent (Augustin B); 19 février 1806].

Castel, Guillaume

ET/VIII/1313 [Quittance à Robert Blain; 7 messidor an III]
ET/VIII/1313 [Quittance de rachat de terre par Castel et Marie Victoire Madeline à Jean Pierre Pelletier et Marie Louis Chapon, sa femme; 18 messidor an III]

Cauchy, Louis François

ET/I/719 [Adjudication, Lambert; 14 août 1810]
ET/I/881 [Procès-verbal d'enchères; 27 janvier 1835]
Chandioux, Marie-Claude

ET/XLIII/677 [Inventaire après décès; 24 mars 1814].

Deshayes, Pierre Marie

ET/I/777 [Quittance en suite du 19 mars 1820 par Deshayes et Marie Catherine Hebert, sa femme, et de Mathier Xavier Hebert et autres à Jean Gabriel Oursel; 1, 15, 16 septembre 1820].

Dommaget, Nicolas

ET/XLVI/739 [Testament déposé par M. Dommaget; 16 août 1816].
ET/XLVI/739 [Inventaire après décès; 30 septembre 1816]

Dosda, Claude

ET/VII/536 [Constitution par Maret, Hugues Bernard; 6 nivôse an V]

Favreau, Louis

ET/X/799 [Mariage, M. Favreau & Mme. Rousseau; 13 février 1792]

Fleurigeon, Rêmi

ET/III/1124 [Mariage Fleurigeon et Tassin; 4 février 1781].
ET/III/1184 [Titre nouvel par Remi Fleurigeon et Marie Louise Emilié Tassin, son épouse, au profit de Tassin; 7 mai 1787].
ET/III/1186 [Retrocession en faveur de Louise Françoise Tassin; 28 août 1787].
ET/XLI/730 [Inventaire M. Fleurigeon, après le décès de sa veuve, Marie Louise Emilie Tassin; 8 brumaire an XIV]
ET/II/829 [Dépôt d'actes - Lebeau, Pierre; 17 septembre 1807].
ET/II/828 [Transaction - Marie Eléonore Fleurigeon; 5 juin 1811].
ET/II/829 [Dépôt de 3 actes, par Dupheis, Nicolas Antoine; 25 septembre 1811].
ET/II/830 [Vente d'un part (par Marie Eléonore Fleurigeon) à Louis Antoine Houdard de Lamotte; 29 octobre 1811].

Gambier de Campy, Pierre François Louis

ET/Ill/932 [Inventaire après décès; 21 août 1832].

Gambier [de] Campy, Robert Denis Timoleon

ET/XI/770 [Depôt des procurations de Jeanne Gambier-Campy; 25 octobre 1791].

ET/XI/776 [Gambier-Campy, Catherine, substitution, voir Gambier-Campy, Pierre François Louis; 8 novembre 1792].

ET/XI/776 [Gambier-Campy, Jean et Gambier-Campy, Catherine: dépôt de procuration donné à Gambier-Campy PFL; 8 novembre 1792]

ET/XI/781 [Substitution par Gambier-Campy, PFL en faveur de Gambier de Campy, Jean; 6 frimaire an II].

ET/XI/781 [Dépôt des pièces concernant Gambier-Campy, Jean; 6 frimaire an II].

ET/XI/803 [Conventions entre Gambier-Campy, Marie Françoise, épouse Sommervogel; François Xavier, Sommervogel; [ ] François, son fils, et Favée, Esprit Prosper; 12 germinal an VIII].

ET/XVIII/1045 [Procuration voir Houdard (Louis Edme); 15 octobre 1810].

Gauthier-la-Chapelle, Claude Adrien Benoit

ET/V/954 [Obligation, S. et D. Gauthier la Chapelle aux S. et D. de Bottière; 15 juillet 1811].

ET/XLI/981 [Inventaire après décès de sa veuve; 27 janvier 1847].

ET/XLI/981 [Dépôt d'acceptation bénéficiaire, Gauthier la Chapelle; 24 février 1847].

Guy de Gisors, Alphonse
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ET/XVI/928 [Bail à loyer par A Gisors, AJB Gisors et Anne René de Gisors à Danstel et Bernard, son épouse; 7 fructidor an V].

ET/XVI/990 [Obligation par M. de Gisors à Mlle Deshayes; 5 janvier 1813].

ET/XVI/993 [Mariage entre M. Despois et Mlle de Gisors; 5 janvier 1813].

ET/XVI/990 [Procuration et substitution par M. AJB G de Gisors a M. A de Gisors; 22 janvier 1813].

ET/XVI/994 [Mainlevée par AJB G de Gisors au Gouvernement; 31 décembre 1814].

ET/XVI/997 [Arreté de comte de tutelle entre A Gisors et Hyacinthe Rose Devilliers; 22 décembre 1815].

D'Hauterive, Maurice Alexandre de la Nautte, Comte d'

ET/XXI/641 [Procuration avec Mélanie le Boucher, son épouse, à René Barbedienne; 17 nivôse an VI].

ET/IV/936 [Brevet de procuration; 30 prairial an X].

Henrion, Nicolas Jean (père)

ET/XVI/984 [Inventaire après décès; 8 mai 1811].

Henry, Pierre Joseph

ET/L/736 [Inventaire après décès de Philippe de la Faille, premier époux de Mme Laurent (femme Henry); 19 février 1789].

ET/X/894 [Dépôt de procuration voir: Froment, Gaspard Nicolas; 3 juillet 1810].

ET/XLVI/717 [Inventaire après décès; 21 février 1814].

Isnard, Joseph Paul Bathélemy

ET/VII/541 [Achat d'une terre; 19 pluviôse an VI].

ET/XVIII/1002 [Mainlevée au Bayeux, père; 8 brumaire an XIII].

Joannès, Jacques
ET/XIII/474 [Procuration par Joannès à Guilleu; 10 novembre 1792].

Sylvestre Laforest, Antoine

ET/XXII/78 [Depôt de procuration, voir: Favez (Pierre-Antoine); 7 février 1792].
ET/XXII/78 [Dépot de procuration, S. Nadault à S. Antoine Laforest; 24 février 1792].

Lamy, Etienne

ET/VIII/1349 [Obligation à Jean Lamy; 1 mars 1806].

Lansel, Jean Antoine

ET/XVIII/1053 [Mariage de Antoinette Marguerite Françoise Lansel avec Alexandre Henri Simon Cornu de la Fontaine; 15 février 1812].

Tripier Lefranc, Claude François

ET/XI/782 [Substitution, voir: Bocquet, A.R.; 26 nivôse an II].
ET/XVII/1101 [Ratification en suite à un procès verbal du 20 pluviose dernier; 25 ventôse an XII].

Lemoine, Louis Hermenegelde

ET/VI/927 [Quittance à Louis Geneviève Dumolin et Elisabeth-Rose Paulmier, sa femme; 12 juillet 1808].
ET/II/932 [Obligation par M et Mad Coqueval à Mlle Lemoine; 18 et 27 août 1832].

Leterreur, Pierre Hilaire Félix

ET/XI/783 [Procuration Popart à Leterreur; 4 prairial an II].
**Linel, Eustache Jacques Hippolite**

ET/XXXII/44 [Contrat de mariage; 23 septembre 1790].

ET/XXIX/829 [Compte de tutelle de Linel à Philibert Chamonard; 16 juin 1818].

ET/XLIII/792 [Inventaire après décès de Mme Linel; 25 juillet 1833].

ET/XLII/871 [Inventaire après décès; 23 mai 1848].

**Loiselet, Edouard Ignace Joseph**

ET/VII/555 [Compte entre Locard et Emeric, femme de Panckoucke; 12 germinal an IX].

ET/VI/926 [Vente des terres laborables à J-B Labour; 19 avril 1808].

ET/VI/928 [Quittance à J-B Labour; 15 septembre 1808].

ET/VI/928 [Quittance à J-B Labour; 25 octobre 1808].

**Mardelet, Pierre**

ET/XXVIII/784 [Acte de donation entrevifs; 20 janvier 1824].

ET/XXVIII/785 [Inventaire après décès; 10 mars 1824].

ET/XLIII/800 [Actes de donation entrevifs, Eugène Hyppolite Mardelet et Josphine Emilie Langois; 21 juillet 1835].

ET/XLIII/800 [inventaire après décès de Eugène Hyppolite Mardelet; 11 août 1835].

ET/XXVIII/892 [inventaire après décès de sa veuve; 20 janvier 1838].

**Mourgue, Jean Scipion Anne**

ET/XCII/291 [Mourgue (Jean Scipion Anne), dissolution de société à Doullers; 26 avril 1808].

ET/XCII/380 [Testament de Jacques Antoine Mourgue, son père, 16 janvier 1818].

ET/XCII/380 [Procuration à Pierre Migeanè 20 février 1818].
ET/XCIII/432 [Mourgue (Scipion) et Cie, Création de société à Rouval-les-Douillers (Somme); 1 juillet 1823].

*Nouet, Benjamin*

ET/VIII/1319 [Procuration à Ignace Grégoire; 4 ventôse an V].
ET/VIII/1327 [Délégation et transport à Bricard, épouse de I. Grégoire; 3e jour comp. an VII].
ET/VIII/1328 [Transport mobilier à Sotin, 26 brumaire an IX].
ET/VIII/1332 [Transport de rente à Bricard; 5 vendémiaire an X].
ET/VIII/1338 [Rénocation à communauté, par Augustine Josephe Perrin; 5 prairial an XI].

*Petit, Jean Emmanuel Hippolyte*

ET/XVI/981 [Obligation: voir J-P. Petit de Lavieuville; 9 août 1810].
ET/V/954 [Consentement à divorce par Masset, E.V.S; 2 mars 1811, 2 août 1811].
ET/V/954 [Inventaire à cause de son divorce; 2 août 1811].
ET/V/954 [Transaction entre lui et sa femme; 20 août 1811].
ET/V/954 [Procès-verbaux de son divorce; 29 août 1811, 5 décembre 1811, 4 mars 1812].
ET/V/954 [Notoriété rectifiant noms; 24 mars 1812].

*Petit de Lavieuville, Jean Pierre*

ET/II/748 [Obligation; 30 juillet 1790].
ET/XVI/981 [Obligation; 5 août 1810].

*Plaine Ligny, François*

ET/VIII/1317 [Ratification de vente de terres; 16 germinal an IV].
Prévost, Charles Claude Lauriot

ET/V/925 [Notoriété constatant ses héritiers; 20 novembre 1806].

Quiret, Antoine Joseph Daniel

ET/VIII/1306 [Procuration, voir Meunier (Claude); 22 nivôse an II].
ET/VIII/1307 [Procuration, voir Quiret (Daniel Joseph); 27 germinal an II].
ET/VIII/1314 [Dépôt de procuration, voir Meunier (Joseph Antoine); 14 thermidor an III].
ET/VIII/1317 [Obligation, voir Nolleau (Marie Nicolas); 6 germinal an IV].
ET/VIII/1342 [Vente de terres, voir Moulin (Jean François Auguste); 15 prairial an XII].
ET/VIII/1342 [Substitution de procuration, voir Croiseuil (Marié); 26 prairial an XII].
ET/VIII/1342 [Quittance, voir Moulin (Jean François Auguste); 10 nivôse an XIII].
ET/VIII/1347 [Obligation, voir Croiseuil (Jean Henry de); 6 thermidor an XIII].
ET/VII/574 [Mainlevée à Quinet (Martin); 1 fructidor an XIII].
ET/VIII/1328 [Obligation par Ignace Grégoire et Alexandrine Pierret Bricard, son épouse, à Antoine Joseph Daniel Quiret; 17 vendémiaire an IX].
ET/VIII/1332 [Vente d'une maison et pièce de vigne, sise à Sancerre (Cher), par Alexandrine Pierrette Marie Bricard, épouse non commun en biens de Ignace Grégoire à Claude Rainbault; 28 vendémiaire an X].
ET/VIII/1333 [Obligation Daniel Joseph Quiret à Alexandrine Pierrette Marie Bricard, épouse non commune en biens de Ignace Grégoire; 3 pluviôse an X].
ET/VIII/1334 [Transport, André Charles Cohendet à Antoine Joseph Daniel Quiret; 1 floréal an X].
ET/XVII/1109 [Procès-verbal d'adjudication, voir: Stevenot (Nicolas Charles); 22 avril 1806].
ET/VIII/1350 [Transfert aux mineurs Louis François Vallot et Anne Vallot; 7 juin 1806].
ET/VIII/1353 [Quittance voir Nardot (Bruno); 10 mars 1807].
ET/VIII/1354 [Procuration, voir: Quiret (Daniel); 22 mai 1807].
ET/VIII/581 [Mainlevée à Guesdon (Thomas Louis); 11 juin 1807].
ET/VIII/1354 [Obligation, voir: Vucit (Pierre) et Marin (Pierre André); 23 juin 1807]
ET/VIII/1355 [Substitution et procuration; 7 juillet 1807]
ET/VIII/1359 [Mainlevée à Louis Etienne Beffroy et Louise Antoinette Viriez, son épouse; 2 juillet 1808]
ET/VIII/1359 [Vente et Bail à ferme, Quiret à M. et Mme Compoint; 13 août 1808].
ET/VIII/1373 [Transport, voir Requier (Joseph); 30 mars 1810].

*Remondat, Jean*

ET/XV/1177 [Obligation Larroque à Remondat; 18 et 19 floréal an XIII].
ET/XV/1158 [Obligation D. Flammarent à Remondat; 29 messidor an XI].
ET/XIX/939 [Quittance et remboursement, Thierry Demauregard à M. Remondat l'ainé; 7 août 1811].

*Remuzat, Etienne François David Marie*

ET/XI/744 [Lots viagères; 30 mars 1787].
ET/XI/757 [Rente viagère; voir: Maggi; 12 mai 1789].
ET/XX/773 [Constitution viagère à Alexandrine Simon; 4 thermidor an IV].
ET/XX/773 [Procuration à Figeagol; 1 fructidor an IV].
ET/XX/779 [Dépôt de procuration le Cen Remuzat à son frère; 21 thermidor an VI].
ET/XX/839 [Obligation M. Lagrange à M. Remuzat; 13 juin 1811].
ET/XX/840 [Obligation M. Figragol Lagrange à M. Remuzat; 25 septembre 1811].
ET/XX/838 [Notoriété après le décès de Dame Figéagol Lagrange; 6 février 1811].

*Rosenstiel, Henri Charles*

ET/I/772 [Mariage Sopie Adélaïde Rosenstiel avec Duvernoy (Jacques Georges Charles); 26 juin 1819].
ET/I/779 [Procuration à Henri-Louis Rosenstiel; 2 août 1820].
ET/l/791 [Procuration, voir Weyland (Louise Dorothée), sa femme; 10 mai 1822].

*Rousseau* de St. Phal, Joseph Alexandre

ET/VIII/1348 [Procuration à Baysellance Lacroix; 13 brumaire an 14].

*Roussel*, Jean Marie François

ET/LVI/423 [Inventaire après le décès de Maciet femme Charière; 4 ventôse an III].
ET/V/912 [Inventaire après le décès de Darchis; 15 nivôse an XIII].
ET/V/913 [Transport des droits mobiliers, voir Mariet; 10 pluviôse an XIII].
ET/V/913 [Procuration par François J. Riquer, veuve d'Antoine Darchis, à
Bernard Pierre Mariet, 16 pluviôse an XIII].
ET/V/919 [Marriage avec François J. Riquer; 6 frimaire an XIV].
ET/X/898 [Dépôt de testament de Geneviève Roussel et des procurations; 8 avril 1811].

*Sabatier*, Barthélémy

ET/XVII/961 [Union de créanciers; 12, 13, 17 brumaire an VI].

de *Sauvan*, Jean Baptiste Balthazard

ET/XI/788 [Contrat de mariage, EA Sauvan et Sue; 28 frimaire an III].
ET/XI/796 [Bail à loyer à Antoine Edme Louis Laplaideir de Sisy et Marie Josephine Cauler; 27 vendémiaire an V].
ET/XVIII/960 [Bail à loyer à Dulong; 14 fructidor an V].
ET/XI/798 [Bail à loyer à Nicolas Simon Bondeux et Marie Madelaine Rouveau, son épouse; 19 brumaire an VI].
ET/XI/799 [Bail à Claude François Sandoz; 9 floréal an VI].
ET/XI/802 [Bail à loyer à Picardeaux; 11 nivôse an VIII].
ET/XI/800 [Bail à loyer, Sauvan et Marie Anne Redot, sa femme, à François Joseph Gobert, fabriquant de Passementerie et Marie Catherine l'Ecuyer; 7 pluviôse an VII].
ET/XI/802 [Procuration à François Guillemin; 22 pluviôse an VIII].
ET/XI/802 [Obligation à la Vve Brun; 28 pluviôse an VIII].
ET/XI/803 [Bail à loyer, à la Veuve Brice; 23 prairial an VIII].
ET/XI/803 [Obligation Sauvan et sa femme à la Ve Brun; 6 messidor an VIII].
ET/XXXV/993 [Quittance, Sue à EA. Sauvan; 24 thermidor an VIII].
ET/XXXV/997 [Quittance, Sue à EA. Sauvan; 14 thermidor an IX].
ET/XVIII/978 [Obligation à E.A. Sauvan, sa fille divorcée de Jean Joseph Sue; 23 thermidor an IX].
ET/XI/821 [Contrat de mariage, EA Sauvan et Legouvé; 13 pluviôse an XI].
ET/XVIII/1005 [Procuration, voir Legouve (Gabriel Marie Jean Baptiste); 7 ventôse an XIII].
ET/XVIII/1009 [Vail à Jean Denis Autun et Madeleine André Toray, sa femme; 26 thermidor an XIII].
ET/XVIII/1009 [Bail par EA Sauvan, épouse de Gabriel Marie Jean Baptiste Legouvé à Jean Pierre Fontaine et Catherine Madeleine Bourgeois, sa femme; 26 thermidor an XIII].
ET/XXXII/177 [inventaire après le décès d'Elisabeth Adelaide de Sauvan; 22 septembre 1809].
ET/XXXII/196 [Inventaire Gabriel Marie Jean Baptist Legouvé; 17 septembre 1812].

Silvestre, Augustin François

ET/II/757 [Vente de ferme; 14 janvier 1792].
ET/XX/763 [Constitution à Girault; 19 novembre 1793].
ET/V/938 [Quittance, voir Louise Julie Constance Garre; 31 décembre 1808].
ET/XXIX/1095 [Inventaire après le décès de Mme Silvestre; 2 novembre 1843].

Thibault, dit la Rue, Denis Elysée

ET/XXXVII/521 [inventaire après décès; 5 avril 1845].
Ministry of Interior (other inventaires après décès)

ET/XLVI/665 [Inventaire après le décès d'Augustin Bonnel, ministère de l'intérieur; 23 mai 1807].
ET/XLVI/675 [Inventaire après le décès de Josephine Emilie Noel, femme de Jean Baptiste Pierre Courtois; 6 décembre 1808].
ET/XCIII/435 [Inventaire après le décès de Nicolas Decorbie, employé du ministère de l'intérieur; 6 octobre 1823].
ET/VII/697 [Inventaire après le décès d'Antoine Bernard, employé au ministère de l'intérieur; 27 décembre 1828].
ET/I/719 [Inventaire après le décès de Hugues Oudotte, employé au Ministère de l'Intérieur; 17 novembre 1807]

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (other inventaires après décès)

ET/XLVI/694 [Inventaire après le décès de Madame Latré; 21 août 1811].

Ministry of War

ET/XI/783 [Inventaire après le décès de Marie Jeanne Deinière, femme de Nicolas Grasset, commis; 9 germinal an II].
ET/XLVI/680 [Inventaire après le décès de Pierre de St. Paul, premier commis; 16 octobre 1809].
ET/XLVI/695 [Inventaire après le décès de Barbe Marguerite Pelletier, chef de bureau; 24 juillet 1811].
ET/XXVIII/683 [Inventaire après le décès de Claude Frédéric Laisne, employé; 2 juillet 1813].
ET/XLVI/345 [Inventaire après le décès de Pierre Michel Simonin, chef de bureau; 11 mars 1814].
ET/XXVIII/730 [Inventaire après le décès de Marie Françoise Dugue, épouse d'un chef de division; 17 juin 1818].
ET/VII/655 [Inventaire après le décès de Frédéric Huché Ricard, employé; 3 novembre 1823].
ET/LXV723 [Inventaire après le décès de Madame Thevenon, femme de Jean Louis Thevenon, employé; 9 juillet 1832].

_Treasury_

ET/XLVI/679 [Inventaire après le décès de Edme Morize, employé; 10 juillet 1809].

ET/XLVI/723 [Inventaire après le décès de Charles Pierre Rottier, employé; 10 octobre 1814].

ET/XLVI/744 [Inventaire après le décès de Marie Nicolas Bourdillat, employé; 13 mai 1817].

ET/XI/961 [Inventaire après le décès de Pierre Gaspard LeTonnellier, ancien chef de bureau au Trésor; 18 juillet 1821].

ET/XXVIII/850 [Inventaire après le décès, de Pierre Cany, employé au trésor; 17 mai 1832].

"_Droits Réunis_

ET/XLVI/653 [Inventaire après le décès de Jean Joseph Georges Lefevre, employé 20 thermidor an XIII].

ET/XXVIII/718 [Inventaire après le décès de Charles Joachim Tisserand, employé, 1 avril 1817].

_Miscellaneous_

ET/XLVI/627 [Liquidation pour divorce, Denis Lavoisier, chef de bureau aux Domaines, 3 messidor an IX].

ET/VIII/1/359 [Inventaire après le décès de Jacques Philippe Ihippe, employé, 15 juillet 1808].

ET/XXVIII/660 [Inventaire après le décès de Julien Pesnelle, employé, 9 novembre 1810].

ET/XXXII/196 [Inventaire après le décès de Louis Laurent Thomas de Saint Mars, chef de division à l'administration générale des hospices civiles à Paris, 17 octobre 1812].
ET/XVI/992 [Inventaire après le décès de M. Julien Bouvier, employé au Secrétariat de la marine, 29 septembre 1813].

ET/XVI/993 [Inventaire après le décès de M. Levasseur, ancien employé, 28 février 1814].

ET/XVI/998 [Dépôt du Testament de Marie Madeleine Rose Delattre, veuve Levasseur, 23 janvier 1816].

ET/XVI/999 [inventaire après le décès de Marguerite Aglaé Chartié, femme de Charles Rémi Laurent, employé, 29 mai 1816].

ET/XLVI/742 [Inventaire après le décès d'Adrien Antoine Yon Moreau, chef de bureau aux Ponts et Chaussées; 31 mars 1817].

ET/XCIII/380 [Inventaire après le décès de André Zamboni, à hôtel de la Marine, 28 janvier 1818].

ET/XXVII/730 [Inventaire après le décès de François Augustin Joiron, employé au ministère de la Marine, 22 juin 1818].

ET/VII/625 [Inventaire après le décès de Joseph Aimable Pierres, employé au ministère, 9 janvier 1819].

ET/I/780 [inventaire après le décès de Claude Théodore Mangin, propriétaire et ancien employé, 30 octobre 1820].

ET/XXVIII/763 [Inventaire après le décès de Catherine Adelaide Josephine Bourgoin, épouse d'un chef de bureau à l'administration des forêts, 25 janvier 1822].

ET/XXVIII/773 [Inventaire après le décès de Louis Victoire Gédéon Lefort, chef de bureau aux Contributions indirectes; 18 janvier 1823].

ET/VII/654 [Inventaire après le décès d'Étienne Doniol, chef de division à l'administration des eaux et forêts, 6 septembre 1823].

ET/XLII/747 [Inventaire après le décès de Jean Joachim Maurice, employé à l'administration des forêts, 14 mars 1825].

ET/XXVIII/812 [Inventaire après le décès de Jean Gervais Lemaire, ex-employé, 19 mars 1827].

ET/VII/704 [Inventaire après le décès de Louise Claire SArdaillon, employé au ministère des Finances, 26 septembre 1829].

ET/XXIX/984 [Inventaire après le décès de Mme Marette, femme de Louis François Marette, employé, 16 juin 1832].
i) Legion of Honour

Legion of Honour Dossiers (Léonore)

LH/74/48/AUGER L
LH/204/15 DE BERNY E C G
LH/225/15/BESSON L M
LH/343/37 BOUVIER M A J
LH/379/23/BRULE N
LH/405/32/CAILLARD A B
LH/1065/59/GAMBIER DE CAMPY P F
LH/451/15 CAUCHY L F
LH/598/48/COSTAZ
LH/621/14/COUTEAUX F CL
LH/808/74/ DUAULT F M
LH/870/49/DURANT E A
LH/935/42/FAUCHAT N
LH/1117/38/GERANDO DE RUSTHSAMH
LH/1153/21/DE GISORS A J B G
LH/1374/41/GUERARD F M
LH/250/65/BLANC D HAUTERIVE A
LH/1374/41/JORELLE F
LH/2786/56/GOYET DE C LABESNADI
LH/1473/61/LANSEL J R
LH/1559/32/LEGOUVE G J B E
LH/2971/137/MOURGUE SC
LH/212/21 PETEL
LH/2224/35 PREVOST
LH/2251/40/QUIRET A
LH/2383/19/ROSENSTIEL H

Requests to the Minister of Interior

f/12/5114 [Claude-Anthelme Costaz, 1847]

j) Private Papers

107 A.P. 55 [Devis, mémoires et documents concernant la construction de l'hôtel de Galliffet].
107 A.P. 56 [Document concernant la construction de l'hôtel de Galliffet et les remaniements, ventes et locations du XIXe siècle]
3. Bibliothèque de l'Institut

Correspondance et papiers de François Arago, secrétaire perpétuel de l'Academie des Sciences (1786-1853) [MS. 2043 (I)]

Correspondance Barbié du Bocage [MS.5497 (II)]

Extrait de papiers Sylvestre Lacroix, membre de l'Académie des Sciences, MS 4796 (II).

Fonds J.-B. Huzard, membre de l'Institut (1755-1838):
   Private Correspondence, 1806-1830 [MS 1976 / HR. 50** bis (1806-1830)]
   Private Correspondence, 1831-1838 [MS. 1977 / HR. 50** bis (1831-1838)]

Papiers de Jean-Nicolas Buache de La Neuville (1741-1825) [MS 2325]

Papiers et correspondance de Pierre-Michel Hennin (1728-1807) [MS.1256 (XXXVII)]

4. Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris:

Building Plans: hôtel Gallifet

B 582 [plan en masse de l'hôtel, 1816]
B 573 ['Hôtel patrimoniale à vendre; plan et élévation de la façade, avant 1851]

Building plans: hôtel Conti (Forbin-Janson)

B 250 [plan en masse de l'hôtel, 1816]
B 251 [plan en masse et élévation sur le jardin]
B253 [affiche de vente, 1830]

5. Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire de la Sorbonne: Salle de Réserve

MS Carton 133 [Archives de la Société philomatique – Correspondance]
6. Bibliothèque Nationale de France

a) Cartes et Plans: Society of Geography Collection

*Colis*

n° 6 bis (microfilm XIII (2))
n° 7 (mf XIV (1))
n° 14 (mf XXIV (2))
n° 18 (mf XXX (1) & mf XXX (2))
n° 19 (mf XXXI (1) & mf XXXII (2))
n° 26 (not microfilmed)

*Cartons*

BA_BIE (mf III)
MA-MARO (mf XXV (2))

b) Manuscripts.

*Correspondance de M. d'Hermand*, 1798-1816 [Fr. n. acq. ms. 22102]
*Lettres de Scribe* [Fr. n.acq. ms. 22547, 22549 & 22552]
*Recueil des Pièces Historiques sur la Révolution et l'Empire - Documents sur les théâtres à Paris* (1790-1798) [Fr. ms. 7005]
*Duval, Henry, Dictionnaire des ouvrages dramatiques depuis Jodalle jusqu'à nos jours, suivi d'une table des Parodies, de celle des Auteurs et de celle des Personnages célèbres* [Fr. ms. 15050]
de Pronville, *Notice historique et biographique sur les spectacles en France et recherches sur la marche de l'art dramatique dans la capitale de ce royaume*, [Fr. ms 15062]

c) Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal

MS 7117 [Notes et Papiers d'Édouard Fournier: notes et extrait sur... Picard]

**7. Bibliothèque Thiers**

*Fonds Masson,*

Manuscrits: carton 5.

**Published Materials:**

**1. Journals**

*Affiches, annonces, avis divers de Paris.*
*Annales politiques, morales et littéraires.*
*Le Constitutionnel, journal politique et littéraire.*
*Le Corsaire, Journal des Spectacles, de la Littérature, des Arts, des Moeurs et des Modes.*
*La Décade Philosophique, Littéraire et Politique.*
*Le Drapeau Blanc, journal de la politique, de la littérature et des théâtres.*
*Feuilleton de Littérature, Spectacles, Aneecotes, Modes et Avis Divers*
  [supplement to *La Quotidienne*.]
*La Foudre, journal de littérature, des spectacles et des arts.*
Gazette Nationale ou le Moniteur Universel.

l'Indépendant, Furet de Paris et de la Banlieue, Littérature, BEaux-Arts, THéatre, Librairie, Industrie et Annonces.


Le Moniteur Parisien: Journal des Spectacles et de Littérature.

La Pandore, Journal des Spectacles, des Lettres, des Arts, des Moeurs et des Modes.

La Presse.

Le Réveil: Journal des Sciences, de la Littérature, des Moeurs, Théâtres et BEaux-Arts.

Revue Encyclopédique ou Analyse raisonnée des productions les plus remarquables dans les sciences, les arts industriels, la littérature et les beaux-arts.

La Semaine: Journal Hebdomadaire – Sciences, Arts, Littérature, Spectacles, Tribunaux, Industrie, Annonces, etc.

Le Siècle.

2. Semi-Periodicals

Fiévée, Correspondance politique et administrative commencée au moi de Mai 1814, et dédiée à M. le Comte de Blacas (Paris: Le Normant, 1815-1816).


3. Official Publications (including edited collections):


Rondonneau, L. (ed.), *Collection Générale des Lois, décrets, arrêts, sénatus-consultes, avis du conseil d'état et règlements d'administration publiés*
4. Society proceedings:

Bulletin de la Société d'Encouragement pour l'Industrie Nationale (Paris: S.E.I.N., 1801-)


5. Caricatures and Lithographs

de Benard, L., Les étages: 1) 1er étage: Monsieur est en affaire et Entresol: Quand le chef n'y est pas, les commis s'amusent (Paris: Aubert, 1840-45).


Ducarne, Rampant avec un supérieur (Paris: Ostervald aîné, 1828).

Monnier, Henry, Mœurs administratives, dessinées d'après nature, par Henry Monnier, 6 feuilles (Paris: Delpech, 1828).

— , Mœurs administratives, dessinées d'après nature, par Henry Monnier, ex-employé au ministère de la justice, 12 feuilles (Paris, Delpech, 1828).


6. Other published primary sources:

— *Code Civil des Français* (Paris: Imp. Nat. 1804) [e-text (frantext) produced by the *Institut National de la Langue Française*).


Alexandre (ancien chef de division), *Projet d'organisation des Bureaux de la Guerre* (n.p., n.d.).


— , "Gavarni" [La Mode, 2 October 1830], in *Oeuvres complètes de Honoré de Balzac*, [revised and annotated by Marcel Bouteron et Henri Longnon], vol. XXXIX [Oeuvres Diverses II, 1830-1835] (Paris: Louis Conard, 1938).

— , "Des Caricatures" [La Caricature, 2 décembre 1830] in *Oeuvres complètes de Honoré de Balzac*, [revised and annotated by Marcel Bouteron et


Barbié du Bocage, Jean-Denis, Recueil de Cartes Géographiques, plans, vues et médailles de l'Ancienne Grèce, relatifs au Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis, précédé d'une analyse critique des Cartes (Paris, de Bure l'aîné, 1788).

Barère de Vieuzac, Bertrand, Opinion de M. Barère de Vieuzac, sur la motion de M. de Mirabeau, concernant les grades administratifs du 10 décembre 1789 (Paris, 1789).


de la Bergerie (baron) (ed.), Cours d'Agriculture Pratique ou l'Agronome Français, par une Société de Savans, d'Agronomes et de Propriétaires fonciers (Paris: Audot, 1817 - )

Berthall, [Nécrologie d'Henry Monnier], in L'Illustration, 1768 (13 janvier 1877) [vol. LXIX (January - June 1877), p. 27].


Bonjour, Casimir, Le Protecteur et le Mari, comédie en cinq actes et en vers, représentée pour la première fois sur le Théâtre Français, par les comédiens ordinaires du Roi, le 5 septembre 1829 (Paris: David, 1829).


---, Considérations politiques et morales sur les constitutions (Paris, Alexis Eymery, 1814).


Carnot, Hippolyte, *D'une École d'Administration* (Versailles: E.. Aubert, 1878).


Cochaud, Antoine, *Aperçu sur les écarts de la presse politique et sur les moyens de la ramener au but de son institution, suivi de lexamen des principaux griefs qu'une partie de ses organes impute au gouvernement* (Paris: Pihan DelaForest, 1834)


de Garden, Guillaume (le Cte), *Histoire générale des Traités de Paix et autres Transactions entre toutes les puissances de l'Europe depuis la paix de Westphalie*, 15 volumes (Paris: Amyot, 1851).
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DeGérando, Joseph-Marie (Baron), *De la Génération des Connaissances Humaines* (Berlin: G. Decker, 1802).


Lavater, Gaspard, *L'art de connaître les hommes par la physionomie. Nouvelle édition, corrigée et disposée dans un ordre plus méthodique; précédée d'une notice historique sur l'auteur; augmentée d'une exposition des recherches ou des opinions de La Chambre, de Porta, de Camper, de Gall, sur la physionomie; d'une histoire anatomique et physiologique de la face, avec des figures coloriées; et d'un très-grand nombre d'articles nouveaux sur les caractères des passions, des tempéraments et des maladies* (ed. Moreau de la Sarthe; trans. Antoine-Bernard Caillard & Marie-Élisabeth Bouée La Fite), 10 volumes (Paris: L. Prudhomme, 1806-1807).


——, *De l'administration des finances de la France* (Paris, 1821).


excellens auteurs, avec des observations sur les traits de quelques personnages, qui ont figuré dans la révolution Française (Meudon: P.S.C. Demaillé, 1797).

Portalis, Jean-Marie "Discours Prélminaire sur le Projet de Code Civil, présenté le 1er pluviôse an IX", in Discours et Rapports sur le Code Civil [Université de Caens, Centre de Philosophie politique et juridique (Bibliothèque de Philosophie politique et juridique: Textes et Documents)] (Paris: URA-CNRS, 1989).


--- & Varner (pseud. Anne-Honoré-Joseph Duveyrier), *Diner de garçons*,
comédie en un acte mêlée de couplets, représentée pour la première fois,
sur le Théâtre de Variétés, le 4 avril 1820 (Paris: Boucher, 1820).

---, *L'art du ministre; par un Excellence* [1. Le ministre qui s'en va] (Paris: le
marchand des nouveautés, 1821).

---, *L'Art de promener ses créanciers, ou Complément de l'Art de faire des
dettes, par un homme comme il faut, dédié aux gens destitués, réformés,
aux victimes des révolutions et des changemens de ministères passés,
présens et à venir...* (Paris: Pélicier, 1824).

---, *Le Sous-chef ou La famille Gautier, comédie-vaudeville en un acte,
représentée pour la première fois à Paris, sur le Théâtre des Variétés, le

---, *Moeurs administratives, pour faire suite aux Observations sur les Moeurs et
les Usages Français au Commencement du XIXe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris:
Ladvocat, 1825).

--- *L'art de faire des dettes* (ed. Jean-Claude Masson) (Paris: Payot et Rivages,
1996).
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