

L'étude est tout aussi objective et équilibrée qu'on est en droit de s'attendre. Même si l'auteur ne déterre pas de scandales inédits dans la vie des évêques (il ne pouvait tout de même pas en inventer), il émaille son ouvrage de quelques leçons générales qui peuvent rendre service à ceux qui souffrent toujours de tentations d'angélisme. Ainsi, il nous rappelle que « les critères de choix des évêques et la qualité des candidats nommés ont été fort arbitraires » (75), et que « l'influence des évêques dans la vie chrétienne des gens était finalement très mince » (100). Par contre, sans jamais tomber dans l'hagiographie, Lemieux ne se gêne pas pour signaler les qualités et les vertus réelles tant des clercs que des fidèles. Bref, une étude qui fait preuve de jugements pondérés, fondés sur une recherche de première qualité.

Même si le soussigné aurait préféré une reliure plus durable, la qualité de l'édition est excellente et les coquilles sont très rares. À ce dernier chapitre, signalons qu'à l'occasion de la prochaine édition, on pourrait corriger une coquille dans la note 11, page 403, laquelle a pour effet de reporter le serment du Test de 1673 à 1763.

Notons enfin que les directeurs de la collection (Lucien Lemieux, Philippe Sylvain et Nive Voisine) n'ont pas voulu une œuvre « théorisante ou absconse, limitée à un cercle d'initiés » (7). Le livre de Lucien Lemieux est rédigé dans un style simple et clair, sans enjolivures littéraires, mais orné de quelques illustrations bien choisies. Il comble un grand vide dans l'historiographie et n'a pas de concurrent comme synthèse de l'histoire du catholicisme québécois des années 1760-1840. C'est un excellent ouvrage.

Robert Choquette
Université d'Ottawa

Katherine A. Lynch — *Family, Class, and Ideology in Early Industrial France. Social Policy and the Working-Class Family, 1825-1848*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988. Pp. 272.

Mary Lynn Stewart — *Women, Work, and the French State. Labour Protection and Social Patriarchy, 1879-1919*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989. Pp. 277.

These two monographs, dealing with closely related topics, complement each other very nicely. Both describe how the French nineteenth-century middle class tried to reshape working-class family life in the image of their own. The French bourgeoisie was not an homogeneous group though; its ideological and occupational heterogeneity accounted for disagreements concerning the means to reach this end and for a degree of inconsistency in the policies which were enacted. Working-class attitudes also thwarted the bourgeois attempt at reshaping them. Policies were implemented without consulting the workers, or taking their perception of their needs into account. Consequently, they resisted the changes imposed upon them.

Katherine Lynch's *Family, Class and Ideology* is a rich book, full of nuances. Lynch argues that some segments of early nineteenth-century French bourgeoisie were deeply preoccupied by the combined consequences of political changes and industrialization on the fabric of French society. A new and large class of wage-earning poor,

whose values and behaviour seemed to contradict the ones of the middle class, was emerging as a consequence of industrialization. But the paternalist, divine right monarchy, which had been able to cement together the various groups composing French society into an organic community, was gone. France stood in danger of becoming a nation of individuals devoid of any sense of responsibility or solidarity towards each other; the whole social order seemed on the brink of desintegration.

Two ideological trends influenced the members of the middle class who took concrete steps to try to bridge the yawning gap between the bourgeoisie and the factory workers. The Social Catholics feared France was becoming another England, individualistic, competitive, antifamilial. Wage earners had no property to transmit to their children and, as a result, the bonds between the generations loosened and the spectre of social anomy was rising. Social Catholics blamed both workers, especially their underdeveloped moral values, and grasping, greedy industrialists for existing social problems. They wanted to unite workers and bourgeois into a community of shared mores and values, and preferred working towards that goal through voluntary associations. Moral economists shared this overall goal, with a subtle but important difference; they solely blamed the workers, their alleged lack of moral values and their deviation from bourgeois family structure for the ills of society. They were also more inclined to advocate limited state intervention to reach their goals.

Both groups focused their attention on the problematic working-class family, where symptoms of social desintegration seemed more obvious. They were particularly concerned with common-law unions, child abandonment and child industrial labour. The first two were symptoms of weak bonds between husbands and wives, and between parents and children. Industrial work rent the child from family supervision at a tender age. It was also the consequence of parental shortsightedness, if not greed. Voluntary associations set up by Social Catholics encouraged common-law couples to marry and legitimize their children. Modifications in the administration of the foundlings' hospitals made it impossible for mothers to use them as a form of child care centre, and difficult for infants from two-parent families to be abandoned. Protective legislation banned young children from the factory, reduced the workday of the others, while providing for the schooling of the children who now had some "free time". Children in family-type workshops were not affected by the legislation.

Workers shared the values of the middle class to a point: marriage was an ideal and depositing infants at the foundlings' hospital, a last resource solution. Nonetheless, they resisted and resented middle-class attempts at reshaping their mores because those attempts did not take sufficient account of the reasons behind their behaviour. Child labour legislation was particularly resisted; the children's income was necessary to the survival of the family. In addition, the child labour law resulted in the massive dismissal of children from factories by employers who did not want to bother with accommodating their shorter shifts. Workers conformed to middle-class models of behaviour only to the extent it did not threaten their already precarious standard of living.

The middle-class desire to shore up working-class families and the perverse effects of labour protective legislation are the major themes of Mary Lynn Stewart's *Women, Work, and the French State*. She investigates how legislation presented as protective of working women was, in fact, designed to defend the patriarchal family and social order, and functioned to preserve women's secondary status in the labour market without materially improving their working conditions.

Sex-specific protective legislation stemmed from concerns about depopulation and social disorders. The health of the female workers had to be protected to ensure they would bear healthy babies. The hours a woman spent working outside the home had to be limited to ensure she could adequately care for and supervise her children, ensure their survival and prevent their slipping into delinquency. Working women also needed time for household chores and, hopefully, to make their husbands feel like staying home instead of hanging around the local cafés.

Legislation to protect women was usually inimical to their interests. It confined them more rigidly to low-paid, dead-end jobs: it excluded them from the better-paid night work and from work in occupations classified dangerous; it reduced their workday without financial compensation; it did not cover family shops, nor retail trade, nor agriculture, and industries traditionally employing a large labour force of inadequately paid women could easily secure exemptions. Protective legislation encouraged factory owners to physically segregate women and confine them to auxiliary tasks. Manufacturers also reduced the size of their labour force and subcontracted the work out to unregulated workshops.

Sex-specific legislation ultimately “protected” women from access to better-paid occupations and trapped them in occupational ghettos, dead-end jobs and inflexible schedules. Consequently, female workers, who had never been consulted, refused to co-operate with the implementation of those reforms and were even accomplices to their employers’ attempts at thwarting the legislation.

Although both books deal with the French experience, they will be of value to readers interested in similar problems in other countries, including Canada. They can help us place issues such as social control, protective labour legislation and women’s place in the labour market in a broader western perspective.

Béatrice Craig
University of Ottawa

Jean-Yves Mollier — *L’argent et les lettres. Histoire du capitalisme d’édition, 1880-1920*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1988. Pp. 549.

Today, when two publishing giants, Hachette and Presses de la Cité, generate half the French industry’s \$1.8 annual turnover, Jean-Yves Mollier offers us an account of the nineteenth-century origins of many of the famous firms that have recently disappeared into the maw of one or another “holding”. Mollier describes this new work as extending in time and scope his important study of 1984, *Michel et Calmann Lévy ou la naissance de l’édition moderne, 1836-1891*. In time, he will penetrate beyond the age of the editor to the world of the publishing house. In scope, he will move from an examination in depth of a single family dynasty to an attempt to construct a typology of “the editor”. I am not convinced that he is fully successful in either ambition, but this voluminous and detailed study is nevertheless a welcome addition to the still scanty ranks of scholarly works on French publishing. It provides a broader view than such firm histories as his own Lévy volume or Pierre Assouline’s work on Gaston Gallimard and a more focused perspective than the multivolume, *Histoire de l’édition française*, edited by Chartier and Martin.