Getting to Know Peasants: Local Population Records and Rural Society in Nineteenth-Century France

HARVEY SMITH*

Inconsistent terminology and under-reporting of agricultural occupations in the French manuscript census schedules from the nineteenth century has proved to be a serious problem for historians. Drawing on the literature that discusses these matters, this article presents evidence from a sample commune to propose a solution: creating linked population files to construct a set of longitudinal analytical class groups into which specific occupations can be assigned in a variable way, depending on standard criteria, from one census to the next. Several tests of social data from local records using the analytical classifications are presented to demonstrate their usefulness for social history.

Une terminologie flottante et le sous-dénombrement des professions agricoles dans les listes nominatives de recensement françaises du XIX^e^ siècle ont considérablement gêné les historiens dans leur travail. S'inspirant de la documentation sur le sujet, le présent article en arrive à proposer une solution après étude d'une commune échantillon : créer des fichiers de population enchaînés pour bâtir un ensemble de catégories longitudinales et analytiques auxquelles on puisse assigner des professions particulières de façon variable, suivant des critères standards, d'un recensement à l'autre. Plusieurs tests de données sociales tirées de registres locaux faits au moyen des classifications analytiques sont présentés afin de démontrer leur utilité pour l'histoire sociale.

HISTORIANS OF RURAL France are fortunate to have many types of population records available from the nineteenth century. These include the nominative census lists (*listes nominatives de recensement*) taken by municipal officials in every commune every fifth year beginning in 1836.

* Harvey Smith is Associate Professor of History and of the Social Science Research Institute at Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois. The author wishes to thank Kris Inwood and the two anonymous readers for their careful reading of this paper and for very useful suggestions and comments.

The nominative lists provide consistent if sometimes perfunctory information on otherwise anonymous individuals and families, including full names, ages, occupations, kinship links within the household, and, in the case of a few enumerations, places of birth. Armed with the *listes*, historians of rural society in particular have fashioned a growing literature on such topics as demographic rates, household structures, social and economic changes, life-cycle patterns, and rural economy and land inheritance. Similar historical work has been underway elsewhere in Europe, too.[1] It is clear, however, that these population records are inconsistent in their coverage and ambiguous in meaning. Two issues, often cited as problematic in the French *listes nominatives*, are especially nettlesome for historians of rural society. One is the difficulty of comparing occupational groups or other social structural measures over time from successive listings of the same population. There are too many inconsistencies from one census to the next. As a result of the enumeration process itself, local officials in rural France produced a plethora of occupational designations to fit seemingly every type of peasant labourer, molecatcher, farm servant, and landholder big and small. Sorting through all these terms is enough to test the patience of the most dogged historian. The other is the problem of underreporting occupations, particularly as concerns working women and older children. No easy solutions to these problems can be based on a single example, of course, but the suggestions proposed in this case study can perhaps be adapted to serve other community studies. A review of the current state of the literature on the *listes nominatives* as concerns occupations and

1 Among many examples, see Peter Laslett and Richard Wall, *Household and Family in Past Time* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1972); Richard Wall, Jean Robin, and Peter Laslett, eds., *Family Forms in Historical Europe* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Etienne van de Walle, *The Female Population of France in the Nineteenth Century: A Reconstruction of 82 Départements* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974); David I. Kertzer and Dennis P. Hogan, *Family, Political Economy, and Demographic Change: The Transformation of Life in Casalecchio, Italy, 1861–1921* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); George Alter, *Family and the Female Life Course: The Women of Verviers, Belgium, 1849–1880* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); Lutz K. Berkner, "The Stem Family and the Development Cycle of the Peasant Household: An Eighteen-Century Austrian Example", *American Historical Review*, vol. 77 (April 1972), pp. 398–418; Hans Medick, "The Proto-Industrial Family Economy: The Structural Function of Household and Family during the Transition from Peasant Society to Industrial Capitalism", *Social History*, no. 3 (October 1976), pp. 291–315; Elinor Accampo, *Industrialization, Family Life, and Class Relations: Saint Chamond, 1815–1914* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1989); David Warren Sabean, *Property, Production, and Family in Neckarhausen, 1700–1870* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Leslie Page Moch, *Paths to the City: Regional Migration in Nineteenth-Century France* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983); the pioneering work by Michael Anderson, *Family Structure in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1971), and "Urban Migration in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire: Some Insights into Two Competing Hypotheses", *Annales de démographie historique* (1971), pp. 13–26; and Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

underenumeration serves to consider prior attempts to grapple with these issues. In order to test a new solution, this study then examines selected *listes* taken over the period from 1836 to 1911 in a large village (population 1,715 in 1901) near Béziers in the lower Languedoc, a Mediterranean wine district in southern France.

The English historian Alan Armstrong, among others, has emphasized the basic importance of census listings for social history.[2] Historians using the French listings have echoed his point but have also discovered many pitfalls in using the *listes nominatives*.[3] One is the sheer quantity and heterogeneity of listings taken in a country as linguistically and regionally diverse as France. Another is that the local authorities who compiled the listings, rural mayors, schoolteachers, and tax bureau officials, were rarely trained as enumerators and worked under minimal supervision; still another, that the cost of the quinquennial enumerations was borne entirely by the municipalities. Meanwhile, over the years officials in the central ministries changed classification schemes (as in the case of occupations) and enumeration procedures in ways that significantly altered the character and contents of the *listes*.[4] Finally, these problems often remain hidden from view in thickets of detail in page upon page of names, ages, occupations, and family

2 Armstrong concluded with regard to the English census: "Where the aim is not simply to describe and comment on patterns which the printed occupational data reveals, but rather to *relate* this data to other variables ... [then] it will be necessary to go back to the enumerators' books." The latter are the closest English equivalent to the French *listes nominatives*. W. A. Armstrong, "The Use of Information about Occupation" in E. A. Wrigley, ed., *Nineteenth-Century Society: Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1972), pp. 251–252.

3 See C. James Haug, "Manuscript Census Materials in France: The Use and Availability of the *Listes Nominatives*", *French Historical Studies*, vol. 11 (Fall 1979), pp. 258–275; Jacques Dupâquier, et al., *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3: *De 1789 à 1914* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1988), pp. 15–61; Bertrand Gille, *Les sources statistiques de l'histoire de France : des enquêtes du XVIII^e siècle à 1870* (Geneva and Paris: Librairie Droz and Librairie Minard, 1964), pp. 151–157, 223–228; Georges Dupeux, "Guide de recherches" in François Goguel and Georges Dupeux, eds., *Sociologie électorale : esquisse d'un bilan. Guide de recherches* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1951), Cahiers de la Fondation National des Sciences Politiques, no. 26, pp. 51–56; Abel Chatelain, "Valeur des recensements de la population française au XIX^e siècle", *Revue de géographie de Lyon*, vol. 29 (1954), pp. 273–280, and "Les leçons d'une dénombrement : 1846 en Anjou", *Annales : économies, sociétés, civilisations*, vol. 1 (1946), pp. 61–66; Philippe Pinchemel, "Les listes nominatives des recensements de population", *Revue du Nord*, vol. 36 (1954), pp. 419–431; Jean-Nöel Biraben, "Inventaire des listes nominatives de recensement en France", *Population*, vol. 18 (1963), pp. 305–328; Claude Legeard, *Guide de recherches documentaires en démographie* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars, 1966), pp. 94–105; René Le Mée, "La Statistique démographique officielle de 1815 à 1870 en France", *Annales de démographie historique 1979*, pp. 251–279; Louis Henry, *Manuel de démographie historique* (Geneva and Paris: Librairie Droz, 1967), pp. 29–48.

4 On these issues see van de Walle, *Female Population of France in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 13–55, and on urban population records, William H. Sewell, Jr., *Structure and Mobility: The Men and Women of Marseille, 1820–1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 317–326, reporting "glaring inaccuracies" (p. 320).

ties. How can one be certain to avoid the worst of these pitfalls? Using the computer to compare participation rates and structures of occupational classifications in census listings over time is certainly a good starting point for designing corrective steps for the inconsistencies and underreporting that presently make longitudinal comparisons unreliable. Short of this, historians will of necessity have to continue to rely on published census summary returns even though their ability to make social or economic comparisons within a given population is thereby lost.

Forty years ago the late Abel Chatelain warned that the nineteenth-century *listes nominatives* showed disconcerting evidence of errors, slipshod procedures, inconsistent practices, and ineptitude. He attributed the errors to "a lack of preparation" on the part of local officials untrained to serve as enumerators; to "a lack of sincerity, if not of honesty" on the part of a public naturally fearful of taxation and conscription; and to widespread "fraud and suspicion shown for census enumerations". While his many examples of enumerators' gaffs make sobering reading even today, Chatelain's main criticism on balance fails to sustain his main objective, which was to show that the entire census process was "falsified" by public opposition.[5] If anything the real problem was in the novice efforts of a fledgling bureaucracy to "classify" the national population, as Alain Desrosières has suggested. Chatelain made no attempt to demonstrate rates of error from his examples, so we do not have even estimates of how much final results may have been distorted by gaps in local returns. Nor did he take into account the significant improvement in French census procedures in the course of the nineteenth century.[6] Accordingly, few of the more recent discussions have accepted Chatelain's conclusions entirely except with respect to one issue: the view that occupational data in the *listes*, particularly from rural districts, are flawed.

In what was in effect a rejoinder to Chatelain, also published in 1954, Philippe Pinchemel enthusiastically endorsed the value of the French census lists:

> Nominative listings are the only documents providing a continuous series of information since 1836 on the whole demographic, social and economic evolution of the past century ... they present demographic and social phenomenon preserved within their original milieu, which is the commune; it is only on the basis of these lists that these social facts can be mapped in their real setting.[7]

5 Chatelain, "Valeur des recensements de la population française", pp. 274, 275, 276, 277.

6 Chatelain conceded only that enumerations "have no doubt undergone improvements but they are not perfect". No one can reasonably expect census enumerations, whether from the nineteenth or any other century, to be perfect. "Valeur des recensements de la population française", p. 280.

7 Pinchemel, "Listes nominatives des recensements", p. 428.

He conceded, however, that "[t]he tables of occupations present many problems", not the least of which was that "the professional categories are never the same from one census to the next."[8] James Haug has concluded, "For historians concerned with questions pertaining to family structure, mobility patterns, and social and geographical stratification, an acquaintance with the *listes* is essential." Yet he, too, notes that "the *listes* must be used with great caution" and that, beyond such problems as underenumeration, inconsistent reporting dates, and frequent transcription errors, "it is difficult and sometimes impossible to use the *listes* to make strict comparisons among populations from one census to the next."[9] In his well-known manual on French demographic historical data, Bertrand Gille indicates that the *listes* can be used with confidence as long as "local studies [are] undertaken to make certain the exact limits of confidence that one can accord these documents." Again, however, occupational designations require caution: "the array of professions remains difficult to interpret," he observes.[10] More recently René Le Mée has taken virtually the same position, finding the *listes nominatives* "indispensable [and] basic documents" but concluding that occupational data were flawed. "It is only proper to be very prudent when it comes to research drawing on the socio-professional breakdowns [as reported in the original returns]."[11] In the latest and by far most thorough assessment, Olivier Marchand and Claude Thélot point out that even in the nineteenth century census officials doubted the utility of data on professions, and with reason.[12]

If the occupational data in local returns and all the more in the published national summaries seem unreliable, it is perhaps time to reconsider how to interpret the French *listes* as part of a more basic rethinking of the nature and limits of manuscript census enumerations. A more utilitarian and flexible view of the nominative lists has been emerging over the past decade, influenced by the work in France of Georges Dupeux, Alain Desrosières, and Ronald Hubscher and, in the United States, Etienne van de Walle, Gregor Dallas, and James Haug, among others. That this has occurred can be traced, it seems, to three broad developments. The first, paradoxically, is the turn to linguistic analysis. It is now a familiar notion

8 *Ibid.*, p. 426.

9 Haug, "Manuscript Census Materials", pp. 273–274, 266, 262.

10 Gille, *Les sources statistiques de l'histoire de la France*, pp. 152–153: "L'historien peut donc, à partir de ce moment [1836] se servir des tableaux nominatifs avec un très réel intérêt ... à l'échelon local, les recensements de la population constituent un document de premier ordre." For cautions noted in the text, see pp. 153, 227.

11 Le Mée, "Statistique démographique officielle", pp. 276, 277.

12 Olivier Marchand and Claude Thélot, *Deux siècles de travail en France : population active et structure sociale, durée et productivité du travail* (Paris: INSEE, 1991), citing the official introductions to nineteenth-century censuses that complained of "the negligence of census agents in the reporting of professions" (p. 11).

that, far from "capturing" in scientific detail some external social reality that contemporaries would have recognized, census listings actually recorded conflicting notions of rank, status, labour, and authority. In this view, state census officials had very real interests and motives in constructing a base of information that, in effect, organized and classified a society undergoing vast social and demographic change in the nineteenth century. Their objectives were inconsistent and varied and even provoked conflicts between competing government agencies, but one central concern was to devise some system of fixed, identified classes and social groups that could be "interpreted" by governing interests to assess particular economic or social issues: immorality or family stability, productive labour or poverty, social decay and disease, migration and crime, or economic development, for example. In this light, enumerating occupations was a process driven by higher state concerns to classify, and thereby to create, new standards for describing a properly ordered society in the urban age. Such standards varied from nation to nation in intriguing ways, as between, for example, France and England. But analysis of theoretical aspects of state policy also requires attention to communities. A state-centred analysis invites a closer look at local returns, which formed the basis of the data. In France, in particular, uneven development of state policy on terminology permitted basic inconsistencies in reporting occupations in local records.[13]

A second influence has been a cluster of new developments in demographic and quantitative history, in particular use of cohort analysis and extrapolation to identify and to correct for systematic errors in aggregate census returns. Here Etienne van de Walle's *The Female Population of France in the Nineteenth Century*, published in 1974, has had a paramount influence. Van de Walle made systematic revision of census data the essential step of his analysis. His method was both ingenious and straightforward. *Female Population* begins with a statistical check to assess longitudinal trends in departmental-level counts of women. By following five-year age cohorts of women through the succession of censuses, he isolates systematic and unsystematic errors in the aggregated results. Errors in any of the 82 departmental aggregate counts stood out in the form of unexpected (and sometimes impossible) dips or bulges in the size of a given cohort from one census to the next. Behind this test was the understanding that each cohort would shrink in a predictable trend as it aged, barring unusual events, and just as predictably the proportion ever-married would

13 See Alain Desrosières, "Official Statistics and Medicine in Nineteenth-Century France: The S.G.F. as a Case Study", *Journal of the Society for the Social History of Medicine* (December 1991), pp. 515–537, for comparisons of France and England; also Edward Higgs, "The Struggle for the Occupational Census, 1841–1911" in Roy MacLead, ed., *Government and Expertise: Specialists, Administrators and Professionals, 1860–1919* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 73–86; Simon R. S. Szreter, "The Genesis of the Registrar-General's Social Classification of Occupations", *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 35 (December 1984), pp. 522–547.

rise, at least up to a point. Working from these trends, he drew from registers of births and deaths the information on numbers of cases to be deducted from each cohort at each census and introduced a factor to correct for migration. With the range of errors revealed he developed formulas based on general demographic trends to reconstruct each cohort of the population in each department to its proper size.[14] Then, after correcting for underenumeration of infants up to four years of age, he found it possible to compute more accurate fertility rates on the basis of the reconstructed data. The details of these procedures are less important than the general conclusion that van de Walle incorporated into the subtitle of his book:

> The conclusion of this examination [is] that considerable bias exists, and that the data cannot be trusted but must be corrected in some way .... It was dissatisfaction with the quality of the data, in simple tests ... that convinced us that extensive reconstruction was needed.

In his words, systematic corrections were unavoidable given the "poor quality of the censuses". One consequence of the reconstruction was to enable van de Walle to assess the accuracy of the successive censuses. He found that enumerations conducted between 1872 and 1896 were *less* accurate in reporting female population than those from either before or after those dates.[15]

In *Deux siècles de travail en France*, published in 1991, Marchand and Thélot devise a related approach to correct for underenumeration of aggregate employment levels in agricultural and non-agricultural sectors of the French economy for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Unlike van de Walle, they employ national aggregate totals rather than departmental data, but their findings parallel his. The principal finding is that the censuses underreported economically active individuals starting with 1856 through 1896.[16] Most of the underreporting concerned adult household dependents, quite often women. The authors explain the undercounting of the employed as a function of the format of enumerations that classified occupations by economic sector and by household rather than by individual. Only beginning in 1896, when the census returns based counts on individual occupations, did the published returns report employment levels accurately. Marchand and Thélot attribute this improvement to the decision of census officials to centralize the reporting process in the offices of the *Statistique Général* in

14 Van de Walle, *Female Population of France in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 25–122.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 26–27, 55.

16 Their assessment is: "the censuses from 1856 to 1891 have been utilized here only to provide *indices* [not basic trend lines] with the idea that they provide some useful information on employment levels but lack sufficient precision to be used with confidence." Marchand and Thélot, *Deux siècles de travail en France*, p. 10 (original emphasis).

Paris; reassigning responsibility for tabulation of occupations and employment from the departments to the central census agency permitted uniform, consistent procedures to be imposed on employment data.[17] Like van de Walle, Marchand and Thélot also emphasize the indispensability of systematic, careful corrections of the final data. Their solution is a formula based on the ratio of employed population in 1896, which they back-project onto the earlier returns to produce the necessary upwards revisions in the longitudinal trend line of employment.[18] While Thélot and Marchand do not apply their employment corrections to departmental-level occupational data, something that has yet to be done, both they and van de Walle acknowledge the importance of doing so.[19] In the meantime, their studies establish the necessity of estimating and then correcting for underenumeration in aggregated census results. By extension, the same must be true for the departmental and local returns.

The third influence on current use of the *listes* comes from the magisterial socio-economic studies of various regions of rural France that have appeared in recent decades. The standard for years was set by George Dupeux's book on the Loir-et-Cher (1962), which provided a rich and varied picture of rural society in an important region. Broadly speaking, Dupeux emphasized how different social strata in the peasantry (such as winegrowers, grain farmers, or graziers) experienced different patterns of economic change, yet he concluded that there was an underlying social homogeneity among the "peasant masses", in the majority peasant smallholders.[20] Dupeux relied heavily on returns from the census of 1851 to generate the richness and detail in his analysis, as have a number of other historians since. On closer examination, however, Dupeux's use of the 1851 data is puzzling, even contradictory, in several respects.[21] One issue is that neither Dupeux nor

17 Marchand and Thélot, *Deux siècles de travail en France*, pp. 11–17.

18 *Ibid.*, pp. 27–38.

19 Van de Walle realized that placing the French fertility decline in its social and cultural context was "[t]he most important task ahead", adding: "One basic limitation of departmental indices is that they hide some of the component variation for human groups that cannot be clearly identified with the population of *départements*. It is certain that there are strong social differentials in the date and speed of the fertility decline." *Female Population of France in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 204.

20 Georges Dupeux, *Aspects de l'histoire sociale et politique du Loir-et-Cher 1848–1914* (Paris and The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1962), pp. 179–297, especially 259–289, comparing incomes of agricultural workers, peasant smallholders growing cereals, peasant winegrowers, tenant farmers, and landlords and emphasizing the decline in real wages of the first, along with the gradual slump in rental income of the landlord, compared to the prolonged if erratic rise in real earnings of smallholders growing grains and especially of tenant farmers.

21 For example, Dupeux emphasizes that the propertied peasants were the majority among adult men, but his own data reveal that rural labourers much outnumbered peasants. See *Loir-et-Cher*, prevalence of propertied peasantry, e.g. *propriétaires-cultivateurs* (pp. 113–119), but preponderance of *les paysans sans terre* (pp. 93–97). He muddied these distinctions, however, by using terms such as *paysans sans terre*, *la masse des ruraux*, or *les masses paysannes* (pp. 97, 169, 173 respectively).

subsequent studies have undertaken extended social structural comparisons over time from census data. This is not critical as long as one is primarily interested in deciphering rural social structures in various regions at the moment of a key historical juncture around the mid-nineteenth century. Sole reliance on the 1851 data has inevitably contributed to a picture of a rural society frozen in time, however, a picture that obscures more than it reveals about what evolved over the decades to follow, particularly as these were years of profound change judging from Dupeux's own analysis. A second issue is that Dupeux, and others since, did not actually compile occupational data directly from the individuals and households enumerated in 1851 *listes nominatives*. He worked from the summary tables printed on the back of the census forms onto which local authorities were instructed to enter counts of occupations by category. This seemingly minor difference is in fact significant. The printed summary tables provided in one place a simple format organizing individual occupations into fixed class categories: landowners, peasant smallholders, day labourers, or artisans, for example. That in itself made the tables highly useful, providing historians with ostensibly comparable data on social structure without the considerable time and effort required to work through *listes* from each commune. What is more, in a number of departments, not only Loir-et-Cher, the authorities tabulated cantonal and departmental totals from the communal summaries, giving historians ready access to aggregate occupational returns. How accurate the summary tables were in comparison with the accompanying *listes* is far from evident, however. For his part, Dupeux conceded that the tables seriously undercounted employment of women and children, with the result that he decided to exclude these cases from his analysis — a drastic but unavoidable step. He insisted, however, that the data on employed males were "numerous and precise", a conclusion he sought to buttress with data from voting lists and the cadastres.[22] Historians since Dupeux have become much more cautious, not to say sceptical, concerning uncorrected occupational data and in particular the summary tables of 1851.[23]

In this context, Ronald Hubscher's book on the Pas-de-Calais (1979) has opened important new perspectives. Carefully comparing a large sample of lists from 200 communes, Hubscher concluded that the summary tables of the 1851 *listes* were completely unreliable.[24] Often the tables grouped the

22 *Ibid.*, pp. 88–97 (p. 92 for quotation).

23 Rejecting or heavily qualifying use of the summary tables are Gilbert Garrier, *Paysans du Beaujolais et du Lyonnais, 1800–1970* (Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 1973), vol. 1, pp. 41–43, 273–275 (among other points, citing "gênantes ... imprécisions de la colonne des professions", p. 41); Pierre Goujon, *Le vignoble de Saone-et-Loire au XIX^e siècle (1815–1870)* (Lyon: Centre d'Histoire Économique et Sociale de la Région Lyonnaise, 1973), pp. 148–154; Philippe Vigier, *La Séconde République dans la région Alpine : étude politique et sociale* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France), vol. 2, pp. 123–124; Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, p. 37.

24 In his words, "a socio-professional analysis relying only on the summary tables from 1851 would

occupations reported in the lists inaccurately, reported totals erroneously, or dropped certain categories. He found the count of occupations in the *listes* more accurate, again with the exception of working women and older children. For that reason Hubscher put the summary table data to one side and worked solely from the *listes*, despite the mammoth undertaking that this represented.[25] Even then, he found occupational designations in some of the documents to be confusing and inconsistent. His scepticism was based on discovering that local enumerators had difficulty translating regional occupational terms and customary designations for agriculturalists into the national occupational terminology that the central state authorities sought to introduce. Accordingly, occupations listed in the *listes* were often vague, imprecise, and clumsy. Close textual analysis of *listes* revealed that enumerators often improvised wordy or ambiguous occupational terms, ostensibly in an effort to fit both local and national purposes. This was the principal basis for what Hubscher called a widespread practice of "pleonasm", the coining of new terms using repetitive and frequently redundant constructions. In various listings, for example, he encountered such baffling peasant occupations as *cultivateur-locataire-journalier*, *journalier-fermier-propriétaire*, *fermier-cultivateur-propriétaire*, and *fermier-cultivateur-locataire*.[26] To decipher such confusing "pleonastic" occupations he tested for real differences in wealth using property records (*cadastres*) and tax rolls kept in the town halls. Painstakingly cross-comparing individuals' occupations with land and tax information, he devised his own analytic scheme of agricultural occupations. The primary result was to increase slightly the count of labourers in the population records. In this manner, Hubscher's solid picture of rural society qualifies Dupeux's original assessment, revealing a larger labouring population and more rural poverty and indebtedness.[27]

Another innovative step came with Gregor Dallas's 1986 economic and social study of the Loire country. Unlike other regional rural histories, his book draws together census data for the entire period from 1836 to 1911, based on households and individuals in the *listes* of 17 sample communes. He also includes data on landholdings taken from the cadastres.[28] Again unlike the others, he conducts an extended statistical analysis of occupations, households,

give only a partial picture of reality and would be the source of major errors [*erreurs magistrales*]." Ronald H. Hubscher, *L'agriculture et la société rurale dans le Pas-de-Calais du milieux du XIX^e siècle à 1914* (Arras: Mémoires de la Commission Départementale des Monuments Historiques du Pas-de-Calais, 1979), vol. 1, p. 140–172 (p. 153 for quotation). Hubscher's discussion of occupations and census lists is an excellent guide, providing insights on peasants, labourers, working children, women, and artisans.

25 *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 153–154.

26 *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 154–155, notes 43, 44, 45, and 54 for these examples; Hubscher questions to what extent these terms reflected "simple pleonasm or social reality" (p. 154).

27 *Ibid.*, especially vol. 1, pp. 172–187, section titled "La vulnérabilité des mal lotis : une pauvreté endémique".

28 Gregor Dallas, *The Imperfect Peasant Economy: The Loire Country, 1800–1914* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 141–143, 180–181 on the census; pp. 198–201 on the cadastre.

and property. His analysis demonstrates skilfully that there was a prolonged expansion of peasant agriculture, though with ups and downs, over these important decades. Moreover, though not always as convincingly (Dallas employs occupations as reported without attempting reclassification), the study presents an explanation of the economic durability and survival of an independent peasantry in the Orléanais over time much more effectively than reliance on the 1851 returns alone could do.[29] The use of occupational data in the study, however, is routine and uncritical to the extent that Dallas finds no significant relationship between such variables as property holding, household structure, age, and occupation in the sample communities.[30] In one sense, his study is another confirmation of the limits of census data. As with van de Walle, Thélot and Marchand, and Hubscher, though in a different way, Dallas demonstrates again the need for systematic scrutiny and reclassification of occupational terms to permit consistent comparisons. The lesson of the census, if you will, is that the administrative purposes for which state officials devised and mayors and clerks reported occupations are not necessarily those that historians must have in mind for their analysis of these old records. Adjusting occupational data is often essential for the historian.

Emerging from these and the other regional monographs is a picture that revises Dupeux's account in familiar but still surprising ways. In most of rural France the small to medium peasantry predominated. In some regions many were tenant farmers (as in the Pas-de-Calais or Picardy), in others, owner-occupiers (Loir, Beaujolais); in some regions, they were secure and prosperous, while in others, where land subdivision was far advanced, peasant holdings were tiny, even marginal. Above all, in many areas the rural poor predominated over independent peasants as of 1851. In these cases (Nantais, Languedoc), marginal property owners, propertyless labourers, rural outworkers, and poor artisans outnumbered peasant-owners.[31] In this perspective it is essential in an analysis of census lists to distinguish clearly between populations of rural day labourers, farm servants, and outworkers on one hand, and independent peasants, that is families of petty producers and smallholders, on the other. One needs also to keep in mind that seasonal, occupational, or life-cycle patterns

29 *Ibid.*, pp. 239–243, 259–266, 280–287.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 178, concluding that "there is little relationship between the variables; the ruling factor is chance."

31 For example, Hubscher, *Agriculture et société rurale dans le Pas-de-Calais*, vol. 1, pp. 125–135, 158–161; vol. 2, pp. 688–695; Garrier, *Paysans du Beaujolais et du Lyonnais*, vol. 1, pp. 276–281, 296–302, 497–500; Gabriel Desert, *Une société rurale au XIX^e siècle : les paysans du Calvados, 1815–1895* (New York: Arno Press, 1977), pp. 132–145, 651–654, 661–663, 719–726; Dallas, *Imperfect Peasant Economy*, pp. 114–134, especially Table 6.5. For fascinating graphic representations of regional contrasts in rural social structure, based on a source comparable to the census of 1851, see Michel Demonet, *Tableau de l'agriculture française au milieu du 19^e siècle : l'enquête de 1852* (Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1990), pp. 39–49, 62–70.

were such that individuals moved back and forth from one category to another. The poor cobbled together an existence from multiple seasonal and part-time occupations.[32] One problem, then, was the difficulty of capturing in official census classifications an elusive experience of constant flux and shifts in agricultural by-employments and mixed rural occupations. Understandably, enumerators often resorted to vague but generic references such as "cultivator" in order to avoid, even evade, difficulties of precision.[33]

To assess how best to meet the twin objectives of distinguishing between rural labourers, including smallholding labourers and peasant owners, and of permitting stable social structural comparisons over time, we turn to examining selected *listes nominatives* from Cruzy, a village in the Languedoc region in southern France. Cruzy is located at the inland edge of the Mediterranean plain in the department of the Hérault. Early in the nineteenth century the peasants and landowners were already producing crops for the regional and national markets, including grain, olive oil, wool, wine, and a distilled liqueur, *eaux de vie*, for which the region was famous. Market towns such as Béziers and Narbonne were nearby and accessible over paved roads while national and international markets were reached via the Canal du Midi, which ran through the commune to Toulouse and Bordeaux to the northwest and in the other direction to the Mediterranean port of Agde, 28 miles to the east. Over time the population increased steadily, if erratically, despite high mortality resulting from periodic epidemics of malaria, typhoid, and tuberculosis, unsanitary living conditions in the crowded village, poor diet, and poverty. From 1,100 inhabitants in 285 households in 1836, the census totals rose to 1,715 inhabitants and 479 households by 1901. Given declining fertility, population growth was a result of a constant influx of immigrant peasants and artisans from the interior highlands in search of

32 Yves Rinaudo, "Un travail de plus : les paysans d'un métier à l'autre (vers 1830—vers 1950", *Annales : économies, sociétés, civilisations*, vol. 42 (March-April 1987), pp. 283–302; Gilbert Garrier and Ronald Hubscher, eds., *Entre faucilles et marteaux : pluriactivités et stratégies paysannes* (Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon, 1988).

33 The omnipresent *cultivateur* in nineteenth-century listings to designate the run-of-the-mill peasant owner, smallholder, part-peasant, agricultural labourer, or worker is particularly troublesome. The meaning of the term is so vague and slippery that it becomes extremely problematic for demographic and social analysis. Virtually all historians cited here share a certain frustration with this problem and heroically attempt to contend with it. One reason Dallas does not make more use of occupational classification is that *cultivateur*, he reports, was "a very nondescript term in the nineteenth century, which referred to anything between a farmer in possession of 50 hectares of land and a humble *journalier*" (*Imperfect Peasant Economy*, p. 166). Similar puzzlement is voiced by Dupeux, *Loir-et-Cher*, pp. 94–95; Hubscher, *L'agriculture et la société rurale dans le Pas-de-Calais*, p. 155 ("a term vague and highly imprecise, covering over diverse realities ... used indifferently to mean farmer-owner, tenant farmer, even worker-peasant"); Maurice Agulhon, *La vie sociale en Provence intérieure au lendemain de la Révolution* (Paris: Société des Études Robespierristes, 1970), pp. 165, 252–253; Desert, *Paysans du Calvados*, pp. 88–90; Philippe Pinchemel, *Structures sociales et dépopulation rurale dans les campagnes picardes de 1836 à 1936* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1957), p. 14; Vigier, *La Seconde République dans la région Alpine*, vol. 1, pp. 123–124.

work and sunshine. They provided an ever-growing pool of impoverished day labourers, all candidates for peasant property, which they eventually purchased with savings or cleared from wastelands on the low hills around the commune. After mid-century, as urban markets expanded, the Languedoc experienced a remarkable wine boom, becoming one of the most productive areas for *vins ordinaires*. Landowners converted their estates to vineyards staffed with day labourers, while peasant owners planted vines on their modest family holdings. Though a source of unprecedented wealth, viticulture also carried great risks, first a terrible vine blight (*phylloxera*) and then, after 1896, a series of market slumps. The constant turnover in population and cohabitation of labourers, peasant smallholders and great landowners makes the region and this commune a worthwhile setting for analysis of population lists. The location, well south of Paris and some distance even from the departmental seat in Montpellier, offers the added opportunity for us to observe population enumeration far from the view of central state administration.

The *liste nominative* taken in Cruzy in 1836 was part of the first periodic, nominative population enumeration in France. The July Monarchy had initiated the administrative process of national enumeration in 1833 by recreating the *Statistique Générale de France*, the government agency for census data first established by Napoleon, followed by the royal decree of August 10, 1835, formally establishing the policy of periodic enumeration.[34] Earlier enumerations, conducted infrequently since 1801, were not true nominative listings, and no trace of them can be found in the commune's archives.[35] By contrast, the list of 1836 was just that: a nominative record of the names and households of all residents, including first and surname, maiden name where appropriate, age, civil status, occupation, and position in the household.[36] The document was prepared with some care; the handwriting is clear, the columns all neatly filled in. The census form, which had room for 30 names on each page and 13 columns for information, was printed in Montpellier based on a model provided by the Ministry of the Interior. Though the form did not include a column to report the individual's position in the household, the enumerator in Cruzy, as in most villages in the region, wrote this information in the last column, otherwise blank, under the heading "Comments". Occupational information was reported in the column under the heading *titres, qualifications, état ou profession et fonctions*. Horizontal lines drawn across the page served to

34 What follows draws on sources cited in note 3.

35 On the earlier enumerations see Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, pp. 26–33; Le Mée, "Statistique démographique officielle", pp. 260–263.

36 The census lists are in the Archives Départementales de l'Hérault (hereafter ADH), 115 M 92, *Listes nominatives de recensement de Cruzy* (hereafter *Listes nom.* followed by the year). This study analyzes six of the *listes* selected at 15-year intervals: 1836, 1851, 1866, 1881, 1896, and 1911.

demarcate each household.[37] As with later censuses the local authorities were instructed to prepare two copies of the *liste*, one for the municipality and the other to be forwarded to the prefect to be included in the departmental totals.[38]

To judge from the handwriting, the list was prepared by the elementary school master and friend of the mayor, who doubled as municipal clerk, another common practice in rural communes. There was little direct instruction from higher administrative authorities on procedures for the enumeration. The true authors of the listing, however, were the landed gentry of the commune. These landowners were travelled, educated, and cosmopolitan. They managed their vast estates and attended weekly markets in the towns nearby to be seen and to sell their grain, wine, wool, and liqueur. Several families also owned urban residences where they spent a few months each year. The landed elite remained close to the commune, however, where they dominated local affairs and served as municipal councillors and mayors. The wealthiest of the gentry families, the d'Andoques, father and son, owners of the estate at Sériège, would occupy the mayor's office for almost the entire period from 1815 to 1868. Their names and those of their allies, the Terrals, Étiennes, and Cabannes, filled the pages of the municipal registers, council minutes, polling lists, and land rolls. As it happened, the census listing of 1836 was not supervised by the d'Andoques, but by a rival, Pierre Genieys, a more modest landowner who, thanks to a political alliance with their bitter enemies the de Lapeyrouses, was briefly mayor in the mid-1830s. Insofar as the census was concerned, the significance of this political feud among the first families was nil. The *propriétaires* in the commune knew the village families, their reputations, and not a few of their secrets. This was especially true of the lowly day labourers of the commune, most of whom depended on the gentry for employment in the vineyards, olive groves, grain fields, pastures, and stables. Another factor that encouraged familiarity with the lesser families was the central organization of the village. Rather than living on isolated farmsteads, the population lived crowded together, Mediterranean-style, in a compact central village. In the centre was the plaza and marketplace, lined with shops and the town hall, and from there the narrow streets radiated into the residential neighbourhoods. Most of the landed elite lived in large houses that lined the broad boulevard along one side of the village, where they and their underlings, their estate stewards and the village clerk, could observe everything. Nearly all landowners were literate, and nearly all spoke both French and *langue d'oc*, also known as *provençale*, the regional dialect

37 A copy of cover sheet and page from the *liste* of 1836 is reproduced in Henry, *Manuel de démographie historique*, pp. 30–31.

38 Haug, "Manuscript Census Materials", pp. 271–273, inventories *listes nominatives* in 71 department archives; see also Biraben, "Inventaire des listes nominatives", pp. 315–321.

that was the everyday language. Yet another source of familiarity was a by-product of civil authority. As municipal officials in charge of all local affairs, landowners routinely kept and updated an array of nominative records: registers of births, marriages, and deaths; lists of indigent families on public assistance; polling lists of municipal electors; enrolment lists of families with children in the elementary school.[39] The census was simply another document prepared for the landed gentry to report on the familiar population of peasants and poor labourers in the commune.

Closer examination reveals those who crafted the 1836 *liste* employed a straightforward and consistent set of occupational designations: landowners, peasants, day labourers, farm servants, and a variety of trades and artisans. Such clear-cut social descriptors, while appearing unexceptional, were rare in subsequent listings. In all there were 49 occupational titles employed in 1836, of which seven were in agriculture, in comparison to 84 occupations by 1896, of which 14 were agricultural. The numbers represented in each class were indicative of the social hierarchy of resident families in 1836: there were only 47 landowners (*propriétaires*) and 45 peasant farmers (*cultivateurs*), but 188 day labourers (*journaliers*), along with a dozen farm servants (*domestiques-agricoles*). There were as well 16 other agricultural workers such as gardeners, shepherds, and stewards, individuals who can be grouped with day labourers. The information on households of the poor also revealed some differences between the day labourers and farm servants. The former, the *journaliers*, lived with their families crowded into small houses they owned or rented in the village. Many of them, though far from all, also owned small plots of land, according to the land cadastres. The latter, *domestiques agricoles*, were usually unmarried and lived on the estates where they were hired by the month or year. Almost all were young men, and propertyless. The artisans and tradesmen, propertied just like the peasantry, included the usual types. There were several butchers, a baker, shoemakers, along with a wheelwright, coopers, potters, a distiller, a veterinarian, and a barber, much as one would expect in any market village. In all they totalled 89 individuals, many fewer than the labouring population. Finally, there was one proud individual, or so we may surmise, who told the enumerator he was holder of the Legion of Honour (*Chevalier de la Légion d'honneur*), and was so recorded in the census. A few such human touches aside, the listing is quite consistent and systematic in accounting for occupations, and in a way revelatory. Most significant is the indication that, in this remote Languedoc village of "peasants", it was day

39 Archives Municipales de Cruzy (Hérault) (hereafter AMC), *Régistres des déliberations du Conseil Municipal, 1828–1912*, 6 vols. (hereafter *Déliberations*); periodic lists in AMC, series Q, "Atelier de charité", "Bons pur [*sic*] les pauvres"; annual "États des élèves indigens" for school charity in *Déliberations*, e.g. August 4, 1833; AMC, "Liste des Électeurs Communaux" (under the July Monarchy mayors also recorded the taxable wealth of each elector in the polling lists).

labourers and not farmers who actually made up the largest social class. Next came artisans and shopkeepers who were nearly as numerous as peasants and landowners together.

Exactly where the occupational terms in the *liste* of 1836 came from is not easily determined, but a number of possibilities can be posed. Most likely the terms were part of the local speech and social vocabulary of the region and the commune. Landowners would easily have perceived the village poor as day labourers because so many were employed on their estates. Indeed, language describing a proletarian class, quite unassociated with any Marxian overtones (one would have to say pre-Marxian overtones since Marx was 18 years old in 1836), was common in municipal registers in these years. Landowners were political benefactors and patrons of the poor on whose behalf they sometimes interceded with higher authorities. Phrases such as "the working class of the commune" or "the indigent poor" recurred in the documents they composed.[40] From that to the occupational terms in the census list was a small step indeed. Equally influential was a second source of hierarchical social terms. Inherent in the southern rural culture, built around agrarian estates, agglomerated villages of labourers and artisans, and a mixed population of independent and poor peasants, was a long-standing notion of society as comprised of three tiers or status groups. This notion of three basic social ranks in rural southern society went back to the old régime, according to Agulhon. By the early nineteenth century, after the Revolution and Napoleonic Empire, conceptions of the ranks had become transmuted from old-régime ideas of aristocratic status and privilege into a more mundane but no less rigid set of class distinctions. These social ranks distinguished landowners and "bourgeois" families, who engaged in no manual labour, from respectable peasant owners with sufficient land to occupy their families, and both of them in turn from poor peasants with little or no land, who suffered the necessity of working as day labourers to make ends meet. The triad *propriétaire-cultivateur-journalier* captured perfectly this three-step social hierarchy.[41] If such a notion was plausible in this rural culture, that still leaves

40 AMC, *Déliberations*. For example, in 1831 the council allocated public funds for road construction "considerant qu'un certain nombre d'habitans [*sic*] de la classe indigente sont privés de travail pour se subsister", April 4, 1831; bread distributed to "la classe indigent[e] des habitants ... sans travail", November 9, 1831; "pain ... [distribué] aux pauvres de la commune", May 1, 1833; charity for "les familles les plus indigent[e]s de la commune", December 10, 1852; funds for road work for labourers "d'attenuer les privations ... de la classe ouvrière de la commune", November 10, 1855.

41 Agulhon, *Vie sociale en Provence intérieure*, pp. 65–68, 153–173, 247–256, 309–333, provides a perceptive analysis of "la vieille division en trois" of rural social structure, *propriétaire — cultivateur — journalier*, i.e. landowner — peasant smallholder — day labourer. Agulhon summarizes "l'évolution du vocabulaire" from the old régime to the nineteenth century as follows: "le bourgeois devient propriétaire, le ménager agriculteur ou cultivateur-propriétiare, le travailleur cultivateur ou journalier" (p. 252).

unresolved the issue of the terms in each case. Why *propriétaire*? Or *cultivateur*, or *journalier*? Here we have to look at the texture of everyday language in a period before a national vocabulary of occupational titles was introduced by the census functionaries of the *Statistique Générale de France*. The occupational terms in Cruzy and their local variants were grounded in an older, even archaic, social vocabulary that went back to the eighteenth century and was preserved in the regional dialect, the *langue d'oc*. It was this everyday language, still infused with an old-régime, regional flavour, that influenced the vocabulary of social status. This is clear if one consults the dictionary of the southern dialect compiled by Frédéric Mistral in the 1870s, which recorded these older usages. The parallels are striking. In the 1836 census from Cruzy the term for landowner, *propriétaire*, came from the provençale words *prouprietàri* and *prouprietaire*; smallholder, *cultivateur*, was the provençale *cultivadou* or *cultibadou*, and day labourer, *journalier*, was from *journadié* or *brassié*.[42] In reporting occupations in the *liste* of 1836, the mayor and village clerk had simply translated, or transliterated, provençale terms used in popular speech to designate different social ranks in this southern district.

This linguistic evidence is somewhat speculative, but it is confirmed by a simple reading of families and households in this and subsequent *listes*. Differences in family organization, marriages, wealth, and property are obvious from one group to the other. The landowners (*propriétaires*), for example, formed extended family clans. They lived in multi-generational households that were closely linked by marriage to the other landed families, and they preserved their large estates through inheritances within the narrow range of co-resident male kin. Thus in the 1836 *liste* one Bernard Terral, *propriétaire*, age 52, owner of 20 hectares of land, lived with his wife Marie Terral *née* Terral, age 37, and their four sons, all of whom subsequently became *propriétaires*. In the adjoining household lived their cousin Bernard Terral, 56, also a landowner, and his wife Marie Cabannes, 55, who were childless. In a third adjacent household lived yet another cousin Bernard Terral, 39, landowner and wealthy distiller, his wife Marguerite Terral *née* Terral, 40, and their seven children ages five months to 19 years (in fact, an atypically large family even for landowners). Together the three households owned 80.1 hectares of land, quite substantial holdings for a winegrowing district. By 1866, thanks to several new marriages within the family, the surviving couples had once again formed

42 Confirming the connection is that *brassier*, the other provençal-based term for labourer besides *journalier*, was used in the *liste* of 1841 in Cruzy. For these equivalencies, consult definitions in Frédéric Mistral, *Lou tresor dóu Felibrige, ou Dictionnaire Provençal-Français embrassant les divers dialectes de la Langue d'Oc moderne* (1879–1886; Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1966), vol. 2, p. 656, *prouprietàri*; vol. 1, p. 688, *cultivadou*; vol. 2, p. 165, *journadié, journalià*; also Agulhon, *Vie sociale en Provence intérieure*, pp. 165–167 especially n. 8, 309–310, 323–325.

extended households and were still in possession of nearly 75 hectares of land.[43] In contrast, smallholding farmers lived in modest houses and formed nuclear families. Typical was Joseph Phalippou, age 47, *cultivateur*, and his wife Anne Bernet, age 39, who had four children of whom the oldest boy, age 15, was also a *cultivateur*. The family owned just over five hectares of land, enough to support their needs but no more. Far more penurious were day labourers who relied primarily on wages throughout the seasons but also owned plots of land worked in off-hours and in periods of seasonal unemployment. For example, on page 12 of the 1836 *liste* we encounter Antoine Barral, *journalier*, age 50, Marie Bastide, age 47, and their four sons and two daughters ages nine to 25 years old. The three eldest sons were *journaliers*, as was no doubt Marie Bastide, though she is not listed as such. The family owned a minuscule holding, just over one hectare of *terre infertile*, suitable only for producing a little grain and wine.[44]

The impression of consistent differences between occupational groups in the *liste* can be subjected to simple statistical tests. These confirm that occupational designations in 1836 were accurate markers of significant differences in wealth and power within the population of the commune. To verify this point, individuals in the census have been linked to their entries in land cadastres, voting lists, and marriage acts. The cross-comparisons of census occupations with the independently compiled records are presented in Table 1. The selected measures of social rank are status as household head, electoral enfranchisement, literacy, political affiliation, property, and age. Most of these variables are self-explanatory. It should be noted that voter eligibility was a proxy for age and wealth. Under the municipal elections law of 1831 men over 25 years of age who paid as little as 25 francs in property taxes were eligible to vote. By all of these measures, farm servants, day labourers, peasant smallholders, and landowners as groups showed distinct differences that were statistically significant across all seven variables drawn from municipal records. The most striking contrasts concerned literacy, political activity and affiliation with royalism, and property holdings. On the last measure, landowners owned on average just under 30 hectares of land compared to five hectares for peasant farmers and less than two hectares for day labourers. Moreover, 83 per cent of landowners owned land at the time the census was compiled, compared to slightly more than half (54.8 per cent) of day labourers.

After the efforts of the 1830s and 1840s, the census of 1851, designed by

43 Information on Terrals from *Liste nom. 1836*, households (hereafter hhs.) 67, 68, 75; *Liste nom. 1851*, hhs. 206, 207; *Liste nom. 1866*, hhs. 326, 354, 358; *Cadastre : matrices*, fols. 662, 673, 677.

44 Phalippou-Bernet, *Liste nom. 1836*, hh. 190; *Cadastre : matrices*, fol. 532; Barral-Bastide, *Liste nom. 1836*, hh. 260; *Cadastre : matrices*, fol. 27, listing 1.3 hectares mostly *terre infertile*, including *champ* and *vigne*.

Table 1 Agricultural Occupations and Social Indicators in 1836

Census occupations (and codes)	Category	(n)	% house heads	% munic. electors	% literate	% Royalists	% own property	Average property (has)[a]	Average age (years)
143 *domestique agricole*	farm servant	14	0.0	7.1	—	0.0	7.1	1.69	31.9
122 *métayer*	foreman	2	100.0	0.0	—	0.0	50.0	0.67	43.5
146 *jardinier*	gardener	4	75.0	0.0	—	0.0	75.0	2.12	34.0
151 *berger*	shepherd	12	83.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	91.7	2.64	51.3
141 *journalier*	day labourer	188	58.0	0.5	11.0	0.5	54.8	1.65	34.3
131 *cultivateur*	smallholder	45	66.7	31.1	26.9	8.9	66.7	5.13	40.4
111 *propriétaire*	landowner	47	74.5	80.9	85.0	66.0	83.0	29.20	46.5
Totals		312	60.6	17.6	23.9	11.5	60.3	7.98	37.6
R =			0.188[b]	0.559[b]	0.544[b]	0.541[b]	0.213[b]	0.411[b]	0.161[b]

a) 1 hectare = 2.47 acres.
b) $p < 0.001$

Sources: *Liste nominative 1836*; *Cadastre : matrices*; *État-civil : actes de mariages* (signature on the marriage act was taken as evidence of literacy).

the Belgian demographer Quinet, is rightfully recognized as a significant forward step. Prepared entirely by the Ministry of the Interior, the census provided 35 columns for information for each individual, as contrasted with 13 columns in 1836 and 16 in 1846, although most of the additional columns concerned medical conditions and infirmities and were rarely filled in. The 1851 census also provided thorough instructions, printed on the cover page of the enumerators' books and reiterated in official circulars sent directly to mayors from the Ministry of the Interior. The instructions advised enumerators to compile the *listes* with care and "to collect personally the required information by speaking directly to each person involved", something that officials in Cruzy had already done for previous censuses.[45] Another innovation was a section on occupations explaining the terms to be used and the specific circumstances under which women and older children were to be reported as employed — all information that was to be abstracted in the summary tables at the end of the list. A third innovation was to require information on family relationships (each individual's relationship to the head of the household). One problem that would persist in later censuses should be noted in this regard. Enumerators were to use the same column on the census form to report both the individual's relationship to the household head and his or her occupation. As can be imagined, this made for ambiguity or outright confusion, all the more as enumerators normally reported household position first, then either omitted any mention of occupation or employed ditto marks (") in its place, particularly for persons who were subordinates in the household. The result was undercounted occupations. For example, immediately following an entry listing the household head, complete with name, age, "head of household", and occupation (such as farmer, landowner), the enumerator typically would report the wife or other next of kin by writing "wife of the above" or "son of the above" in the proper column and directly below in the same box inserting ditto marks or nothing. Were the ditto marks to be interpreted to mean "not applicable" (no occupation) or "same as above" (farmer, landowner)? Opinions will differ, but in many cases it seems the former was clearly intended while in others the latter was more likely, for example, in the instance of an adult, married son. Nothing in the census record allows one to say for certain which is correct. This problem of underreported occupations due to "ditto-mark creep" persisted for decades in listings from Cruzy. Not until 1881 and after were two separate columns introduced in French census forms for this information.[46]

45 Desrosières, "S.G.F. as a Case Study", p. 523; Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, p. 37.

46 This arrangement may have been an afterthought, the printed instructions reading far along on the cover page, "Col. 8 — On fera connaître dans cette colonne, outre la professions, la position de chaque individu par rapport au ménage dont il fait partie." The confusion of occupations and

The 1851 instructions on occupations represented a first and ultimately unsuccessful attempt to set a standardized national scheme of agricultural occupations for France in place of leaving designations to the discretion of local authorities.[47] The lengthy guidelines advised enumerators that all things being equal the occupation or "profession" of a peasant was to be "cultivator" (*la profession de cultivateur*). Doubtless because the term was so vague, the instructions added a set of sub-classifications for different types of peasants. "It is necessary to distinguish between five classes [*classes*] of cultivators", advised the instructions, "peasant-owners [or smallholders], tenant farmers, sharecroppers, day labourers, and farm hands."[48] Instructions also required enumerators to report multiple occupations since peasants frequently worked part-time in other economic activities or held a trade. A peasant-owner who was also a miller was to be reported as a peasant-miller, *propriétaire-cultivateur-meunier*; a peasant-owner who rented land and worked as a basket weaver was to be reported as a peasant tenant-farmer-basket-weaver, or *fermier-propriétaire-vannier*.[49] Admittedly, some rather complex formulations are easy to imagine! Landowners (*propriétaires*) were included not with agriculturalists but with the liberal professions in keeping with the generic notion of *propriétaire* as someone who lived from rents or other substantial wealth derived from property holdings of any sort. On the matter of reporting working women and older children, the 1851 instructions advised enumerators to report women as employed only if they actually worked on their own or practised a distinct trade. Otherwise, enumerators were to record wives as "living from the work or income of the husband" — even if they participated in their household's productive labour in a trade or profession (the instructions cited shopkeeping as an example). Agriculture was different, however. Given the ubiquity of household labour in agricultural pursuits, "Wives of peasants [*cultivateurs*] should be considered as having the same profession as their husbands."

Given such detailed stipulations, should we be surprised that the

household position is widely cited in the census literature, e.g. Garrier, *Paysans du Beaujolais et du Lyonnais*, vol. 1, p. 41. In the Hérault the change to two separate columns came in 1881 and not in 1886, as is sometimes reported (Pinchemel, "Listes nominatives des recensements", p. 422).

47 Desrosières, "S.G.F. as a Case Study", pp. 523–524.

48 In the original: "propriétaires-cultivateurs, fermiers, métayers, journalier, domestiques attachés à l'exploitation".

49 Citations from printed instructions accompanying *Liste nom. 1851*, "Observations relatives à quelques des renseignements que les maires doivent prendre sur chaque habitant", most of which concerned the occupations to be reported in col. 8 in the *liste*. One can easily imagine the thoroughly urbanized government official of the S.G.F. or Ministry of the Interior in Paris responsible for drawing up such instructions. After taking a leisurely lunch at a favourite café to ponder in earnest contemplation a cartesian taxonomy of whatever it is peasants might do for a living, and after ranking the full range of logical possibilities, he would stroll back to the office to commit thought to paper.

authorities in Cruzy did not follow occupational instructions for the *liste* of 1851 to the letter? No doubt writing time after time, entry after entry, "living from the work or income of her husband", would have exhausted the most eager clerk with writer's cramp. They simply omitted that phrase. The enumerator did report some multiple occupations, 34 in all, but virtually all of these applied to shopkeepers or tradesmen, not peasants or smallholders as the instructions had indicated. No doubt to have done otherwise would have required the authorities to record endlessly varied combinations of dual and even triple occupations given the ubiquity of part-time, semi-agricultural/semi-trade activities in this southern community.[50] Nor were the agricultural subclasses outlined on the instruction page actually used in this *liste*. Virtually no *journaliers* were reported, despite their having been the largest occupational class in the commune in 1836! All this suggests that the central authorities had miscalculated the willingness of local officials to make painstaking efforts to collect what must have appeared to them to be unduly detailed information, much as Chatelain asserted. The summary table at the end of the *liste* of 1851 suggests as much, too, for it was compiled carelessly and with several numbers crossed out or modified after the fact, apparently with an eye to getting the column of figures to sum to the total population rather than accurately reporting occupational composition.

Other factors may have contributed to the disappearance of class definition in the 1851 document. One was the prevailing political climate. Unlike the 1836 census, taken at a time of political order during the July Monarchy, the census of 1851 was taken after the Revolution of 1848, in a period which saw the installation of a democratic Second Republic, political and social reform, and universal manhood suffrage. The Revolution's impact was immediate. As in many Languedoc villages, democratic-socialism took hold among the poor in Cruzy. Political clubs and a secret society flourished, and in December 1851, a few months after the census was completed, scores of villagers joined in a widespread insurrection in the futile attempt to defend the Republic from Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état*.[51] Under these circumstances, it is understandable that local notables still in control in the commune played down the rhetoric of social hierarchy and domination in municipal documents. For a time after 1848, in fact, they had taken to referring to themselves as *citoyens* (citizens) in council minutes, doubtless as much for self-preservation as from conviction, in place of the older honorific phrases such as *Mon Sieur* (my lord) favoured in the

50 Virtually all were poor artisans or shopkeepers, e.g. tailor-smallholder (*tailleur-propriétaire*), shoemaker-smallholder, stonemason-smallholder. *Liste nom. 1851*, hhs. 94, 212, 287.

51 On the Second Republic and the insurrection of 1851 in the Languedoc, see Ted W. Margadant, *French Peasants in Revolt: The Insurrection of 1851* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979), especially chaps. 1, 9–10; Peter McPhee, *The Politics of Rural Life: Political Mobilization in the French Countryside, 1846–1852* (Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1992).

1830s.[52] Once the authoritarian Empire was safely established in 1851, order was restored but even then the new régime maintained, or rather restored, manhood suffrage. To garner votes, therefore, landowners in Cruzy welcomed peasants and tradesmen onto the council. Alexandre d'Andoque himself responded to the opening to the masses by dropping the particle from his name and becoming just Alexandre Andoque.[53] Given these circumstances, it seemed unwise to retain the language of social hierarchy derived from the old régime, and better to report peasants, whether labourers or smallholders, simply as *cultivateurs*, thereby glossing over sub-classifications that indicated class inequalities.[54] The outcome was that in 1851 Cruzy reported many *cultivateurs* or *cultivateurs-propriétaires* but not many *journaliers* — much different from 1836. The summary table does have a category for day labourers, but the figures recorded there do not correspond to those from the *liste* itself. Just as curiously, those few women who were reported employed (they were *cultivateurs* too) were all listed on the first two pages of the *liste*; beginning at the top of the third page, no more women were reported as employed, with the exception of a few widows of landowners. Did the clerk simply tire of reporting so many occupations and resort to ditto marks to simplify the writing task? It seems so. This inconsistency signals a falsified count of working women, instructions notwithstanding.

Table 2 compares agricultural occupations reported in the *listes* of 1836 and 1851 and in the summary table at the end of the *liste* of 1851. The disappearance of *journaliers* in the 1851 *liste* is evident, as is the substitution of *cultivateur* for day labourer. By this logic, *cultivateur-propriétaire* in 1851 apparently signified smallholders including smallholding day labourers to judge from the inflated numbers (n = 127), while *propriétaire* in 1851 referred both to big landowners and well-off peasants given the size of that group (n = 68). If this is the case, then between 1836 and 1851 there was an upward drift in social identifiers, as *journaliers* become *cultivateurs* and *cultivateurs* become *cultivateurs-propriétaires* or even *propriétaires*. Accelerated fragmentation of smallholdings in southern villages such as Cruzy can only have contributed to this drift in social terminology by weakening the social demarcation between rural labourers and small peasants.[55] This interpretation explains why figures in the summary table of

52 For example, "Le citoyen Andoque de Sériège a été proclamé par le citoyen présidant maire de Cruzy, et le citoyen Felix Terral a été proclamé maire adjoint." ADH, 17 M 38, Procès-verbaux des élections des maires et adjoints, August 20, 1848.

53 ADH, 17 M, "Élections municipales — Cruzy", 1852 ff.

54 The spread of French as a language also played a role. Agulhon's observation about the French Revolution and Napoleonic era can be applied to 1848 and after: "The major development during the two regimes from 1792 to 1814 was the blow delivered at one and the same time by equality and by French against the older structures of language." *Vie sociale en Provence intérieur*, p. 256.

55 A process also noted by Peter McPhee, "A Reconsideration of the 'Peasantry' of Nineteenth-Century France", *Peasant Studies*, vol. 9 (Fall 1981), pp. 5–25.

Table 2 Inconsistencies in Frequency Counts of Agricultural Occupations in Censuses of 1836 and 1851

Census occupations (and codes)	Analytic category	1836 Census list	1851 Census list	1851 Summary table	1851 Table description
143 *domestique agricole*	farm servant	14	12		
122 *métayer*	foreman	2	—	—	
144 *ramonet*	foreman	—	4	—	
432 *agent rural*	steward	—	1	—	
146 *jardinier*	gardener	4	5	—	
151 *berger*	shepherd	12	11	—	
141 *journalier*	day labourer	188	2	—	"journaliers-propriétaires"
Agricultural labour		220	35	228	
131 *cultivateur*	smallholder(?)[a]	45	103[a]	—	
123 *cultivateur-propriétaire*	smallholder	—	127	50	"propriétaires-cultivateurs"
Independent smallholders		45	230[a]	50	
111 *propriétaire*	landowner	47	68	28	"propriétaires"
Landowners		47	68	28	
Totals		312	333	306	

a) The imbalance in totals for *cultivateurs* and *cultivateur-propriétaires* in the *liste* of 1851 as compared with 1836 suggests that *cultivateurs* might justifiably be grouped with day labourers in that document. This would bring the number of labourers to 138 individuals and reduce smallholders to 127 individuals in 1851, but such an improvised arrangement would offer no guidance for interpreting subsequent lists.

Sources: Liste nominative 1836, liste nominative 1851.

1851 are closer to the *liste* of 1836 when it comes to distinguishing between *journalier*, *cultivateur*, and *propriétaire*. Unfortunately, the summary table omitted any information on farm servants or other dependent agricultural workers. It may be that farm servants were here subsumed under *journaliers*, despite instructions to the contrary. In any event, this evidence confirms the warnings of Hubscher and others that the summary tables in 1851 are at best crude approximations of the true count of occupational groups. We are left with clear proof that the counts of occupations from the *listes* of 1836 and of 1851 in this community cannot be directly compared. The terminology of agricultural occupations was too shifting and unstable.

Owing to the demands of administrative oversight and to time delays in completing preparation of the returns, after 1851 the Ministry of the Interior returned to more basic census reporting. Twelve- to thirteen-column enumerations once again became the rule until 1911. Meanwhile the census publi-

cations office, the *Statistique Générale de France*, under the direction of Alfred Legoyt from 1853 to 1870 and then under his successors, began to assume a more active role in the conduct of enumerations by working closely with the Ministries of Interior and of Commerce.[56] The result was the introduction over the decades of a series of refinements that improved, standardized, and centralized population enumeration. Among these were fixed dates for collecting census forms, separating "residential" from "floating" (transient) population, information on place of birth in some censuses, and, after 1906, information on employers of wage earners.[57] More important for our purposes were innovations in collecting census information on individuals that were particularly significant for reporting occupations.

Beginning with the census of 1856, rather than having enumerators record information directly onto the manuscript *listes*, a laborious and often error-prone task, the Ministry of Agriculture, Commerce, and Public Works, in collaboration with the S.G.F., introduced household forms (*bulletins de ménage*) for census enumerators, based on the practice in Paris (Circular of May 5, 1856). In each commune, household heads assisted by the enumerators were to fill in the information on the form and have it ready for collection on the specified census day. The enumerators then used the collected forms to compile the *listes nominatives* of which, as before, they kept one copy and forwarded the other to the prefect. In 1876, the household form was replaced by the individual form (*le bulletin individuel*) to be filled in for each person. The form asked for name, surname, sex and civil status, age, occupation, place of birth, nationality, and specific medical infirmities.[58] These forms were folded into a household cover form and turned over to the enumerators to use in preparing the nominative lists. Initially, household heads did not file census forms willy-nilly with no supervision; the 1876 instructions stipulated that to assure accuracy of information the enumerators were to fill in the forms in the presence of the household head, although householders were given primary responsibility for preparing the forms in 1881.[59] It is true, though, that after 1856 the household forms,

56 Despite friction that developed between the Ministry of the Interior and the Statistique Générale de France, part of the Ministry of Commerce, until the S.G.F. finally assumed greater control over the census. Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, pp. 33–36, 41–43; Desrosières, "S.G.F. as a Case Study", pp. 518–521.

57 For these and other improvements, see Biraben, "Inventaire des listes nominatives", pp. 324–327; and Haug, "Manuscript Census Materials", p. 260 n. 4, pp. 263–265; Pinchemel, "Les listes nominatives des recensements", pp. 422–423.

58 A copy of the *bulletin de ménage* is reproduced in Le Mée, "La statistique démographique officielle", p. 274. The *bulletin individuel* is reproduced in Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, illustration 2 on p. 29.

59 Desrosières, "S.G.F. as a Case Study", pp. 524–525; Haug, "Manuscript Census Materials", pp. 262–265; Biraben, "Inventaire des listes nominatives", pp. 309–310, 323, 326; Pinchemel, "Les listes nominatives des recensements", p. 419; Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, pp. 38–39, 44–45.

and subsequently the individual forms, were forwarded to higher authorities to be used to tabulate departmental population data. This meant that these documents, not the *listes nominatives*, formed the basis of the final census returns, even though municipal authorities continued dutifully to compile the *listes* every fifth year. Proposals to abandon preparation of the *listes* went unheeded, fortunately for historians, because no significant body of individual or household forms has survived. Departmental authorities or the S.G.F. discarded these records after use.[60] What we have for individual-level census data are the surviving *listes nominatives*, the documentary step-children of the French census enumerations. At the same time, the introduction of individual and household forms additional to the *listes nominatives* permitted much more rapid and sophisticated central data processing, long an objective of modern census management. Beginning in 1896, in the interests of efficiency and accuracy, officials in the S.G.F. were able to process individual census forms in the central offices in Paris rather than rely on prefects to tabulate departmental returns. This enormous undertaking permitted the S.G.F. and the French central government to impose standardized census accounting including uniform reporting of employment and occupations. It also kept France in the forefront of demographic accounting methods in Europe. The daunting task of processing population records was practicable thanks to mechanization of the census bureau. Lucien March, an engineer who later became head of the S.G.F, developed and installed in S.G.F. offices in Paris the efficient typesetting and data-correcting machine he called the *classicompteur-imprimeur*. Widely publicized in photographs at the time, the machine was a modified version of the Hollerith machines then being used by the American Census Bureau.[61]

Integral to centralization of data processing was a shift towards state-defined, standardized occupational classifications that privileged economic sectors rather than professions or occupational status. Beginning in 1856 the Ministry holding the portfolio for Commerce abandoned the occupational scheme used in 1851 and introduced one that defined occupational classifications in relation to economic sectors (agriculture and extractive industries, manufacturing, small businesses and shops, liberal professions) rather than social class (peasants, workers, tradesmen). The origins of this change need not concern us here, other than to note that change reflected the growing place of industry and commerce in France and the interests of public and

60 Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, pp. 38–39; Le Mée, "La statistique démographique officielle", pp. 273–275; Biraben, "Inventaire des listes nominatives", p. 310.

61 Engineer, civil servant, and subsequently head of the S.G.F., March introduced the modified Hollerith machine in 1896 and gave it its name; it speeded preparation and accuracy of the results. Desrosières, "S.G.F. as a Case Study", p. 525; Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, pp. 42–43, 46–48. A reproduction of a contemporary photograph on p. 60 of the latter volume shows a row of properly dressed, earnest young women in an office, each seated at a *classicompteur-imprimeur*, hard at work on the census.

private officials in national economic accounting and industrial development.[62] The period after 1850 in France brought industrial growth, urbanization, and the rise of free trade symbolized by the Cobden-Chevalier agreement of 1859. Following England's lead, the need for national population accounting was given new emphasis by state officials, medical authorities, academics, and industrialists. Among the most influential were Michel Chevalier, Louis Villermé, Emile Levasseur, and Adolphe and Jacques Bertillon, all of whom were active in the newly-founded Statistical Society of Paris. At the same time, social conservatives such as Frédéric Le Play and somewhat later Emile Durkheim emphasized a parallel concern to limit social disruption, maintain social integration, and avoid urban chaos. For Le Play in particular this meant the need to preserve social order and family, to stabilize agriculture and prevent rural exodus, and to restrain the disruptive and politically unstable urban working classes. These views gave both a policy imperative and a moralistic value to state analysis of "social functions" and sectors of production. By contrast, English censuses in these years moved in the other direction, emphasizing class-based policy analysis. Thanks to the influence of eugenics, government officials there sought to assess the effects of growth of the working classes on disease, birth rates, and labour unrest, leading them to develop techniques of statistical analysis based on five economic class categories abstracted from census occupational data rather than rely on sociological comparisons of social function or sectors of society.[63] The concrete result was that the S.G.F. produced over the next decades a roughly consistent grid of economic sectors that varied from five to eight categories depending on the census. In 1872 there were seven economic sectors or *grands divisions*: agriculture, industry, commerce, transport and credit, diverse professions, liberal professions, and persons living entirely from their revenues. Within each sector, "patrons", which included independent owners, were distinguished from "employees", "workers", and "day labourers". Each counted as separate subcategories but aggregation applied to sectors, not economic status. A significant modification beginning in 1876 was that professions were cross-classified in columns indicating employment status (heads, employees, workers, day

62 On this development, see Alain Desrosières, "Éléments pour l'histoire des nomenclatures socio-professionnelles" in François Bédarida *et al.*, *Pour une histoire de la statistique*, vol. 1: *Contributions* (Paris: Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques, 1977), pp. 155–231, especially pp. 164–169; and Desrosières, "S.G.F. as a Case Study", pp. 521–526, 528–530.

63 Desrosières, "S.G.F. as a Case Study", pp. 527–530. On England, see Simon R. S. Szreter, "The Genesis of the Registrar-General's Social Classification of Occupations", *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 35 (December 1984), pp. 522–547, especially pp. 530–534, showing how British officials devised a system grouping occupations into five class categories in order to analyze medical conditions, moral patterns, and fertility rates (all concerns with eugenic overtones) and later labour unrest, all based on a "graded hierarchy of occupations" (p. 538); and Edward Higgs, "The Struggle for the Occupational Census, 1841–1911", pp. 75–82.

labourers, family members, or servants). This provided clearer classifications, but the published returns continued to compute population totals by economic sector.[64]

The outcome of an official emphasis on economic sectors after 1850 was significant for enumerating rural social classes from local census returns. Henceforth, the rural labour force was classified by government officials as a largely undifferentiated population of "agriculturalists" rather than as workers, farm servants, smallholding farmers, or landowners. Further, a logical extension of sectoral analysis was to classify all individuals in the census by the profession and economic sector of the household head. In a circular of June 25, 1856, Legoyt, head of the S.G.F., expressly instructed enumerators to count within each profession not only the individuals so employed but also their families and other household members including servants. Though sound as a means of apportioning total population among economic sectors, this approach was disastrous when it came to attempting to determine real employment rates. Dupâquier and Le Mée conclude that this policy was an "error ... that made the data on professions almost unusable".[65] The policy was modified in 1876 when the introduction of individual census forms meant that enumerators could record employment status for each person. Thereafter the distinction was made between employed individuals and "members of the household living from the work of the head of the family".[66] Aggregation by economic sector continued to drive the use of the census returns, however, and not always with good result. As late as 1881 the enumerator in Cruzy reported occupations for household heads only and below that wrote "id" as the occupation for most other individuals, young or old, in each household.[67] The outcome of state policy that emphasized economic sectors and occupations of household heads rather

64 Desrosières, "Éléments pour l'histoire des nomenclatures socio-professionnelles", pp. 200–209; Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, pp. 39–40, 43–46.

65 In the words of the circular, agents were required "to classify within each profession not only the head of the family, but also all persons who live directly or indirectly from that profession, including his family, his workers, his various agents, and even his servants". Note the clear implication that proper households were headed by males with persons dependent on their labour. Dupâquier *et al.*, *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3, p. 39.

66 Classified into six subgroups: active family heads including the self-employed (*chefs d'exploitation*), followed by dependents who were employees, workers, day labourers, members of the household living from the labour of the head of the family head, and domestics. *Ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 44–45.

67 Accordingly, it was necessary to ignore the designation "id" in the column for occupations in many instances, as will be explained. The alternatives soon border on the absurd. Three-year-old shoemakers were just one of many bizarre examples that this method produced. One actual entry in the census of 1881 was for "Louise Bordes, age 3, daughter", whose father Maximilien was a shoemaker and whose own occupation was reported as "id". This did not signify that she was making shoes but that she was to be counted as part of the population living from the economic activity of shoemakers and, more generally, all tradesmen. By contrast, the individual listed next, "August Rouanet, age 28", whose occupation was also "id" but whose position in the household was "worker", can be counted as employed. Examples from *Liste nom. 1881*, hh. 7.

than individual occupations was inevitably an erosion of attention to occupations in local *listes*, rendering analysis of class structure much more difficult. On this matter evidence from Cruzy is conclusive.

Changes on the regional level hastened the ascendancy of national standards and policies in preparation of population enumerations in Cruzy. By the 1860s municipal record keeping, ever more complex and time-consuming, was becoming a full-time task suited for harried clerks, not leisured landowners. This was owing in part to a steady rise in the resident population and in part to the multiplication of government programmes under the Empire and Third Republic that required population registration of various kinds.[68] From the mid-1850s to mid-1870s, there was also a dramatic economic boom in the wine industry in the lower Languedoc. In Cruzy, as throughout the region, landowners were preoccupied with converting their estates to vineyards, a major undertaking requiring huge investments of time and personal wealth and careful management. In the face of these changes and given soaring profits from their estates, their long-standing sense of paternal responsibility for civic order and municipal government as well as for the labouring poor lost its hold. In 1868 Alexandre Andoque abruptly resigned as mayor in order, as officials said, "to attend to a major expansion of his landed estate [*domaine*]".[69] He was to be succeeded by a series of municipal officials and mayors of modest standing, winegrowers and tradesmen, who, until 1911, left the census to equally anonymous village clerks. Though the clerks were usually competent, their function was dutifully to follow changing sets of government instructions with quite uneven results.[70] Each census was a separate, autonomous report, prepared by inexperienced village clerks under instructions sent down from the ministries in Paris and supervised casually, if at all, by uninterested mayors.

That the introduction of (changing) national census standards profoundly affected local returns is evident from examining occupations and participation rates in the sample community. There is a continuous decline in consis-

68 Added responsibilities of municipal officers included: enrolment lists of students in boys' and girls' elementary schools, individual entries for cadastral landholdings and communal land allotments, poor relief rolls, medical assistance rolls, polling lists, entries in birth, marriage, and death registers, and quinquennial census lists along with household or individual bulletin forms. The rise in resident population, from 1,100 individuals and 250 households in 1836 to 1,688 individuals and 469 households by 1896, added to burdens of record keeping, as did legal changes. For example, polling lists recorded 85 individuals by name and age in 1834 under limited manhood suffrage, but 393 individuals by 1896 thanks to manhood suffrage.

69 Robert Laurent, "Les quatre âges du vignoble du Bas-Languedoc et du Roussillon", in *Économie et société en Languedoc-Roussillon de 1789 à nos jours* (Montpellier: Centre d'Histoire Contemporaine du Languedoc Méditerranéen et du Roussillon, 1978), pp. 11–44; ADH, 8M 191, report of October 25, 1868, to prefect (quotation).

70 Further evidence of this was the inferior quality of certain listings from Cruzy — those of 1886 and 1891 in particular — the work, seemingly, of uninspired clerks (sloppy handwriting, omitted names, frequent gaps in occupations).

tency in the Cruzy listings after 1851 with regard to occupational designations, which became vague and inconsistent with a proliferation of catch-all terms such as *cultivateur*, as well as to employment levels or, as these are also known, participation rates. Consider occupations first. Table 3 presents original occupations and frequencies for all agricultural occupations in selected censuses.[71] The table takes the social ranks in the *liste* of 1836 and extends these longitudinally, grouping agricultural occupations in successive lists according to categories in the first one, or at least attempting to do so. In practice, the effort is virtually impossible. The profusion of occupational designations in the later censuses appears to be a linguistic mess. After 1851, the rise in frequency of *cultivateur* and its variants, *cultivateur-propriétaire* or *cultivateur-agricole*, is plain to see, while the term for day labourer, *journalier,* declines and in several lists nearly disappears. Also notable is a somewhat erratic increase in the frequency of the term *propriétaire*. More puzzling still is the array of new terms not previously encountered, particularly in 1896, which will merit attention below. Then there is the curious reappearance in 1911 of agricultural workers, in this instance *ouvriers agricoles*, in place of the *journaliers* recorded in 1836 and in many fewer cases again in 1896. Beneath these fluctuating numbers the general impression is of the rise of smallholders and landowners, perhaps even of a "rural democracy", but the evidence is far from conclusive on the basis of these lists.[72] More likely, self-reporting of professions contributed to lack of precision, for *cultivateur* became a term used by small peasants and labourers alike to describe their status and its essential ambiguity.[73] The proliferation of occupational terms in 1896 in particular can be attributed to this process. As literacy, awareness of the national language, and occupational conventions spread, residents of this commune came to adapt, perhaps in the interest of seeking to impress higher authorities, a variety of contemporary terms to describe their social condition.[74] The

71 Artisans and non-agricultural workers are grouped at the bottom of the table to reduce visual clutter. Corrective steps to reassign some of these occupations are discussed below.

72 On this point, see Annie Moulin, *Peasantry and Society in France since 1789*, translated by M. C. and M. F. Cleary (Cambridge, England, and Paris: Cambridge University Press and Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1991), pp. 90–93, 109–115: "the reality of rural society was a long way from the 'rural democracy' whose seeming virtues were eulogized by agrarians of all colours" (p. 114). On the Languedoc, see Rémy Pech, *Entreprise viticole et capitalisme en Languedoc-Roussillon du phylloxera aux crises de mévente* (Toulouse: Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, 1975), pp. 35–81, 371–420.

73 Jean Dubois, *Le vocabulaire politique et social en France de 1869 à 1872 à travers les oeuvres des écrivains, les revues et les journaux* (Paris: Librairie Larousse, 1962), pp. 85–86. Dubois shows that in writing and in popular speech the word *cultivateur* had come to replace the more pejorative *paysan* while retaining that term's lack of social specificity: "il s'agit de désigner l'homme de la campagne, sans spécifier exactement sa situation sociale de fermier ou de journalier [...] le paysan est tour à tour possesseur et non-possédant."

74 The recurrence in the *liste* of 1896 of occupations such as *journalier*, *cultivateur-journalier*, *culti-*

Table 3 Agricultural and Total Occupations in Selected Listes Nominatives, 1836–1911

Census occupations and codes	Analytic category	Census list of: 1836	1851	1866	1881	1896	1911
143 *domestique agricole*	farm servant	14	12	14	33	13	67
147 *valet*	farm servant	—	—	—	10	—	—
122 *métayer*[a]	foreman[a]	2	—	—	—	—	—
144 *ramonet*	foreman	—	4	8	7	23	—
145 *régisseur*	steward	—	—	—	—	8	11
432 *agent rural*	steward	—	1	2	2	—	—
146 *jardinier*	gardener	4	5	1	1	2	1
151 *berger*	shepherd	12	11	6	4	3	4
152 *chevrier*	goatherd	—	—	—	—	2	—
458 *garde champêtre*	field guard	—	—	—	2	2	1
141 *journalier*	day labourer	188	2	—	53	70	—
123 *cultivateur-journalier*[a]	day labourer[a]	—	—	—	—	14	—
142 *ouvrier agricole*	day labourer	—	—	—	—	—	212
121 *agriculteur*[a]	smallholder[a]	—	—	—	—	40	—
131 *cultivateur*[a]	smallholder[a]	45	103	255	114	228	12
133 *cultivateur-agricole*[a]	smallholder[a]	—	—	—	—	39	—
123 *cultivateur-propriétaire*[a]	smallholder[a]	—	127	—	—	—	—
111 *propriétaire*	landowner	47	68	64	193	38	187
114 *propriétaire-agricole*[a]	landowner[a]	—	—	—	—	80	—
[other workers]		10	14	39	71	51	32
[shopkeepers, artisans]		89	77	97	142	167	145
Totals		411	424	487	632	780	672

a) Ambiguous to classify.
Sources: Listes nominatives, 1836–1911.

triumph of national occupational vocabulary was far from producing standardized, consistent categories, however. On the contrary, up through the 1890s in this commune census classifications imposed by the central state, combined with popular nineteenth-century linguistic conventions, created the impression of the ubiquity of independent peasants by undercounting or disguising rural labourers.

Tracing the occupations of families through successive listings illustrates just how instable occupational designations were even at the individual level. The entries in successive *listes* for day labourers Antoine Barral and Marie Bastide, mentioned above, are a case in point. In 1836 Antoine and three of their sons were all reported as day labourers (*journaliers*). In 1851 Antoine and two sons were reported as peasant-owners (*cultivateurs-*

vateur, cultivateur-agricole, agriculteur, and *propriétaire-agricole* fits Hubscher's notion of occupational pleonasm.

propriétaires) and the third was a labourer (*cultivateur*). By 1866, after Antoine's death, four employed sons were all *cultivateurs*. In 1881 one was reported as a labourer (*journalier*), two were smallholders (*cultivateurs*), and the fourth was a landowner (*propriétaire*), and in 1896 the three surviving sons were all *cultivateurs*! In fact land records strongly suggest that all of them were and remained simple day labourers. None owned more than two hectares of land, insufficient to support a family from winegrowing.[75] By contrast the farmer-owner Phalippou and his sons, also described above, were consistently recorded as *cultivateurs* in 1836, 1851, and 1866, emphasizing the ambiguity of that designation given that the same term was sometimes applied to the labourer Barrals. In 1881 the Phalippou sons were recorded as a *cultivateur* and two *propriétaires*. By 1896 they were a *propriétaire-agricole* and two *agriculteurs* — again ambiguous as to social rank. Land records indicate all three sons were indeed independent peasant owners, suggesting the variation in terms was simply owing to a changing cast of enumerators.[76] For the most part, landowners continued to be respectfully reported as *propriétaires*, which is not to say that modest peasant households did not also appropriate this term, as the Phalippous did in 1881 and 1896. There were dramatic exceptions, however. Alexandre Andoque, the wealthiest landowner in the district, was actually recorded as a *cultivateur* in 1881 while residing on his landed estate! Curiously, Andoque's male farm servants were also *cultivateurs* while the women farm servants were *journalières*.[77] It represented an extreme confusion of occupations to apply the same term to a wealthy landowner and to the poorest of his labourers. A similar confusion occurred in 1896, when all farm servants were *cultivateurs*.[78] Clearly, *cultivateur* could mean almost any type of peasant, including agricultural workers, just as Dallas has observed.[79]

75 *Liste nom. 1836*, hh. 260; *Liste nom. 1851*, hhs. 128, 178, 201, 210; *Liste nom. 1866*, hhs. 163, 73, 202, 297; *Liste nom. 1881*, hhs. 70, 241, 314, 316; *Liste nom. 1896*, hhs. 60, 180, 364; *Cadastre : matrices*, fols. 27, 824, 826, 827, 1164. Note that the *liste* of 1911 is specific concerning the social status of their direct descendants (three sons, one son-in-law): two were *propriétaires*, i.e. smallholders, and two were *ouvriers agricoles*. *Liste nom. 1911*, hhs. 112, 118, 147, 260.

76 *Liste nom. 1836*, hh. 190; *Liste nom. 1851*, hh. 66; *Liste nom. 1866*, hhs. 94, 64, 128; *Liste nom. 1881*, hhs. 62, 122, 168; *Liste nom. 1896*, hhs. 216, 231, 330; *Cadastre : matrices*, fols. 532, 980, 981, 982.

77 *Liste nom. 1881*, at "Sériège — campagne" (Sériège-domaine): hh. 455, Alexandre Andoque, age 66, *cultivateur*, with live-in cook (*cuisinière*) and estate steward (*agent rural*); hhs. 453–454 housed 14 male farm servants designated *cultivateurs* and 11 women farm servants designated *journalières*.

78 *Liste nom. 1896*, hh. 434, Alexandre Andoque, age 80, *propriétaire-agricole*, with live-in cook (*cuisinière*) and steward (*régisseur*); hhs. 437–445 housed 25 farm servants, all *cultivateurs*, of whom six were women.

79 Dallas, *Imperfect Peasant Economy*, p. 166. The linguistic substitution of a term ostensibly meaning "peasant" for day labourers was not unique to France. According to K. D. M. Snell, in England at this time "in most cases 'peasant' meant the wage-dependent [rural] poor." He adds in a note, "It was often also used to denote a small farmer." Thus, we encounter the same imprecision as in France. K. D. M. Snell, "Deferential Bitterness: The Social Outlook of the Rural Proletariat in

Besides the erratic shifts in terms, a second concrete problem in the *listes* concerns underenumeration of occupations. Participation rates were far from uniform across groups and lists and were skewed over time in interesting ways. To reveal the patterns, Table 4 shows the proportion of adults reported as employed in selected *listes* by status in the household. There was a pronounced decline in occupations reported from 1836 to 1881, particularly among certain sub-populations. The extent of underenumeration depended most, it seems, on whether co-resident dependent adults such as wives and older children in households with an employed head also had designated occupations. Male household heads nearly always were reported as having occupations, no doubt in part because they filled out the forms, as were most adult men. In contrast, wives usually did not have occupations, although female household heads (usually widows) more often did. The systematic underenumeration of women workers is everywhere evident in the table. It is certain that in this agricultural village there were not many adult women, married or unmarried, in peasant or labourer households who were not engaged in some form of labour or another. Otherwise it is among co-resident adult children that participation rates fell most precipitously after 1836, reaching bottom in 1881 before rising again by 1896 and 1911. This pattern echoes the findings of Marchand and Thélot for the national returns. It is worth noting that the sharpest decline was among adult sons, although there was also a sizeable decline in occupations even for married sons and sons-in-law. Since, as the literature on the peasant family emphasizes, marriage in peasant households required some basic economic earning power, married men and women would have to be employed, and so would their older unmarried children. Yet in 1866 a sizeable minority and in 1881 a majority of married sons and sons-in-law in agricultural households were not reported as employed, even when they were 30 or 40 years old. The same was true in artisan families: rarely were sons listed as employed.

The fact that participation rates for male dependents fell most noticeably between 1851 and 1881 suggests that the underreporting of occupations was 2tied to the formative evolution of census policy discussed above. A close reading of individual and household census entries suggests as much as well. In the *listes* of 1851 and especially of 1866 and 1881 those sons and sons-in-law listed as employed almost always had occupations different from that of the head of their household, usually the father or father-in-law, even though occupational succession was the rule in this region. In fact, in the census of 1881 nearly without exception co-resident sons had reported occupations only when theirs were different from the heads, a pattern we might call an enumerator's law of occupational dissimilarity. This pattern

Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century England and Wales" in M. L. Bush, ed., *Social Orders and Social Class in Europe since 1500: Studies in Social Stratification* (London and New York: Longman, 1992), pp. 158–159 and n. 2.

Table 4 Adult Participation Rates by Household Position in Sample Listings (ages 20 and over only)

	Proportion of adults reported with an occupation in each group by year (%)					
	1836	1851	1866	1881	1896	1911
Adults 20 yrs. and over						
Men	94.5	93.1	87.8	84.6	96.6	95.4
Women	9.8	11.3	4.7	12.7	23.5	13.0
Both	53.5	52.8	48.7	49.8	59.9	54.7
Household heads						
Men	98.0	99.6	100.0	98.1	98.5	98.8
Women	29.4	48.3	17.0	50.0	27.8	62.7
Both	89.8	94.8	89.7	93.3	90.3	94.9
Adult children						
Sons	85.9	64.6	41.4	23.7	93.7	90.7
Daughters	34.2	5.0	0.0	6.9	20.3	10.3
Both	69.0	41.9	27.5	15.4	62.3	55.6
Ever-married children[a]						
Sons/-in-law	100.0	94.7	67.6	30.4	100.0	100.0
Daughters/-in-law	7.1	0.0	16.4	0.0	10.0	21.6
Both	51.9	48.6	37.1	14.7	55.0	57.4

a) Ever-married sons, sons-in-law, daughters, and daughters-in-law.
Sources: Listes nominatives, 1836–1911.

likely resulted from the instructions to enumerators that, unless co-resident adults had demonstrably different occupations, enumerators were to assign the household head's occupation to the other adults, in other words, to use the head to determine the appropriate economic function of the household. The consequence was that only when a co-resident adult's occupation differed from that of the head was he or she accorded a separate mention. The flip-side of such a hypothetical law would indicate that an adult son without an occupation next to his name was understood to have the same occupation as the father or other household head. This supposition may appear tenuous, yet the evidence in household after household is emphatic. Compare participation rates in Table 4 for sons in the *listes* of 1836 and 1896 with those rates in the intervening censuses: unless one takes corrective measures, analysis of these listings will suffer from "hidden" occupational underenumeration of men, quite apart from the systematic and visible underreporting of women's employment. To correct for underreporting due to implied pursuit of household head's occupation, it was necessary to adopt the following rule: unless the document gave explicit indication to the contrary (such as "no occupation") or evidence of infirmity (such as

"idiot"), then co-residing male kin 20 years and over without a reported occupation were assigned the same occupation as the household head. To avoid corrupting the original census data file, these implied occupations were classified in a separate subset of occupation codes.[80] These individuals could subsequently be assimilated with those with reported occupations for analysis, and included either with the trades or with agriculture, as appropriate. The effect was to reduce quite dramatically the rates of occupational underenumeration among men.[81]

With this corrective step accomplished, the twin problems of unstable occupational terminology and underreported employment of co-resident adults could be addressed by means of a common solution that tested and corrected both matters simultaneously. The following steps, explained in more detail in Appendix A, made possible sound comparisons between the *listes*.

To provide comparability, the entire contents of each census list were entered into a computer file in their exact original form so that inconsistencies and variations in occupational coverage could be identified. In this process, the occupation of the household head was also coded with the entry for each member of that household in the data base, whether or not individuals had reported occupations, so that the head's occupation was replicated in a separate household occupation code. In this way one could identify the household occupation codes for individuals in any household in the commune and at the same time select age and gender groups to see how many of each group had individual occupations in the listing and how many had only household codes. The same was done for certain other variables such as household structure. Individuals in the census data base were then linked to information about themselves or their families in other economic and political records including land cadastres, polling lists, poor relief rolls, marriage acts, municipal registers, elections, and political reports.

The next step was to work with data in the linked files to devise a set of systematically comparable longitudinal occupational class variables that would permit sound comparisons from census to census. This was not a direct coding scheme based on an assumed logical consistency in the reported census occupations, an effort that would have been impossible to perform with any certainty, as we have seen. Instead, the evidence on occupation was compared with evidence from the linked records in order to produce a revised social classification scheme incorporating more than occupational

80 In the numeric codes for original census occupations in the Languedoc study, the implied occupations were grouped in the 700s. In this way these cases could either be included or excluded from subsequent analysis. Tests confirmed that attributed occupations should be included in the analytical variables.

81 Adult men with attributed occupations added to the proportion of employed male kin by census year as follows: 1836 = 0%; 1851, 22/87 cases = +25.3%; 1866, 56/120 = +46.7%; 1881, 73/86 = +84.9%; 1896, 2/115 = +1.7%. Note the sharp improvement in 1896, consistent with the literature.

data. The primary solution of the Languedoc study for occupational enumeration, therefore, was to devise an independent set of "analytical" variables to stand above changes in terminology and thereby serve as a continuous and consistent standard into which the occupational codes in the separate censuses could be converted, not by any fixed formula, but depending on the particular and varied occupational profiles employed in each census list.[82] The dummy or implied occupational variables mentioned above were then added to these files to correct for underreporting, and these too were translated into the longitudinal analytic variables. In this way both the inconsistencies in classifications and underenumerations of occupations could be solved in tandem and longer-term trends in occupational, household, and property patterns more clearly observed. The computer proved to be indispensable for making these adjustments and for testing alternative measures to correct for the longitudinal inconsistencies in occupational terms. The results are far from perfect, but they represent a considerable improvement over the uncorrected lists. The basic operating steps were as follows.

First, a basic 16-point classification scheme of analytic class groups was devised to serve as the longitudinal analytical variable, one that could be telescoped into fewer units (eleven, five, or three groups) for different types of analysis.[83] The scheme ranged from workers and servants up to the big landowners in rank order. The scheme included a separate category for ambiguous cases for those marginal smallholders who could be grouped either with labourers or with independent smallholders, depending on the outcome of subsequent tests. This proved especially useful for the census lists of 1866, 1881, and to a lesser degree, 1896.

Second, in assigning individuals to agricultural classes, servants and dependent workers were nearly always identifiable by occupation coupled with the designation *domestique* for their position in the household.[84] Day labourers were defined as those individuals and their families who relied entirely or primarily on wage labour in agriculture as their source of livelihood. Many of these householders did in addition own dwarf holdings insufficient to support their families. Independent smallholders were those individuals and their families who had sufficient land, worked entirely by

82 On using analytically consistent categories of analysis, see David Herlihy, "Quantification in the 1980s: Numerical and Formal Analysis in European History", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 12 (1981), pp. 115–135. Herlihy distinguished between "empirical categories" (i.e. data directly as found in the documents) and "formal interpretation" using "analytical categories".

83 For the classifications of occupations, I drew on Agulhon, *La vie sociale en Provence intérieure*, pp. 65–73, 103–202; and Sewell, *Structure and Mobility*, pp. 327–345.

84 Even in the *listes* of 1881 and 1896 where farm servants had misleading occupations such as *cultivateur* they could still be identified by their designation as *domestique* under the column for position in the household. See, for example, *Liste nom. 1881*, hhs. 453–454; *Liste nom. 1896*, hh. 442.

family labour, to support the family. Landowners were those individuals and their families who employed labourers to work their holdings. The analytical scheme also distinguished between moderate and big landowners, a specification that was useful in a number of instances. Drawing on the literature and on the cadastres, we can determine that individuals or families who owned up to 20 hectares of land were medium landowners and over 20 hectares were big landowners. Though far from big holdings by European standards, these were substantial properties indeed for a wine district, particularly one where the cumulation of multiple properties in extended landowner lineages was common.[85]

Third, a similar method was employed to test and assign analytical class designations for remaining ambiguous families of peasants or labourers such as *cultivateurs*, *cultivateurs-agricoles*, or *agriculteurs*. In a first pass, the *listes* of 1836 and 1911 at either end of the period in this study, which presented reliable occupational groupings, served as base documents from which individuals and families could be traced either forward or back in other *listes* and, all things being equal, their analytical class assignment estimated with some degree of confidence. As a second verification, a sliding scale of property sizes was devised, drawing on cadastres and the literature, to approximate the land thresholds that separated families of day labourers from independent smallholders.[86] These assignments were then incorporated into the longitudinal analytical classifications. Here again, the original occupations in the *listes* were not altered.

Fourth, for artisans, a trade reported in the census served as a sufficient identifier for the analytic classification, with one exception. Some of the later censuses assigned trades to individuals who appeared to be workers — always an ambiguous situation in any case. The rule adopted was that unmarried men who were non-kin, were under 25 years of age, and were reported with the same trade as the household head (such as potter or blacksmith), whether listed as "servants" or not, were counted as workers in the analytic scheme, while the occupation code continued to report their given trade. This proved to be consistent when comparisons were made between censuses over time.

85 Pech, *Entreprise viticole et capitalisme*, pp. 45–57, 282–319; Raymond Dugrand, *Villes et campagnes en Bas-Languedoc* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963), p. 85; Robert Laurent, "La propriété foncière dans le Biterrois à la veille de la Première Guerre Mondiale", in *Béziers et le Biterrois*, Fédération historique du Languedoc-Méditerranéen et du Roussillon, 43rd Congress, Béziers, 1970 (Montpellier, 1971), pp. 415–426.

86 After a series of tests, the property threshold was set at 4.2 hectares of land for 1836 comparisons (1 hectare = 2.47 acres). For later censuses, tests indicated that the property threshold size should be lowered in measured stages to reflect the pace with which winegrowing made smallholdings and smaller individual land units more productive. In this way, the threshold dropped by stages to 2.7 hectares by 1896. Reducing threshold property size was necessary to avoid deflating the number of independent smallholders in regions of land morcellization. For explanation see Appendix A.

By taking these steps to compose the analytical variables, a parallel scheme for social analysis was constructed to supplement occupational information, one that would permit consistent longitudinal comparisons. The original occupational data were also preserved in the data base and, since these had not been the sole determinant in assigning the analytic variables, a comparison allows us to decode the patterns of social status and social agency implied in the original designations. Introducing a parallel, longitudinal measure of social class generated by a consistent process of assessment, therefore, allows us to read more clearly the significance of shifts in occupational designations as these were originally employed in times past in this rural Languedoc commune.

Table 5 presents cross-comparisons of the more important agricultural occupations in the *listes* with the analytic class groups. The table shows how individuals in each occupational class were assigned to analytic groups as a result of the identification process just described. Individuals reported as day labourers (*journaliers*) in the *listes* turned out consistently to be labourers in the analytical class groups, too, although there is some confusion in 1881 and 1896 with a minority of *journaliers* who turned out in fact to be farm servants. The analytical class status for *cultivateurs*, on the other hand, was much less predictable. In all of the *listes* examined here, except for 1836 and 1911, the majority were day labourers and farm servants. Independent smallholders actually made up only a minority until 1911. The rough equation of *cultivateur* to agricultural labourer, therefore, was often enough though not always correct. In contrast, *cultivateur-propriétaire*, *cultivateur-agricole*, and *agriculteur* were more often smallholders, though only by scant majorities. The breakdown of *propriétaire* also revealed an important trend. Over time, that term descended from a rank of privilege to represent all independent property-owners, peasants, and landowners alike — and in some years (most notably 1881), some day labourers as well. To put it differently, from 1881 on, there was a distinct increase in the proportion of individuals described as *propriétaires* in the *listes* who were actually independent smallholders and not gentry. The sense of rural democracy was evident in the progressively more-encompassing meaning of *propriétaire* if not in the actual realities of wealth and social status. In the end, original census occupations do not fare particularly well when matched up against analytical class groups and have to undergo significant realignment before longitudinal comparisons can begin.

The same is also evident if we reverse this process and break out the established analytical class groups by the individuals' original census occupations (Table 6). In this instance we can include in the table all the agricultural class groups, including farm servants and other workers omitted from Table 5 for reasons of space. In this array of the data, it turns out that individuals with the same census occupation are distributed among widely different analytical class groups. Certain patterns are evident. The table confirms that different readings of social rank were implicit in changing

Table 5 Breaking out Analytic Classes from Census Occupations (Agricultural Occupations), 1836–1911

Census occupation[a]	Analytic classes in 1836		1851		1866		1881		1896		1911	
Journaliers[b]	day labourers	100%	servants	50%	n/a[c]		servants	26%	servants	13%	servants	3%
			day labourers	50%			day labourers	74%	day labourers	87%	day labourers	96%
											smallholders	1%
Cultivateurs[d]	smallholders	100%	servants	1%	servants	1%	servants	13%	servants	19%	day labourers	25%
			day labourers	82%	day labourers	62%	day labourers	69%	day labourers	65%	smallholders	67%
			smallholders	17%	smallholders	36%	smallholders	18%	smallholders	16%	landowners	8%
					landowners	1%						
Cultivateurs-propriétaires[e]	n/a		day labourers	54%	n/a		n/a		day labourers	34%	n/a	
			smallholders	42%					smallholders	58%		
			landowners	4%					landowners	8%		
Agriculteurs[f]	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		day labourers	43%	n/a	
									smallholders	55%		
									landowners	2%		
Propriétaires[g]	smallholders	7%	smallholders	35%	day labourers	2%	day labourers	26%	day labourers	2%	servants	1%
	landowners	93%	landowners	65%	smallholders	25%	smallholders	50%	smallholders	61%	day labourers	3%
					landowners	73%	landowners	24%	landowners	37%	smallholders	76%
											landowners	20%

a) Terminology varies; approximate equivalencies are indicated in footnotes.
b) Day labourers, including *cultivateurs-journaliers* in 1896 and *ouvriers agricoles* in 1911.
c) Not applicable (no occurrences).
d) Smallholders.
e) Smallholders, 1851 only (*cultivateurs-agricoles* in 1896).
f) Smallholders, 1896 only.
g) Landowners, including *propriétaires-agricoles* in 1896.
Sources: Listes nominatives, 1836–1911.

Table 6 Breaking out Agricultural Census Occupations from Analytic Classes, 1836–1911

Analytic classification[a]	Census occupations (individuals) in											
	1836		1851		1866		1881		1896		1911	
Domestiques agricoles[b]	dom. agricole	14	cultivateur	1	cultivateur	4	cultivateur	15	cultivateur	43	dom. agricole	66
			dom. agricole	12	dom. agricole	14	dom. agricole	33	dom. agricole	13	ouvrier agricole	7
			journalier	1			journalier	14	journalier	11	propriétaire	1
Autres ouvriers de fermes[c]	berger	12	berger	11	berger	5	berger	4	berger	3	berger	4
	jardinier	4	jardinier	5	jardinier	1	jardinier	1	jardinier	2	jardinier	1
	métayer	2	ramonet	4	ramonet	8	ramonet	7	ramonet	23	régisseur	10
							valet	10	régisseur	8		
Journaliers/ ouvriers agricoles[d]	journalier	188	cultivateur	78	cultivateur	158	cultivateur	79	agriculteur	17	cultivateur	3
			cult. propriétaire	69	propriétaire	1	journalier	39	cult. journalier	14	dom. agricole	1
			journalier	1			propriétaire	48	cultivateur	147	ouvrier agricole	203
									cult. agricole	13	propriétaire	5
									journalier	59		
									prop. agricole	2		
									propriétaire	1		
Cultivateurs/ petits propriétaires[e]	cultivateur	45	cultivateur	16	berger	1	cultivateur	20	cultivateur	36	cultivateur	8
	propriétaire	3	cult. propriétaire	53	cultivateur	91	propriétaire	93	cult. agricole	22	ouvrier agricole	2
			propriétaire	22	propriétaire	15			agriculteur	22	propriétaire	140
									prop. agricole	49	régisseur	1
									propriétaire	22		
Propriétaires[f]	propriétaire	42	propriétaire	41	propriétaire	44	propriétaire	46	agriculteur	1	cultivateur	1
			cult. propriétaire	5	cultivateur	2			cult. agricole	3	propriétaire	37
									prop. agricole	29		
									propriétaire	14		

a) Original French occupations used to demonstrate variation in actual census terminology. Classifications in descending order as follows.
b) Farm servants; c) Other farm workers; d) Day labourers; e) Independent smallholders; f) Landowners.
Sources: Listes nominatives, 1836–1911.

occupational designations in population records. In 1851, as suspected, *cultivateur* was nearly synonymous with agricultural worker, though not always; *cultivateur-propriétaire* meant propertied peasant-owner, though in a majority of cases these individuals had such minimal holdings that they were in effect day labourers; and *propriétaire* could refer either to the big landowner or to the prosperous peasant but never to day labourer. In 1866, somewhat the same reasoning applied, only now *cultivateur* referred to poor peasant or day labourer, while *propriétaire* still meant landowner or rich peasant. By 1881 *cultivateur* remained nearly synonymous with labourer, and all the more so in 1896, but *propriétaire* extended across all ranks, from big landowner to independent smallholder and to (propertied) day labourer. Here we have two simultaneously different standards, one conforming to a social definition of rural labour, and one referring to propertied agricultural producers of any rank, the latter forming almost a juridical definition of a corporate body of agriculturalists, even though some were day labourers. This is not an inappropriate social definition for a Third Republic based on the support of peasants, but it is of limited use for a refined historical analysis. The array of redundant occupational terms in 1896, noted before, is evident. This table confirms that since all individuals in question could logically be assigned to one or another of the analytic classes, the proliferation of occupations presented no insurmountable obstacles, which is one reason why the analytic variables introduced here work. Only in 1911 is there a return to a cleaner set of occupations, including a clearly identified body of agricultural workers, but even that list confirmed the use of *propriétaire* to mean all landed peasants. The precision of occupational terminology as well as the impressive detail of that listing was no accident. Municipal records report that in 1911 the council hired professional enumerators from outside to conduct the census, making it the first professional state census conducted in the commune.[87]

For purposes of verification of the results, Table 7 presents a simple analysis of size of landholdings by analytic class groups at selected dates over the period. Though not included here, the same comparison was performed using original census occupations. That comparison revealed erratic patterns of uncertain significance, scarcely surprising considering the jumbled occupational terminology in the *listes*. By comparison, Table 7, using the analytic classes defined in part to assure more internally consistent groupings, reveals the trend lines clearly. From the 1830s to 1890s property sizes for all classes in Cruzy diminished consistently, thanks to immigration,

87 AMC, *Déliberations*, 1911 entry authorizing 500 francs for "the census of 1911, including funds for census enumerators [*les agents recenseurs*], supervisors, and employees to assist with the operations". The list of 1911 was composed in a carefully scripted, professional hand, with accurate and detailed data on name, age, civil status, occupation, place of birth, employer or employee status, and name of employer.

Table 7 Average Size of Property by Analytic Classes, 1836–1911 (hectares)

	1836		1866		1896		1911	
Analytic classes	has.[a]	(n)	has.	(n)	has.	(n)	has.	(n)
Non-agricultural workers	0.79	(1)	0.46	(1)	0.52	(7)	1.29	(6)
Farm servants	1.18	(2)	1.31	(4)	1.15	(13)	0.79	(21)
Day labourers	1.77	(122)	1.17	(137)	0.93	(100)	1.16	(116)
Smallholders	5.35	(37)	4.54	(90)	3.64	(110)	4.14	(107)
All trades	4.21	(51)	1.64	(55)	1.81	(54)	1.96	(52)
Landowners	30.51	(37)	26.80	(41)	25.59	(42)	28.67	(34)
Totals	7.05	(250)	5.38	(328)	5.17	(326)	4.99	(336)
R=	0.492		0.406		0.378		0.404	

a) 1 hectare = 2.47 acres.

Sources: *Listes nominatives* and *Cadastre : matrices*, in merged files for 1836, 1866, 1896, and 1911.

rising population of individuals and households, land fragmentation, and winegrowing. By 1911, after the wine crisis was over, property sizes began to increase somewhat for most groups, thanks in part to the rural exodus. Most notable, however, is that striking differences in size of property between class groups remained as pronounced as ever. Such an analysis would not be possible using the unprepared, raw data from the *listes nominatives*. Two lessons may be suggested: one is the need to devise systematic, sound strategies for correcting or at least adjusting occupations in the nineteenth-century *listes nominatives*; the other is the indispensability of linking census lists with land cadastres and other community-level records to form integrated data files, both to test the reclassification of occupations and to carry out meaningful analysis of the population.

The shift from a clear language of social rank to a more confused one of occupations is evident in the population lists of this Languedoc commune. The period from 1836 to 1911 witnessed the transition from censuses prepared under supervision of powerful landowner patriarchs, to those recorded by republican mayors and their clerks, to those taken by professional enumerators hired especially for the task. Each set of documents had a different accounting of individuals and families. For each, external conditions of state authority, economy, and national political culture directly affected the collection of data and the resulting texts. Even in this remote commune, what happened in Paris and Europe generally influenced population enumeration. It follows that using the computer to reclassify social groups and occupational categories over time was instrumental for tracing patterns of rural social and economic change from local records. In a larger project, the result is to trace the trajectory of peasants and labourers from poverty and dependency in the 1830s and 1840s to growing economic

independence and political autonomy by the 1890s and 1900s, despite the harsh effects of depressions and periodic wine slumps. This trajectory was difficult to perceive, much less to explore systematically, from raw occupational counts in the census listings. What this suggests is that historians can be much more systematic in their adjustments and close textual readings of census documents if they wish to undertake social analyses of broad-ranging historical change in the countryside. By presenting accurate counts of subgroups in the community, the adjusted analytical rankings have been used to distinguish how smallholding winegrowers took eager advantage of opportunities of the wine boom, how labourers declined in importance in the face of a certain ''peasantization'' of small producers, and how landowners held on but over time lost their social and economic domination. This picture of a peasantry fully engaged in labour-intensive, market production of a specialized commercial product, not at all a traditional peasantry clinging to the old ways, emerges from careful scrutiny of local population and land records. In the end, tracing accurately the underlying structural shifts in community records can tell us much about the drama of individual, ordinary lives. Illuminated by an understanding of broader social, economic, and demographic trends, histories of families such as the Terrals, Phalippous, and Barrals take on new meaning and instruct in new ways.

APPENDIX A

1) The *listes* of 1836 and 1911 presented the most consistent occupational reporting of individuals and families. These two lists were used as analytic anchors for the longitudinal occupational classifications of residents. Intervening census class assignments of agricultural families were calibrated in part by referring to family and individual occupations in those two lists, particularly for the early and late decades of the study. Specifically, individuals in the 1836 list were linked to the cadastral records and their property holdings noted and added to the computer file (size of landholding, assessed value, buildings if any and value). Then they, or their direct descendants, were traced to the census of 1866, and their property holdings noted a generation later. If their holdings and other aspects of social status were approximately the same, they were given the same social rank in the analytical class variable as the earlier generation. If land or other measures of social rank had changed, then they were assigned the lower or higher rank. Then with the coding for individuals and households done for 1836 and 1866, the analytical variables could be generated for individuals in the census of 1851, conveniently bracketed by the other two. This made assigning individuals to the social class variable in 1851 relatively straightforward, even with regard to those who were labourers or independent smallholders.

   The same steps were followed to establish the analytical class and household variables for all individuals in the *listes* of 1866 and 1896,

which were then back-projected to generate the analytical variable classifications for individuals in the census of 1881. Again, both the 1866 and 1896 classifications were made with reference to cadastral data to sort out land occupancy. As in 1836, both private holdings and communal landholdings in rental allotments were taken into consideration. The final classifications for 1911 were then performed, this time with reference to occupational designations in that census and in 1896, and linked, in this instance, to the updated cadastre (*cadastre renouvelé*) completed in 1914. By this process of generational jumps and then back-filling, the six data files acquired consistency and comparability for internal as well as longitudinal comparisons over time.

2) Of course, not all families or descendants remained in place. Some died out, or left, or married into other families, while on the other hand new individuals immigrated to the commune and were newcomers in the next census. Property scaling was the primary means to resolve ambiguous family status. Computer analysis of the 1836 linked data file revealed that day labourers owned, on average, 1.8 hectares of land while independent smallholders owned on average 5.4 hectares (Table 7). This meant that on a per capita basis independent smallholders each had a share of land equivalent to about 4.2 hectares each. In fact, around 4 and 4.2 hectares was the typical property-threshold separating agricultural day labourer and independent smallholder families (the mean difference between the two groups was 3.6 hectares).[88] The same procedure was applied to the 1866 data to resolve ambiguous cases, with this important difference. In the intervening years winegrowing had progressed rapidly and the wine market was booming. Cadastral data as well as the secondary literature indicated that the labourer/independent owner property threshold had fallen to approximately 3.5 hectares by 1866. The same process of recalculation and scaling down the independent holding threshold occurred a generation later, so that for the 1896 and 1911 data, the estimated property threshold had become approximately 2.7 hectares. Accordingly, in cases of undetermined or ambiguous class ranking, individuals or families with less than 3.5 hectares of land in the case of the 1866 population file, or with less than 2.7 hectares in the cases of 1896 and 1911 files, were assigned the status of day labourer.

88 In the 1836 file of census and cadastral data, only two of the 122 day labourers with property owned more than 4.2 hectares of land (1.6%), whereas 39 of 52 independent smallholders with property owned more than 4.2 hectares of land (75%). Peasants and artisans normally showed a pattern of acquiring and then divesting themselves of property over the course of the life-cycle such that at any given time in a general "snapshot" cross-sectional study many of these individuals would appear as owning holdings smaller than 4.2 hectares, especially when young or old. This normal variation has been taken into account when assigning individuals to analytic class ranks by referring to family histories. By way of warning, a strictly mathematical assignment of class rank by property size alone would be highly misleading if applied to the aggregate population.

3) After the cadastres, the next records in order of authority to resolve ambiguous class rank assignments were the polling lists, followed by the marriage acts.[89] The great majority of adult men, though not all, could be traced to either or both of these records. Polling lists were valuable for distinguishing between landowners and smallholders. Because each list included nearly all adult males in the population organized alphabetically by family surname (and because newcomers to the commune were listed at the end of each alphabetical letter group), polling lists preserved a fairly clear distinction between *propriétaires* and *cultivateurs* and their families. These indications were then included in the household analytical class variables. Distinctions between smallholders and labourers, however, were much less evident in polling lists. For purposes of final assessments, marriage acts were indispensable for verifying social rank and affiliation in two respects. The acts were the authoritative record of family links between parents and adult children, the bride and groom, providing confirmation of kinship and inheritance links to supplement cadastral information. In addition, the acts included information on witnesses to each ceremony, including their names, occupations, and specific kinship/friendship status (such as brother, cousin, brother-in-law, friend, neighbour). Information on these clusters of intimates proved to be highly useful in establishing evidence on social peers and allies for individuals and families in the community.

89 Polling lists are in ADH, 17 M series, filed with the municipal election returns. Marriage records are in AMC, *État civil : actes de mariage*, 1810–1911.