

# ***Occupational Evolution in XVIIIth and XIXth-Century France\****

**Wayne Snyder**

Emeritus, Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan

*This article provides a quantitative dimension to what heretofore has been primarily a qualitative picture of the occupational structure of eighteenth and nineteenth-Century France. The survey data chiefly covers the occupations of heads-of-households in three of France's twenty-one regions, encompassing about 10 per cent France's population. Using household data from eighteenth-century capitation tax roles and from nineteenth-century censuses, the article follows the numerical evolution of over 150 occupation. For the first time there is a solid basis for discussing how the numerical importance of dozens of occupations changed during the 177 year between 1695 and 1872. Throughout this period more than half the French population were normally engaged in agricultural activities, but the proportion of economically "independent" and "dependent" persons in the family population changed significantly after the Revolution. Furthermore, beginning before the middle of the nineteenth century the nascent Industrial Revolution launched dramatic changes in France's urban economic structure.*

## **1. Introduction**

An important dimension of the economic fabric of every society, perhaps even the most crucial aspect, is how work is distributed among its residents. Knowing the structure of occupations within a country permits understanding the nature of a country's economic activity. Knowing how many people have what kind of occupations is decisive for understanding differences in the level of economic activity among

\* An earlier version of this article was presented at the *Fourth European Social Science History Conference*, (The Hague 2002).

countries. This is equally true for comparing the evolution of a country's economy over time. If we know how many people worked in which occupations at various periods in the past we have a basis for understanding much about the economic history of a country.

Who did what work, where and when, in France before the middle of the nineteenth century is mostly based on speculation. In spite of the extensive discussion of the social and economic fabric of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries provided in Labrousse and Braudel's authoritative tomes, their studies provide little quantitative information about employment in the major sectors of the economy (agriculture, artisanal/industry, commerce, liberal professions).<sup>1</sup> We know even less about the relative importance of particular professions within those sectors. For example, which were more numerous, bakers or butchers, and did their relative importance change between the beginning of the eighteenth and the nineteenth century? Other articles and books about specific villages and cities provide some partial answers to such questions, but often only for a single point in time.<sup>2</sup> As yet no study has provided a systematic analysis of the size of employment in the principal socio-economic sectors and the relative importance of various professions throughout France in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

<sup>1</sup> F. Braudel and E. Labrousse (dir.), *Histoire économique et sociale de la France*, t. 2 (1660-1789), (Paris 1970) and t. 3 (1789-1880), (Paris 1976).

<sup>2</sup> For examples of studies that focus on the socio-professional structures of particular communities, see: M. Derlange, "De la Répartition fiscale de la capitation à la définition d'un corps social: L'Exemple provençal", *Annales du Midi* (1980), pp. 281-300; M. El Kordi, *Bayeux aux XVII<sup>e</sup> et XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, (Paris 1970), pp. 52-57; P. Haudrere, "Un Exemple d'utilisation des roles de capitation: L'Orient, port de la Compagnie des Indes, en 1748," *L'Information Historique*, (1980), pp. 210-16; J. Sentou, *Fortunes et groupes sociaux à Toulouse sous la Révolution, 1789-1799*, (Toulouse 1969); Guy de Valous, "La Capitation des 'nobles' de Lyon en 1701 et 1702," *Actes du Quarante-Vingt-Quatorzième Congrès National des Sociétés Savantes*, (Pau 1969), pp. 210-16.

<sup>3</sup> Institut National des Etudes Démographiques (INED), *Population: Démographie Historique, Numéro Spécial*, (November 1975). This special issue contains a dozen articles describing the methodology and principal results of the INED study of births, deaths and marriages. This mammoth study was begun in 1959 to estimate the demographic characteristics of France between the latter part of the seventeenth century and the first third of the nineteenth century (when demographic statistics became dependable). The study was based on the registers maintained at 373 sites among the 30,000 cities and rural communes that existed in France at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Naively, I decided that I would attempt to remedy the situation single handedly. I was familiar with the INED study of births, deaths and marriages that included the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century; it is based on a random sample of 373 communes in France.<sup>3</sup> I believed if I worked diligently it should be possible in a few years time to use the same registers to collect data about occupations of everyone in the same communes and thus have a valid sample survey of occupations for all of France. After all I was retired and could devote full time to the study.

I was naive on three counts. First, the birth, death and particularly marriage registers are not representative of the entire population; many working French are not included in the registers (e.g. single persons and the clergy). Second, and more important, INED was interested in single variables (a birth, a death, a marriage) whereas I knew that to obtain a reasonably complete survey of the work performed by individuals I would have to collect information about several dozen occupational categories. In the end my occupational tally sheet included more than 150 different occupations. Third, sampling only a few communes in each department as INED had done would be inadequate because the sample would be too small to capture the full diversity of occupations.

In considering the options for collecting a representative sample of occupations, I concluded that the *capitation* tax offered the best source for occupations in the eighteenth century. Earlier I had collected data from the *capitation* registers in numerous departmental archives throughout France and from several dozen communal archives as well. I knew that the *capitation* data for the eighteenth century provided information about the occupation of every head-of-household. Finding similarly reliable data for the first half of the nineteenth century would be a problem. Although national censuses had begun early in the century, until after the middle of the nineteenth century they were not administered uniformly throughout the country nor did communes necessarily retain the census roles.

The *capitation* tax began in 1695 and continued, except for 1699 and 1700, until the tax was abolished in 1791 along with the entire tax system of the *ancien regime*. These roles contain the names and occupations of all heads-of-households and generally the names of other family members as well as enumerating household and farm servants, artisan apprentices,

plus members the leisure class of nobles, bourgeois and *rentiers*. Some nobles were exempt from the *capitation* tax but they were typically listed in the registers anyway. Most of the clergy were exempt because the church elected to pay a forfeit to the king; nevertheless they were usually listed in the *capitation* roles.

The major deficiency of the *capitation* roles and also the censuses before the middle of the nineteenth century is that the work of women is largely ignored. The exceptions were self-supporting female heads-of-household, live-in domestics, and the occasional reporting of women working as *couturières*, *modistes*, *repasseuses*, *revendeuses*, or as the more rarely encountered *sage femmes* or teachers. Also women were listed if they were employed in the agricultural sector as *bergères*, *domestiques* or *journalières*. Widows were sometimes listed as continuing their husband's occupation; that was especially the case for agriculture. Throughout both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it would have been common for the wives and daughters to have worked alongside the head-of-household in many occupations (e.g., *boulangers*, *cabaratiers*, *cardeurs*, *épiciers*, *tailleurs d'habit*, *tisserands*). The same was undoubtedly the case in many commercial activities, and women probably assisted their husbands in some of the liberal professions as well. I have made no attempt to adjust or modify the original data to allow for what might be a reasonable estimate of the number of woman workers besides those listed explicitly in the *capitation* and census roles. It was only after the middle of the nineteenth century that the census takers made a concerted effort to ascribe to women the work they actually performed. Thus, what is available from the earlier tax and census records principally concerns the socio-professional status of the male population. This deficiency is regrettable but obtaining accurate aggregate data about women and their work may be impossible for the eighteenth and much of the nineteenth century.

Another shortcoming of the *capitation* roles and also the later census registers is that one learns nothing about what secondary occupations people may have had. This is a serious deficiency because many agricultural workers, especially the *journaliers*, needed other work at least part of the year because their revenue was insufficient to maintain

their family in food and shelter on their agriculture income alone.<sup>4</sup> Some found seasonal employment in the building trades as assistants to *maçons* and *menuisiers*. In areas where cloth was produced, they often worked as *cardeurs* and *tisserrands* during the agricultural off-season. Another way that some agricultural households supplemented their income was to provide foster care for infants and older children who were sponsored by benevolent organisations.

Napoleon Bonaparte's brother, Lucien, was responsible for administering the first national census in April 1800, but the results fell short of providing a complete enumeration of the French population.<sup>5</sup> Even after 1831, when a joint committee of the Ministries of Agriculture, Commerce and Public Works was created for the purpose of coordinating 5-year censuses, the results were often unsatisfactory. One of the major deficiencies was that the occupation of the head-of-household was attributed to all other family members and to their domestics as well. Undoubtedly, many wives, sons and daughters did work together with the head-of-household, but the censuses made no distinction and simply listed everyone living in the household as being supported by the same occupation as the head-of-household. The instructions for the census of 1856 attempted to correct this situation by instructing enumerators to list "*individus exerçant réellement les professions*". But the results reveal that the instructions were not consistently followed. In the next census, 1861, the enumerators were again instructed to list everyone (wife, children and domestics) in the same occupation as the head of household thus making it impossible to ascertain the real work of wives and young adults living at home. This is particularly unfortunate because it would be useful to know how women's work evolved in the first half of the nineteenth century when the Industrial Revolution was getting underway in France and women had opportunities for employment that had never existed before. It wasn't until the census of 1866 and afterwards that the situation was reversed and the enumerators were again instructed to classify everyone according to their real work.

<sup>4</sup> M. Augé-Laribé, *La révolution agricole*, (Paris 1955), p 34; P. Goubert, *La vie quotidienne des paysans français au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris 1969), p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> L. Ballois, *Annales de Statistique*, (Paris 1802).

In September 1995 I set out to collect the occupation data in the SouthEast region (Provence plus the Alpes-Maritimes west of the Var River). Eventually, after three years of research, I had collected occupational data for 182,364 persons living in 182 rural villages between 1695 and 1866.<sup>6</sup> Subsequently, I turned my attention to two departments of the North region (Nord and Pas-de-Calais), and later two departments of the Rhône-Alpes region (Rhône and Isère).

After spending nearly seven years in the archives I had covered only three of France's 21 regions. It became obvious that my professional life simply would not be long enough for me to accomplish my original goal. However, the data I collected covers 493,699 individuals in 443 communes among the 30,000 that existed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in France.<sup>7</sup> The data represents 1½ % of the population living in the ten departments where I collected data. The population of the departments themselves contained 10% of France's total population of 30 million at the beginning of the nineteenth century. As such, the data constitutes a good sized sample that provides a reasonable approximation of the work that occupied a large portion of the French during the 150 years after the beginning of the eighteenth century.

To evaluate the changing socio-professional structure between 1695 and 1872, I collected data from three periods: (I) 1695-1720, (II) 1780-1820, and (III) 1856-1872. In order to avoid frequently repeating these dates, in the following discussion the three periods are often referred to simply as the first, second and third or last period. The period beginning in 1695 coincides with the introduction of the *capitation* tax. It also encompasses the last years of Louis XIV's reign and the beginning of that of Louis XV. The period 1790-1820 was selected in order to assess the socio-professional-structure that unfolded during the revolutionary and Napoleonic period. The last period covers the first four censuses conducted under Napoleon III.

<sup>6</sup> N. Ostroot and W. Snyder, "Évolution de la structure socio-professionnelle des villages du Sud-Est de la France, 1695-1866," *Provence Historique* 200 (2000), pp.161-188.

<sup>7</sup> The number of communes has increased about 20% since the end of the 18th century, but today there are somewhat fewer than the number that existed early in the 20th century (36,500 in 1994 compared to 38,000 in 1920).

The data in this study pertaining to the individual occupations are presented as a percentage of the socio-professional population, either for a specific region or for the combined weighted averages. The expression "socio-professional population" is used because the term includes persons who would be excluded from the active population today because they had no active employment: the leisure class of nobles, bourgeois and *rentiers*. When the percentage exercising a particular occupation is very small, I have sometimes expressed the percentages as so many workers out of 100 or out of 500.

In discussing the structure of occupations and changes that occurred during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, I have divided the communes according to their population at the beginning of the nineteenth century: communes with populations fewer than 2,000 inhabitants; communes 2,000-5,000; communes 5,000-10,000; communes 10,000-20,000; and those with a population greater than 20,000. The most numerous group of communes by far is those with fewer than 2,000 inhabitants. In 1846 the threshold of 2,000 inhabitants was chosen to distinguish "rural" from "urban" communes, a criteria that continues to be used today.

In the following discussion, when a sector of the economy or an occupation within a sector is the focus of attention for a particular region or for the combination of the three regions, that data is always based on a weighting of the separate items. Thus, when the data from communes in a specific group (i.e., all villages with less than 2,000 inhabitants) are averaged, the data for each commune are weighted according to its population. The same is true when the weighted average for the three regions is calculated; each region is weighted according to its population at the beginning of the nineteenth century: Nord (0.42), Rhône-Alps (0.26) and the SouthEast region (0.32).

The survey contains data for 357 communes where the population was less than 2,000 at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The average number of inhabitants in these rural villages was 745, far below the threshold for being classified as an urban community. Rural villages in the SouthEast region tended to be somewhat larger than elsewhere, but villages as small as 100 inhabitants were numerous everywhere. This

suggests that many communes contained no more than 25 families. The survey also includes a fair number of the middle-size cities as well as some of the largest cities in France: Aix-en-Provence, Arras, Avignon, Grenoble, Lille, Lyon and Marseille. Paris is notably absent from the studies based on the *capitation* because two nineteenth-century fires destroyed all the *capitation* records which would have provided a treasury of occupational data.

## 2. Overview

The detailed information concerning the relative size of each of 150 occupations and each of the three regions is given in the Appendix where the occupations have not been translated into English because there are no exact equivalents for many of the terms. However, in the following tables, the French terms have been replaced by their English equivalents with the exception of *Table 4: Agriculture*. *Table 1* gives the summary information for the three major sectors. These are agriculture, artisanal/industry/transport/commerce, and a third sector labelled "Other" that includes domestic services, liberal professions, clergy and the leisure class. The first two sectors are discussed briefly below, followed by a detailed analysis; the third sector "Other" is discussed later.

The classifications by profession worked well for the eighteenth century when there was relatively little change in occupations, but increasingly in the nineteenth century new occupations emerged. These new occupations are classified in a catch-all rubric "other" associated with each of the major categories (i.e., agriculture, building, clothing, etc.)

There is no disagreement about the general importance of agricultural employment during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The data in this survey show that, for the three regions combined, the percentage of the socio-professional population who worked in the agricultural sector was over 50% during the early decades of the eighteenth century, increased somewhat during the Revolutionary period, and then decreased to somewhat below 50% by the middle of the nineteenth century. Although the data do not exhibit a smooth trend towards a decrease in the importance of agriculture during the 150 year period in any of the

three regions, nevertheless, there exists an overall tendency for agricultural employment to decline. The relative importance of the agricultural sector in the regions of Nord and Rhone-Alpes is fairly similar, whereas in the SouthEast region the percentage of those working in agriculture was nearly 10% higher (i.e. 60%). Structural changes that occurred in the agricultural sector during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are discussed later.

The second sector shown in *Table 1* includes occupations that were originally artisanal activities, many of which were gradually transformed into industrial employment; it also includes transportation and commerce. Together these activities remained generally at the same level through the first two periods, but by the middle of the nineteenth century they increased nearly 50% with the expansion in the number of activities associated with the Industrial Revolution. The change, however, was limited almost entirely to the regions of Nord and Rhone-Alps; there is no evidence that a similar increase occurred in the SouthEast region.

Another way to present the summary data is to classify the information according to a commune's population. The data for four groups of communes are presented in *Table 2*. The profile of the rural villages as compared with the cities having a population over 10,000, is just what one would expect. The agricultural sector of the latter is only one-seventh as large as in the communes with fewer than 2,000 inhabitants. And as one would imagine, the artisanal/industry sector was smallest in the rural villages and largest in the communes having more than 10,000 inhabitants. There do not seem to be notable differences in profile between the group of communes with 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants as compared with the group of larger communes (5,000 to 10,000). As for the sector labelled "Other," there is no simple pattern evident among the four groups of communes.

### **3. Agriculture**

We have already seen that, during the nineteenth century, except in the SouthEast region, there was a decrease in the proportion of persons engaged in the agricultural sector. The most interesting question to ask about the change between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is

whether this change was accompanied by significant modifications within the agricultural sector. Traditionally there were large differences in the livelihood of those engaged in agriculture. Some farmers were "economically independent," meaning that they had sufficient resources of land, animals and equipment to live without being dependent on outside employment or the charity of others. But the large majority of farmers were "economically dependent" because their agricultural production alone was insufficient to feed, house and clothe their family.\* They needed to seek seasonal or occasional employment, often as an artisan's assistant or by engaging in some textile-related activity. Too often, none of these activities were sufficient to sustain themselves and their family, and they had to rely on charitable assistance. Some agricultural workers did not fall into either of these two groups. Agricultural domestics, male and female, and valets lived in fairly substantial farm households. The bergers, bûcherons, poulardiers and jardiniers cannot be neatly assigned to either of the two previous categories because their economic status cannot be easily ascertained.

The basic data on agricultural employment shown in the Appendix has been rearranged in *Table 3* to illustrate the relative importance of each of the two main economic groups; those in occupations that cannot be assigned to one of the two groups are listed as "Divers." The names of the various occupations have been left in French because for many there are no precisely equivalent translations in English. Looking at the combined (weighted) data for the three regions, important changes are evident. In the first period, 1695-1720, the proportion of the socio-professional population in agriculture that was "economically independent" was only 40% as large as the group that was "economically dependent." There was no change in this relationship until after the Revolutionary period. But a half-century later in 1856-1872, the proportion who were "economically independent" had increased to 75% of the "economically dependent" group.

It is tempting to attribute the change to effects of the Revolution and

\* I am indebted to Professor Michel Vovelle for suggesting that comparing the two groups would facilitate an analysis of the evolution of the structure of the agricultural sector.

indeed the Revolution brought changes that did improve the lot of some of the smaller farmers. Although the larger farmers and other wealthy persons were best able to benefit from purchasing nationalised church and noble lands, some small farmers were also able to acquire enough additional land to attain the status of being "economically independent." But another reason involved factors surrounding the nascent Industrial Revolution during the first half of the nineteenth century. Many farmers, especially those in the poorest class, simply gave up farming and migrated to the cities where they hoped to improve their economic situation.

Differences among the three regions were also important. In the North where industrialisation came earliest and progressed most rapidly, there was a large decrease in the percentage of both the economically independent and dependent in the socio-professional population. But it is curious that the economically independent relative to those who were economically dependent decreased over the one hundred and fifty year period. This suggests that the richer farmers found it easier to transform their agricultural assets into resources they could use in the city, whereas the poorer farmers had little they could sell to give them a stake in moving to urban areas. By contrast, in the SouthEast region the decrease in the proportion of dependents was counterbalanced by a corresponding increase in the independents.

Table 2 also illustrates how the terminology used in the agricultural sector changed over the 150-year period. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the largest group of agricultural workers and also the largest among all the occupational categories were the *travailleurs* who represented 16% of the total socio-professional population. Unlike the *journaliers*, most of the *travailleurs* had a bit of land for themselves, either as proprietor or as renter, but usually it was insufficient to support themselves and their families, so most hired themselves to others. The term "*travailleur*" virtually disappeared in the nineteenth century to be replaced by *cultivateur*. In the third period (1856-72) the *cultivateurs* represented 10% of the socio-professional population, again the most numerous agricultural category. However, a number of the nineteenth century *cultivateurs* were referred to as *riche cultivateurs*.

Another significant change occurred among the *laboueurs*. In the

first period they represented 5% of the socio-professional population, but the designation virtually disappeared by the middle of the nineteenth century. In the eighteenth century the *laboureurs* were among the most important of agriculturists who were economically independent because they generally had enough land, animals and equipment to provide more than adequately for their household. Many offered employment to *travailleurs* and *journaliers* who needed extra work in order to sustain their families.

#### 4. Artisanal/Industry/Transport/Commerce

The overall increase in the artisanal/industry/transport/commerce sector from 28% of the total socio-professional population in the first period to 42% in the third period is striking evidence of the remarkable growth and increasing diversity of industrial activities that occurred during the nineteenth century. The curious thing is that the relative size of several of the activities in this sector decreased during this period: *alimentation*, *aubergiste/cabaratier*, *cordonnier*, *tailleur* and *tonnelier*. The decline in *cabaratiers* is particularly puzzling because the category also includes the hotels and restaurants that were beginning to become more numerous the nineteenth century.

The expansion of the physical aspects of the industrial growth was remarkable as factories became more and more common. But the increase in size of the urban centres, notably the centres of industrial development, was remarkable too. For example, the population of Roubaix was only 8,800 in 1804 but by the end of the century it had grown to 125,000 and the growth in several other cities, especially in the North, was nearly as spectacular. The engine of industrial growth in the North and in the Rhone-Alps manifested itself mainly in the creation of hundreds of new jobs in textiles, mining and metallurgy. Even in the SouthEast region the change was noticeable as the proportion of the socio-professional population working in the artisanal/industry, transportation and commerce sector increased by one-third from 23% in the first period to 30% in the third period.

Thousands of persons left their marginal agricultural activities to seek

what they believed would be a richer, more predictable life in the city. But the living conditions of those who left their rural homes often failed to live up to their expectations and in many cases their quality of life deteriorated. Pierrard wrote that many urban workers lived in cellars that had been modified for habitation but that were often "obscure, humide et fétide"; in Lille, for example, conditions were so overcrowded that some families had no more than 10 cubic metres of air for each person whereas the health standards of the time required a minimum of 37 cubic metres apiece.<sup>9</sup>

The textile industry was more heavily concentrated in the North region than elsewhere. In 1866 in Waterloo 80% of the socio-professional population worked in textiles and the percentage of textile workers was nearly as high in several other cities of the north; Roubaix had 65% and Marcq 50%. Figures were similar in some of the cities near Lyon where Cours-la-Ville had 62% in textiles and several other cities had near or more than 50%. Even in Lyon itself one out of every five persons in the socio-professional population worked in the textile industry, mostly in the production of silk fabrics. At the beginning of the eighteenth century in the three combined regions two persons in 100 worked in textiles; one hundred and fifty years later this had doubled to four per 100. Since the nineteenth century censuses prior to 1866 generally failed to accurately attribute to women and children the work they actually performed, the effective size of the work force must have been considerably larger, especially as concerns women working in textiles.

Because more than 60 individual occupations are enumerated in this sector it is not possible to discuss how the percentage of persons varied in each one. Within the clothing industry the percentage of workers in the *couturière/dentellière/lingère* activities increased from one to four persons per 100, another indication of the growing importance of textiles.

Mining was virtually non-existent at the beginning of the eighteenth century. By the middle of the nineteenth century it was not yet a major activity anywhere, but there were mining activities in each of the three regions where nearly one person in 100 was employed.

<sup>9</sup> P. Pierrard, *La vie quotidienne dans le Nord au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris 1976), p. 56.

Although in the transport sector the percentage of persons went from three per 100 to four and a half, there was no notable change among the various occupations within the sector. Railroad workers were virtually unknown until the last period, and even then they were no more than one in 500. In commerce the number of workers increased from less than four to more than five persons in 100 from the first period to the last period with most of the increase being attributed to a increase in general merchants.

## 5. Sector "Other"

As was mentioned previously the sector "Other" includes quite diverse activities. The first group is "domestics;" they decreased from 7% in the first period to 5% during the second period (1790-1820), undoubtedly due to changes that occurred during the Revolution. Afterwards the decline continued, but only reaching somewhat less than 5% by the last period (1856-1872). The decrease was more pronounced for men than for women. One aspect that is not evident in the data is that the conditions of work for some domestics changed for the better. During most of the eighteenth century women domestics were required to live where they worked. For many young single women this arrangement provided a convenient way of obtaining room and board that would have been difficult to find elsewhere. But for some women it was an insecure employment because before the Revolution most servants lacked a room of their own and this made women physically and sexually vulnerable to the master of the house, his male offspring, the other male domestics and visitors to the house as well. Furthermore, it was common practice to summarily fire a maid if she became pregnant.<sup>10</sup> Even by the middle of the nineteenth century only a handful of domestics had living quarters elsewhere than with their employer.

The "liberal occupations" include people working for the communal

<sup>10</sup> In one instance a noble impregnated three servants in his house in a single year! N. Ostroot, "Exposition des filles mères à Aix-en-Provence: Étude de Contrôle Social," *Femmes entre ombre et lumière. Recherches sur la visibilité sociale (XVI-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, (Paris 2000).

or departmental administration; education, health care, law related occupations: and a catch-all category "Other" that encompassed an increasingly diverse number of occupations as the nineteenth century progressed. The surprising thing is that for the sector as a whole the percentage of persons in the socio-professional population *declined* significantly from 6% in the first period to 4% in the last period.

The decrease in the proportion of the population exercising the liberal professions was distributed more or less generally throughout all the components of this sector with the exception of education, which increased from less than one in 500 to four per 500. However, this apparent increase may overstate the real increase, as many of the teachers in the eighteenth century were monks and nuns and the *capitation* roles did not necessarily indicate when they were members of a teaching order. What makes the general decrease of the liberal professions particularly surprising is that the percentage of persons working in health care decreased substantially, too, from one per 100 in the first period to only one in 300 in the last period. Even the percentage of persons working in administration decreased, from five to less than three per 200. This, too, is unexpected as one would have presumed that during the 150 years between the beginning of the eighteenth century and the middle of the nineteenth would have been a period of the increasing role of public service. In addition, the law-related occupations (lawyers, *notaires* and persons associated with the court system) also decreased markedly as a percentage of the socio-professional population, from three to less than one per 200. History does not provide a clear answer to explain why these decreases occurred.

There has always been some uncertainty about the exact size of the "clergy," especially during the eighteenth century. The most widely accepted figures place the number of male clergy in France between 200,000 and 250,000.<sup>11</sup> Very roughly this would translate into about one

<sup>11</sup> Some estimates are well outside this range. At the upper end, l'Abbé Expilly, *Dictionnaire des Gaules*, estimated that in 1762 the number of clergy was as large as 406,000. At the lower end, Sée, *La France Economique*, p. 54, quotes the *Royal Almanac* (no date) as giving a figure as low as 131,000. Sée believed that the range 200,000 to 250,000 was most likely.

percent of the population. In our study in the first period we counted about one percent for both women and men. During the Revolution many monasteries were closed, but some eventually managed to reopen. The data suggest that the proportion of clergy was even a bit higher during the years immediately after the Revolution. The net result was that by the middle of the nineteenth century the percentage of the socio-professional population belonging to the clergy was somewhat higher than it had been 150 years earlier.

The "leisure class" during the eighteenth century includes those who were nobles, bourgeois, proprietors and *rentiers*, although the later two terms were rarely employed. In the nineteenth century persons in the leisure class were classified in the censuses as either proprietors or *rentiers*. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the number of bourgeois was about twice as large as the number of nobles. After the Revolution neither term was used officially, although occasionally a person might respond to a census-taker that they belonged to nobility or the bourgeois class. There has long been considerable discussion and ambiguity about the exact number of nobles in France prior to the Revolution. The lowest estimates are in the neighborhood of 100,000 and the highest around 400,000. The historian Jean Meyer has proposed that a "prudent estimate of the nebulous nobility," might be considered to lie between 200,000 and 300,000 persons.<sup>12</sup> This corresponds to between one percent and one-and-a-half percent of the population. In the *capitation* roles used for this study, the nobility represented slightly over one percent of those registered.

<sup>12</sup> Abbé Expilly was one of the few who thought the number of nobles in the 18th century was as much as 400,000, but he didn't provide an explanation of the basis for his estimate. See Abbé Expilly, *Dictionnaire Géographique, Historique et Politique des Gaules et de la France*, t. 4, (Amsterdam 1766). Detailed discussions of the principal issues surrounding the problem of estimating the number of nobles can be found in the following: David Higgs, *Nobles in Nineteenth Century France: The Practice of Inegalitarianism*, (Baltimore 1987); Chaussinand-Nogaret, *La Noblesse au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris, 1976), pp. 1-48; Robert Dauvergne, "Le Problème du nombre des nobles en France au 18<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Hommage à Marcel Reinbard: Sur la Population Français au 18<sup>e</sup> et 19<sup>e</sup> siècles*, (Paris 1973), pp. 181-192; Jean Meyer, *Noblesse et Pouvoir dans l'Europe d'Ancien Régime*, (Paris 1973), p. 28, Henri Sée, *La France économique et sociale au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris, 1967).

Urban proprietors and *rentiers* accounted for about one-half of one percent of the socio-professional population in the first period. By the third period they amounted to nearly three and one-half percent. If the proportion of the eighteenth-century bourgeois and nobles had simply been reclassified as proprietors and renters, the combined total in the leisure class would have been one percent higher than actually accounted for. Some of the former nobles had emigrated from France, but the figures suggest that other former nobles and perhaps proprietors-too-lost their status between the Revolutionary era and the middle of the nineteenth century.

## **6. Summary and Conclusions**

The purpose of this study is to give a quantitative dimension to what has heretofore been principally a qualitative picture of occupations in eighteenth and nineteenth century France. None of the findings are dramatically contrary to what has already been known about work in those decades. But for the first time there is a fairly solid basis for discussing how the numerical importance of dozens of occupations changed during the 150-year period between the beginning of the eighteenth century and the middle of the nineteenth century.

We now have confirmation that indeed a majority of French toiled in agriculture and that most of them lived in rural villages of fewer than 2,000 inhabitants. More important, we know that the economic livelihood of a substantial portion of farmers improved after the Revolution and permitted them to advance from being essentially "dependent" to being "independent." But we also know that a significant number of farmers of both categories gave up farming in order to become urban workers. Although they hoped to find increased opportunities, for many persons urban poverty may have been more crushing than their previous rural poverty.

As the Industrial Revolution progressed in the nineteenth century there were many changes in the occupations but none so dramatic as the percentage of people engaged in the production of cotton, silk and wool textiles. Most of this change occurred in the cities of the North and

around Lyon, but even the SouthEast region saw a modest increase in industrial activities.

In the tertiary sector the percentage of servants in the socio-professional population declined and the same was true for those employed in the liberal occupations. Overall the clergy appear not to have been as affected by the events of the Revolution as one might have assumed. Lastly, the elimination of the classification bourgeois and nobles and their integration into the categories of proprietors and *rentiers* was associated with in a one-percent decrease in the percentage of persons in the leisure class.

#### REFERENCES

- AUGÉ-LARIBÉ M., *La révolution agricole*, (Paris 1955), p 34;
- BAILLOIS L., *Annales de Statistique*, (Paris 1802).
- BRAUDEL F. and E. LABROUSSE (dir.), *Histoire économique et sociale de la France*, t. 2 (1660-1789), (Paris 1970) and t. 3 (1789-1880), (Paris 1976).
- CHAUSSINAND-NOGARET, *La Noblesse au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris 1976), pp. 1-48.
- DAUVERGNE R., "Le Problème du nombre des nobles en France au 18<sup>e</sup> siècle, in "Hommage à Marcel Reinhard: Sur la Population Français au 18<sup>e</sup> et 19<sup>e</sup> siècles, (Paris 1973), pp. 181-192.
- DERLANGE M., "De La Répartition fiscale de la capitation à la définition d'un corps social: L'Exemple provençal," *Annales du Midi* (1980), pp. 281-300.
- DE VALOUS G., "La Capitation des 'nobles' de Lyon en 1701 et 1702," *Actes du Quatre-Vingt-Quatorzième Congrès National des Sociétés Savantes*, (Pau 1969), pp. 210-16.
- EL KORDI M., *Bayeux aux XVII<sup>e</sup> et XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, (Paris 1970), pp. 52-57.
- EXPILLY L'ABBÉ, *Dictionnaire Géographique, Historique et Politique des Gaules et de la France*," t. 4, (Amsterdam 1766).
- GOUBERT P., *La vie quotidienne des paysans français au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris 1969), p. 45.
- HAUDRERE P., "Un Exemple d'utilisation des roles de capitation: L'Orient, port de la Compagnie des Indes, en 1748," *L'Information Historique*, (1980), pp. 210-16.
- HIGGS D., *Nobles in Nineteenth Century France: The Practice of Inegalitarianism*, (Baltimore 1987).

- INSTITUT NATIONAL DES ETUDES DEMOGRAPHIQUES (INED), *Population: Démographie Historique, Numéro Spécial*, (November 1975).
- MEYER J., *Noblesse et Pouvoir dans l'Europe d'Ancien Regime*, (Paris 1973), p. 28.
- OSTROOT N. and SNYDER W., "Évolution de la structure socio-professionnelle des villages du Sud-Est de la France, 1695-1866," *Provence Historique* 200 (2000), pp. 161-188.
- OSTROOT N., "Exposition des filles mères à Aix-en-Provence: Étude de Contrôle Social," *Femmes entre ombre et lumière: Recherches sur la visibilité sociale (XVI-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, (Paris 2000).
- PIERRARD P., *La vie quotidienne dans le Nord au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris 1956), p. 56.
- SÉE H., *La France économique et sociale au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Paris 1967).
- SENTOU S., *Fortunes et groupes sociaux à Toulouse sous la Révolution, 1789-1799*, (Toulouse 1969).



# *Appendix*

Occupational Evolution in XVIIIth  
and XIXth-Century France



**TABLE 2. Occupations by Size of Commune (Percent of socio-professional population)**

Sector	Less than 2,000			2,000 - 5,000			5,000 - 10,000			Over 10,000		
	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872
Agriculture	71.89	74.80	63.83	39.74	37.66	32.08	42.07	45.87	15.47	17.71	7.92	8.04
Artisanat/Industry												
Transport/Commerce	16.93	15.66	28.18	37.05	36.77	51.88	32.96	35.78	65.35	51.99	68.83	66.22
Other:	11.17	9.53	7.99	23.21	25.58	16.04	24.97	18.35	19.17	30.31	23.25	25.74
Domestics, Liberal professions, Clergy, Leisure Class												
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE 3. Agricultural Sector (Percentage of the socio-professional population)**

Catégorie	Nord			Rhône-Alpes			South East			Combined Weighted Average		
	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872
<b>Exploitant économiquement indépendant:</b>	10.74	7.60	6.84	16.26	14.30	25.16	15.83	15.73	23.30	13.80	11.94	16.87
Fermier	2.41	2.31	2.59	4.21	1.27	3.77	0.57	0.96	2.02	2.29	1.61	2.71
Ménager, form	0.00	4.05	2.71	7.19	6.26	0.06	6.72	9.06	1.35	4.02	6.23	1.58
Laboureur	8.02	0.71	0.15	1.29	1.40	0.89	3.29	1.92	0.08	4.75	1.27	0.32
Propriétaire cultivateur (plus 20% autre)	0.29	0.40	1.11	3.29	3.74	1.00	2.89	1.79	14.15	1.90	1.71	5.25
Propriétaire, rentier	0.01	0.12	0.28	0.27	1.64	19.44	2.36	2.00	5.70	0.83	1.12	7.00
<b>Exploitant économiquement dépendant:</b>	30.14	41.76	25.09	29.89	30.73	10.32	38.92	36.05	29.06	32.88	37.06	22.52
Journalier/ère, brassier, ouvrier, manoeuvre	13.17	12.82	18.49	14.08	13.30	5.34	7.29	5.28	4.78	11.53	10.53	10.68
Travailleur, locataire (plus 80% autre)	10.06	20.02	1.10	13.16	14.55	3.61	27.38	20.44	1.18	16.41	18.73	1.78
Cultivateur, agriculteur non-spécifié	5.27	8.92	5.48	2.27	2.03	0.80	3.23	9.21	22.50	3.84	7.22	9.71
Méger, métayer, grangier	1.64	0.00	0.03	0.37	0.84	0.57	1.02	1.12	0.61	1.11	0.58	0.36
<b>Divers:</b>	5.40	8.29	8.26	8.97	11.30	15.27	7.93	6.43	4.96	7.14	8.48	9.03
Berger, bûcheron, domestique, jardinier, servante, valet, vigneron												
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46.28</b>	<b>57.64</b>	<b>40.18</b>	<b>55.11</b>	<b>56.33</b>	<b>50.74</b>	<b>62.67</b>	<b>58.21</b>	<b>57.33</b>	<b>53.82</b>	<b>57.48</b>	<b>48.41</b>

Source: Annex

**TABLE 4. Selected Categories from Artisanat/Industry plus Transport and Commerce**  
(Percent of socio-professional population)

Secteur	Nord et Pas-de-Calais			Rhone-Alpes			South East			Combined Weighted Average		
	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872
<b>Artisanat/Industry (selected)</b>	19.16	16.17	28.87	23.74	20.82	23.10	12.49	12.92	12.99	18.22	16.34	22.29
Food	2.36	1.55	1.13	1.47	1.49	1.36	0.86	1.94	2.11	1.65	1.66	1.50
Lodging and Restaurants	4.17	2.51	2.07	1.20	1.19	1.74	1.17	1.09	2.71	2.44	1.71	2.19
Building	3.37	1.90	4.96	3.18	3.20	3.79	2.72	2.13	0.30	3.11	2.31	3.16
Clothing	5.88	4.90	4.60	6.61	6.20	6.16	3.42	5.65	6.42	5.28	5.48	5.59
Textiles: Cotton, silk, wool	1.69	3.14	7.49	9.65	7.50	7.95	3.69	1.98	0.93	4.40	3.90	5.51
Manual labourers: Women	0.45	0.45	2.13	0.47	0.37	0.30	0.11	0.03	0.10	0.35	0.29	1.01
Men	1.24	1.72	6.49	1.16	0.88	1.80	0.51	0.10	0.43	0.99	0.98	3.33
Transportation	2.39	4.26	4.53	1.67	1.64	1.71	4.06	5.85	4.18	2.73	4.09	3.68
Commerce	4.55	4.13	6.37	3.45	3.52	3.31	2.89	4.29	5.63	3.73	4.02	5.34
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26.09</b>	<b>29.80</b>	<b>49.03</b>	<b>30.08</b>	<b>27.69</b>	<b>46.18</b>	<b>22.58</b>	<b>28.74</b>	<b>30.05</b>	<b>27.54</b>	<b>28.91</b>	<b>42.22</b>

Source: Annex

**TABLE 5. The "Other" Category: Domestic, Liberal Professions, Clergy and the Leisure Class**  
**(Percent of socio-professional population)**

Secteur	Nord et Pas-de-Calais			Rhône-Alpes			South East			Combined Weighted Average		
	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872	1695- 1720	1790- 1820	1856- 1872
Domestics	9.61	6.10	4.18	5.83	5.01	5.24	5.45	4.21	5.72	7.30	5.21	4.95
Women	6.52	3.98	3.27	4.14	3.55	3.55	4.04	3.26	4.69	5.11	3.64	3.80
Men	2.65	1.60	0.91	1.70	1.46	1.70	1.40	0.95	1.03	2.00	1.36	1.15
Liberal Professions	7.85	2.60	3.06	2.96	3.46	2.78	2.90	3.40	3.17	4.99	3.08	3.02
Administration	4.27	1.06	1.68	1.04	1.30	0.92	1.07	1.39	1.70	2.41	1.23	1.49
Education	0.19	0.24	0.75	0.21	0.17	0.78	0.13	0.37	0.87	0.18	0.26	0.80
Law	2.34	0.66	0.37	1.15	1.48	0.56	0.76	0.74	0.15	1.53	0.90	0.35
Médecin/Chirurgie Pharmacien	1.05	0.64	0.25	0.55	0.50	0.52	0.93	0.91	0.44	0.89	0.69	0.38
Clergy	1.03	1.44	0.73	0.60	0.97	1.32	0.76	0.52	1.07	0.83	1.02	0.99
Femme	0.48	0.54	0.33	0.20	0.29	0.72	0.45	0.19	0.34	0.40	0.36	0.44
Homme	0.55	0.90	0.40	0.40	0.68	0.59	0.31	0.34	0.72	0.44	0.66	0.55
Leisure Class	4.77	3.24	4.31	3.78	4.73	3.04	3.26	3.40	1.39	4.03	3.68	3.05
Bourgeois	3.01	0.91	0.01	1.93	2.65	1.01	1.89	2.61	0.15	2.37	1.91	0.31
Nobles	1.01	0.32	0.00	0.85	1.11	0.27	1.27	0.54	0.01	1.05	0.60	0.07
Proprietors (non-agricole)	0.47	0.10	0.47	0.13	0.09	0.20	0.06	0.24	0.84	0.25	0.14	0.52
Rentiers	0.28	1.94	3.96	0.86	0.87	1.55	0.03	0.01	0.39	0.35	1.04	2.19
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23.27</b>	<b>13.39</b>	<b>12.28</b>	<b>13.17</b>	<b>14.16</b>	<b>12.38</b>	<b>12.36</b>	<b>11.53</b>	<b>11.34</b>	<b>17.15</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>

Source: Annex

<b>TABLE 6. Percent of the Soclo-professional Population</b>						
<b>Secteur</b>	<b>Nord et Pas-de-Calais</b>			<b>Rhone-Alps</b>		
	<b>1695- 1720</b>	<b>1790- 1820</b>	<b>1856- 1872</b>	<b>1695- 1720</b>	<b>1790- 1820</b>	<b>1856- 1872</b>
<b>Agriculture</b>	46.28	57.88	40.18	55.11	56.33	50.78
Berger	1.17	0.36	0.31	0.01	0.01	0.22
Cultivateur	5.27	8.92	5.48	0.11	0.04	0.71
Domestique/Valet: Femme	1.35	4.59	3.66	2.39	5.86	11.24
Homme	2.36	3.08	3.63	3.08	0.68	2.23
Fermier	2.41	2.31	2.59	4.21	1.27	3.77
Jardinier/Verger	0.52	0.26	0.66	3.49	4.75	1.57
Journalier/Ouvrier	3.52	6.97	11.32	0.46	0.33	0.50
Journalière	1.16	2.71	3.76	9.45	11.49	4.47
Laboureur	8.02	0.71	0.15	1.29	1.40	0.89
Ménager	0.00	4.05	2.71	7.19	6.26	0.06
Métayer/Grangier	1.64	0.00	0.03	0.37	0.84	0.57
Manoeuvre	8.49	3.14	3.41	4.17	1.48	0.36
Propriétaire	0.00	0.12	0.28	0.06	0.10	0.04
Propriétaire cultivateur	0.00	0.20	0.90	0.03	0.11	0.26
Rentier	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.21	1.54	19.40
Travailleur	8.89	19.21	0.28	0.10	0.06	0.68
Agriculteur				2.17	1.99	0.09
Autre	1.46	1.01	1.02	16.32	18.11	3.67
<b>Artisanat/Transport</b>	25.53	23.57	39.81	27.46	24.87	32.47
Alimentation	2.36	1.55	1.13	1.47	1.49	1.36
Boulangier/Fournier	1.48	0.89	0.50	0.85	0.86	0.82
Boucher/Charcutier	0.75	0.48	0.50	0.46	0.46	0.35
Autre	0.30	0.17	0.13	0.16	0.17	0.19
Ameublement	0.17	0.10	0.19	0.11	0.11	0.10
Aubergiste/Cabaretier/Cafetier	4.17	2.51	2.07	1.20	1.19	1.74
Bâtiment	3.37	1.90	4.96	3.18	3.20	3.79
Maçon/Tailleur de pierre	0.65	0.31	1.81	0.96	0.90	1.33
Menuisier/Charpentier	2.26	1.16	2.11	1.29	1.34	1.57
Peintre/Plâtrier	0.17	0.06	0.37	0.10	0.08	0.26
Scieur de bois	0.06	0.05	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.06
Serrurier/Ferrurier/Taillandier	0.30	0.21	0.31	0.39	0.36	0.44
Autre	0.12	0.11	0.26	0.04	0.08	0.14
Bois/Tonnellier/Tourneur	0.77	0.58	0.46	0.32	0.40	0.70
Cordier	0.09	0.15	0.15	0.18	0.20	0.03
Cuir: Bourrellier/Tanneur	0.53	0.28	0.78	0.52	0.55	0.28
Habillement	5.88	4.90	4.60	6.61	6.20	6.16
Chapelier	0.25	0.12	0.05	0.77	0.65	0.24
Cordonnier/Savetier	3.25	1.51	1.25	2.22	1.80	2.24
Coutière/Dentellière/Lingère	0.28	1.35	1.92	1.23	1.30	1.83
Perruquier/Coiffeur	0.20	0.35	0.09	0.21	0.32	0.26
Tailleur	1.51	0.90	0.62	1.00	0.98	0.86
Autre	0.49	0.66	0.84	1.17	1.16	0.73
Metal: Forgeron/Chaudronnier	0.49	0.28	0.49	0.19	0.38	0.21
Mine	0.00	0.07	0.59	0.02	0.02	1.82
Orfèvre/Bijoutier/Horloger	0.09	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.13	0.06
Pêcheur	0.11	0.19	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00
Tissage: Coton/Laine/Lin	1.69	3.14	7.49	9.65	7.50	7.95

**TABLE 7. Percent of the Socio-professional Population**

Secteur	Nord et Pas-de-Calais			Rhône-Alps		
	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872
Transport	2.39	4.26	4.53	1.67	1.64	1.71
Cantonnier	0.00	0.01	0.34	0.01	0.01	0.17
Charron	0.78	0.73	0.46	0.33	0.32	0.53
Chemin de fer	0.00	0.02	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.07
Maréchal ferrant	0.63	0.74	0.25	0.53	0.47	0.28
Mann	0.39	0.42	2.28	0.13	0.12	0.05
Portefaix	0.22	0.07	0.07	0.16	0.12	0.03
Voiturier	0.20	0.46	0.35	0.47	0.59	0.47
Autre	0.16	0.11	0.52	0.05	0.03	0.05
Journal/Ouvr/Manoeuvre: Femme	0.45	0.45	2.13	0.47	0.37	0.30
:Homme	1.24	1.72	6.49	1.16	0.88	1.80
Autre	1.73	1.03	3.71	0.61	0.61	1.43
<b>Commerce</b>	4.55	4.13	6.37	3.45	3.52	3.31
Alimentation/Poissonnier	0.43	0.53	0.91	0.23	0.31	0.65
Commis	0.04	0.06	0.10	0.12	0.14	0.05
Habillement	1.19	0.17	0.06	0.13	0.18	0.27
Marchand diverse	2.00	2.39	3.59	2.40	2.11	1.27
Négociant	0.23	0.21	0.83	0.13	0.25	0.36
Vendeur/Revendeur	0.19	0.28	0.16	0.37	0.32	0.11
Autre	0.45	0.48	0.72	0.07	0.20	0.31
<b>Domestique</b>	9.61	6.10	4.18	5.83	5.01	5.24
Femme	6.52	3.98	3.27	4.14	3.55	3.55
Homme	2.65	1.60	0.91	1.70	1.46	1.70
<b>Profession libérale</b>	8.22	3.63	4.41	3.33	4.14	3.40
Administration	4.27	1.06	1.68	1.04	1.30	0.92
Enseignement	0.19	0.24	0.75	0.21	0.17	0.78
Judiciaire	2.34	0.66	0.37	1.15	1.48	0.56
Avocat/Avoué	0.34	0.11	0.10	0.14	0.25	0.15
Cour	1.50	0.28	0.10	0.37	0.82	0.19
Notaire	0.38	0.20	0.17	0.32	0.41	0.23
Autre	0.13	0.08	0.01	0.32	0.03	0.02
Médecin/Chirurgie/Pharmacien	1.05	0.64	0.25	0.55	0.50	0.52
Militaire	0.16	0.83	0.79	0.16	0.17	0.12
Autre	0.21	0.20	0.63	0.21	0.51	0.53
<b>Clergé</b>	1.03	1.44	0.73	0.60	0.97	1.32
Femme	0.48	0.54	0.33	0.20	0.29	0.72
Homme	0.55	0.90	0.40	0.40	0.68	0.59
<b>Sans profession</b>	4.77	3.24	4.31	3.78	4.73	3.04
Bourgeois	3.01	0.91	0.01	1.93	2.65	1.01
Noble	1.01	0.32	0.00	0.85	1.11	0.27
Propriétaire non-agricole	0.47	0.10	0.47	0.13	0.09	0.20
Rentier	0.28	1.94	3.96	0.86	0.87	1.55
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE 8. Percent of the Socio-professional Population**

Secteur	South East			Combined Weighted Average		
	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872	1695-1720	1790-1820	1856-1872
<b>Agriculture</b>	62.35	58.34	57.65	53.72	57.63	48.53
Berger	3.36	2.92	1.33	1.57	1.09	0.61
Cultivateur	3.07	8.98	22.08	3.22	6.63	9.55
Domestique/Valet: Femme	1.40	0.99	1.07	1.64	3.77	4.80
Homme	2.85	2.02	2.18	2.70	2.11	2.80
Fermier	0.57	0.96	2.02	2.29	1.61	2.71
Jardinier/verger	0.31	0.51	0.38	1.23	1.50	0.81
Journalier/Ouvrier	6.13	4.23	3.74	3.56	4.37	6.08
Journalière	1.16	1.05	1.04	3.32	4.46	3.08
Laboureur	3.29	1.92	0.08	4.75	1.27	0.32
Ménager	6.72	9.06	1.35	4.02	6.23	1.58
Métayer/Grangier	1.02	1.12	0.61	1.11	0.58	0.36
Manoeuvre	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.65	1.70	1.53
Propriétaire	0.09	0.10	5.66	0.04	0.11	1.94
Propriétaire cultivateur	2.72	1.64	14.06	0.88	0.64	4.95
Rentier	2.27	1.90	0.04	0.79	1.01	5.06
Travailleur	26.70	19.85	0.84	12.30	14.44	0.56
Agriculteur	0.16	0.23	0.42	0.61	0.59	0.16
Autre	0.85	0.74	0.43	5.13	5.37	1.52
<b>Artisanat/Transport</b>	19.51	22.76	20.91	24.11	23.65	31.85
Alimentation	0.86	1.94	2.11	1.65	1.66	1.50
Boulangier/Fournier	0.56	1.30	1.43	1.02	1.01	0.88
Boucher/Charcutier	0.22	0.46	0.48	0.50	0.47	0.46
Autre	0.09	0.17	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.16
Ameublement	0.05	0.04	0.18	0.11	0.09	0.16
Aubergiste/Cabarattier/Cafetier	1.17	1.09	2.71	2.44	1.71	2.19
Bâtiment	2.72	2.13	0.30	3.11	2.31	3.16
Macon/Tailleur de pierre	1.16	1.79	2.01	0.89	0.94	1.75
Menuisier/Charpentier	0.88	2.02	1.36	1.56	1.48	1.73
Peintre/Plâtrier	0.09	0.14	0.29	0.13	0.09	0.31
Scieur de bois	0.24	0.10	0.40	0.10	0.06	0.19
Serrurier/Ferrurier/Taillandier	0.27	0.29	0.31	0.31	0.28	0.34
Autre	0.09	0.24	0.38	0.09	0.15	0.27
Bois/Tonnellier/Tourneur	0.43	0.69	0.49	0.55	0.57	0.53
Cordier	0.45	0.61	0.08	0.23	0.31	0.10
Cuir: Bourrellier/Tanneur	0.32	0.41	0.27	0.46	0.39	0.49
Habillement	3.42	5.65	6.42	5.28	5.48	5.59
Chapelier	0.38	0.45	0.33	0.43	0.36	0.19
Cordonnier/Savetier	1.63	2.68	2.08	2.47	1.96	1.77
Coutière/Dentellière/Lingère	0.04	0.43	2.22	0.45	1.04	1.99
Perruquier/Coiffeur	0.18	0.52	0.53	0.19	0.40	0.27
Tailleur	0.97	1.15	1.14	1.20	1.00	0.85
Autre	0.22	0.43	0.11	0.58	0.72	0.58
Metal: Forgeron/Chaudronnier	0.26	0.26	0.77	0.34	0.30	0.51
Mine	0.01	0.01	0.15	0.01	0.04	0.77
Orfèvre/Bijoutier/Horloger	0.09	0.26	0.31	0.09	0.15	0.12
Pêcheur	0.36	0.29	0.28	0.16	0.18	0.10
Tissage: Coton/Laine/Lin	3.69	1.98	0.93	4.40	3.90	5.51

continues

<b>TABLE 8. Percent of the Socio-professional Population</b>						
<i>continued</i>	<b>South East</b>			<b>Combined Weighted Average</b>		
<b>Secteur</b>	<b>1695- 1720</b>	<b>1790- 1820</b>	<b>1856- 1872</b>	<b>1695- 1720</b>	<b>1790- 1820</b>	<b>1856- 1872</b>
Transport	4.06	5.85	4.18	2.73	4.09	3.68
Cantonnier	0.03	0.09	0.40	0.01	0.03	0.32
Charron	0.15	0.39	0.37	0.46	0.52	0.45
Chemin de fer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.13
Maréchal ferrant	0.62	0.82	0.60	0.60	0.69	0.37
Mann	1.36	2.57	1.13	0.63	1.03	1.33
Portefaix	0.59	0.57	0.47	0.32	0.24	0.19
Voiturier	0.86	0.67	0.83	0.48	0.56	0.53
Autre	0.45	0.74	0.38	0.23	0.29	0.35
Journal/Ouvr/Manouvre: Femme	0.11	0.03	0.10	0.35	0.29	1.01
:Homme	0.51	0.10	0.43	0.99	0.98	3.33
Autre	0.99	1.42	1.21	1.20	1.04	2.32
<b>Commerce</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>5.63</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>5.34</b>
Alimentation/Poissonnier	0.22	0.29	1.28	0.31	0.40	0.96
Commis	0.11	0.49	0.21	0.08	0.22	0.12
Habillement	0.24	0.08	2.07	0.61	0.15	0.76
Marchand diverse	1.04	1.40	1.26	1.80	2.00	2.24
Négociant	0.29	0.90	0.23	0.23	0.44	0.52
Vendeur/Revendeur	0.83	0.88	0.36	0.44	0.48	0.21
Autre	0.17	0.24	0.21	0.26	0.33	0.45
<b>Domestique</b>	<b>5.45</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>5.72</b>	<b>7.30</b>	<b>5.21</b>	<b>4.95</b>
Femme	4.04	3.26	4.69	5.11	3.64	3.80
Homme	1.40	0.95	1.03	2.00	1.36	1.15
<b>Profession libérale</b>	<b>5.07</b>	<b>4.78</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>5.94</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>4.24</b>
Administration	1.07	1.39	1.70	2.41	1.23	1.49
Enseignement	0.13	0.37	0.87	0.18	0.26	0.80
Judiciaire	0.76	0.74	0.15	1.53	0.90	0.35
Avocat/Avoué	0.48	0.60	0.17	0.33	0.30	0.14
Cour	0.66	0.30	0.14	0.94	0.43	0.14
Notaire	0.46	0.27	0.19	0.39	0.28	0.19
Autre	0.11	0.02	0.01	0.17	0.04	0.01
Médecin/Chirurg/Pharmacien	0.93	0.91	0.44	0.89	0.69	0.38
Militaire	0.92	0.66	0.16	0.40	0.61	0.41
Autre	0.30	0.24	1.03	0.24	0.29	0.73
<b>Clergé</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>0.99</b>
Femme	0.45	0.19	0.34	0.40	0.36	0.44
Homme	0.31	0.34	0.72	0.44	0.66	0.55
<b>Sans profession</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.05</b>
Bourgeois	1.89	2.61	0.15	2.37	1.91	0.31
Noble	1.27	0.54	0.01	1.05	0.60	0.07
Propriétaire non-agricole	0.06	0.24	0.84	0.25	0.14	0.52
Rentier	0.03	0.01	0.39	0.35	1.04	2.19
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>

*notes*

