Caen and Limoges under the Old Regime fulfilled similar functions. Administratively and judicially, they were almost identical—each was the seat of an intendancy, each supported important regional courts, and neither played host to a parlement. Both towns enjoyed the privilege of nominating mayors and electing municipal councils. Caen countered Limoges' ecclesiastical prestige with an academic reputation—Limoges was a bishop's seat, whereas Caen boasted a university. Both towns served as important regional trade centers—Caen lay at the center of Lower Normandy, and Limoges dominated the Limousin and the Marche.

Looking more closely, however, one discovers fundamental differences in the vitality of the two economies in the late eighteenth century. Rich and productive farmland surrounded Caen. The principal crop, wheat, not only fed the population in all except the leanest years but also produced a surplus that helped finance a thriving textile industry early in the century and a shift into varied commercial activity later, after competition had made local textiles less profitable. The move away from textiles came largely before the 1780s; so the 1786 treaty with England, which created serious unemployment in many northern French textile towns on the eve of the Revolution, did not seriously affect Caen. Even the poor harvests of 1788 and 1789 did not prove disastrous for Caen's economy.

Limoges, on the other hand, lay in a poor agricultural region. The rocky,
infertile hills of the Limousin yielded rye, not wheat; and in harsh years, most peasants were forced to supplement their diets with chestnuts. The region did support a modest textile industry, but the local economy in the eighteenth century can best be described as depressed. The Revolution brought little improvement. Five consecutive poor harvests racked the Haute-Vienne, beginning in 1788. Limoges itself suffered a serious fire in September, 1790, a crippling tragedy that was a portent of the economic hardship that plagued the entire department throughout the Revolution.

The contrast in agricultural fertility carried over, though less dramatically, into other economic sectors. Jean-Claude Perrot describes the half-century between 1725 and 1775 as a period of commercial expansion that pushed the population of Caen from 27,000 to 40,000, inspired an impressive wave of road and building projects, and produced a level of urbanization in Caen that “surpassed Paris, four large ports and several celebrated cities of the interior.”¹ The Limoges economy expanded, too, during the eighteenth century, but it built upon a weaker base. Georges Verynaud writes that by the beginning of the century, “Limoges had become a poor city.”² Local industry was in decline, roads were in miserable shape, and the expense of recent wars had overtaxed the population. The reign of Louis XV rejuvenated somewhat the tired Limoges economy. Successive intendants turned their attention to improving the region’s roads, and after 1725 a modest textile industry took root, employing one-third of the Limoges work force by mid-century. This growth was limited, however, and could not fully absorb the considerable mendicant population that the cathedral attracted to Limoges.

The growth of the Caen economy, then, proved more dynamic than that of the Limoges economy, but the character of that growth differed as well. One cannot ignore the importance of the rich agricultural basin to the prosperity of Caen. Perrot has demonstrated a strong correlation between Caen’s economy and fluctuations in local wheat production and price. Increases in production during the 1730s enriched local farmers and depressed real rural wages, thereby driving the surplus population to the city, where people could find work in the flourishing artisanal trades financed by farm profits.³

Ironically, the agricultural sector later competed with the artisanal industry

³. Perrot, Genèse d’une ville moderne, II, 801, 948.
that it had encouraged. Salaries for temporary work in agriculture, at peak periods, generally exceeded those for urban labor, and it was difficult for manufacturers to procure raw materials at the same time that labor was available.

A combination of factors—the cost of importing wool and cotton, the high cost of labor, and competition from Upper Normandy—caused a gradual shift within the Caen textile industry from wool production to linen and finally to lace. The wool industry had gone into a steady, and sharp, decline as early as 1740. Manufacturers shifted their efforts to linen production, which maintained its viability until 1760, when the Seven Years War triggered the gradual decline of the linen industry by disrupting the supply of raw materials. Lace production began to grow around 1750, accelerated after 1762, and maintained a peak level from 1772 until the 1790s. A luxury fabric, lace enjoyed a wide market and could be produced by women and children at home without expensive machinery, thus reducing labor costs.4

The period of decline in the main textile sectors coincided with the period of Caen’s greatest growth, 1725 to 1775. This apparent contradiction is explained by a surge in trade activity after 1750. Throughout the century, textile production tended to be dominated by merchants and speculators rather than manufacturers. Linen production, in particular, became a speculative and capitalistic activity, since much of the flax and all the cotton had to be imported from outside of Normandy. Capital and commercial ties were necessary for the procurement of primary materials and, of course, the sale of final products. This period also witnessed a shift in production from the city to the surrounding countryside, as the putting-out system proved to be more economical than urban production. Linen production in Caen peaked between 1720 and 1740, whereas rural production soared by 800 percent from 1730 to 1760.5

On the eve of the Revolution, then, Caen was not predominantly a textile town. The makeup of the labor force reflected the city’s diverse economy. To be sure, textile manufacture employed nearly half of the labor engaged in urban production (as opposed to service occupations), and between 1760 and 1792 the number of textile workers had nearly doubled (from 1,343 to 2,572, of whom 1,929 were salaried workers). However, the introduction of

5. Ibid., I, 417–21.
women and children into the lace industry accounted for much of this increase. The labor force as a whole, moreover, was diverse. Service workers (including transport and commercial employees, servants, and day laborers attached to commercial enterprises) comprised 60 percent of wage earners in 1792. Wage earners represented just over 18 percent of the total population, and the textile industry employed just 30 percent of those wage earners. Compare this situation with that in the textile town of Elbeuf, where 56 percent of the population were wage earners in the 1780s and nearly all of these worked in the textile industry. Caen, by contrast, had a relatively low number of wage earners and a larger number of self-employed artisans, shopkeepers, and merchants.

As textile production became more competitive, manufacturers who could no longer compete in producing wool and linen turned to commerce. Perrot emphasizes, time and again, the commercial mentality of the people of Caen. Norman customary law regarding inheritance and division of property tended to impede capital investment (by failing to distinguish between business capital and family capital) but in no way discouraged commercial speculation. Lace was a commercial commodity par excellence—it required little capital investment, it utilized cheap labor, and its market extended from Paris and the Breton coast to the North Sea. During the 1760s, lace making generated gross product of as much as four million livres per year for Caen, an amount that outstripped by far the contributions of the other textile branches and made lace making one of the leading sources of urban wealth. In 1776, Caen boasted forty-six lace entrepreneurs, a 50-percent increase since 1750. Many lace merchants expanded their activities and became true négociants, dealing not only in lace but in other luxury commodities as well.

Between 1750 and 1789, production in Caen increased only slightly, while trade in and out of the city, by land and by sea, increased by 50 percent. The importance of commerce to the local economy is evidenced by the size of the two regional fairs in the area. Since the 1740s, the wholesale fair at Guibray (held in August) and the retail fair in Caen (held in the spring) had been the second- and third-largest fairs in France. The two fairs were complementary rather than competitive. Caen merchants controlled the

stalls at Guibray, located near Falaise, and that fair in particular attracted a national clientele.\textsuperscript{8}

Merchants from throughout northern France and as far south as Lyon attended both fairs. They offered goods ranging from drugs and spices to hardware and textiles of all sorts. Horses and cattle were also sold in most years. At mid-century, the volume and value of goods available at Guibray tended on average to be twice as great as those of goods offered at Caen. As the century progressed, that gap narrowed. In addition, after 1770, the Caen fair proved generally more successful, for approximately 75 percent of the goods brought to market there were sold, compared with 50 percent at Guibray. This attests to the growing commercial dominance of Caen within Lower Normandy.\textsuperscript{9}

The two fairs did show some decline in the latter part of the century, brought on in part by improvements in the national road network and the increasing tendency of merchants to buy directly from producers. The last outstanding year for the Caen fair was 1767, when goods valued at 8,853,000 livres were brought to market and sales totaled 6,946,000 livres. By 1778, following a period of agricultural depression, those figures had dropped to 5,719,000 and 4,191,000 livres, respectively. The last years of the Old Regime were more prosperous, however, and the royal inspector reported particularly successful fairs in 1785 and 1787. The role of these fairs in the regional economy would remain important well into the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{10}

Two periods of war contributed to the commercial boom of the late eighteenth century in Caen. Both the War of Austrian Succession (1740–1748) and the Seven Years War (1756–1763) closed the coastal shipping lanes and forced trade within France to travel overland. Forced reliance on inland routes inspired extensive road improvement efforts, particularly following the Seven Years War. This improvement, in turn, facilitated internal trade and further boosted Caen's commerce. By the 1780s, traffic was moving daily between Caen and Rouen, Paris, Alençon, and Cherbourg. Perrot describes what he calls a “Building-Transport cycle.” Each period of national road improvement was followed by major street renovation and building

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., I, 467–71, II, 729–48.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., I, 490. See also A.N. F\textsuperscript{1} 1232 (Foire de Caen), and F\textsuperscript{1} 1235 (Foire du Guibray).

\textsuperscript{10} A.N. F\textsuperscript{1} 1232; Henri Sée, “Notes sur les Foires en France et particulièrement sur les Foires de Caen au XVIII\textsuperscript{e} siècle,” Revue d'histoire économique et sociale, XV (1927), 366–85.
projects within Caen. Twenty-five streets were redone between 1750 and 1789, and major construction projects on the docks, the fairgrounds, and the grain market were carried out. Thus, the expansion of Caen’s commercial role was primarily responsible for the rapid urbanization of the city.¹¹  

Caen did not develop as a significant maritime port until late in the century. The larger part of Caen’s trade went inland, for two reasons. One was the improving condition of the royal highways. The other was the difficulty of navigation on the Orne, which followed a meandering, silt-obstructed route from Caen to the English Channel. This did not prevent Caen merchants, however, from casting longing glances toward the ports of England and the North Sea. Between 1747 and 1782, the people of Caen sent twelve petitions to Paris requesting that a major project be undertaken to make the Orne fully navigable. The 1747 petition joined the signatures of fifty-six Caen négociants with those of fifty nobles and seigneurs, who appreciated that an upgrading of the port of Caen would enhance the possibilities of selling their grain.¹² The petitioners’ dreams were partially realized in 1785 with the completion of a canal straightening the course of the Orne and making Caen accessible to small seagoing vessels. The renovations proposed in these petitions, however, would not be fully realized until the Second Empire. Indeed, the persistent aspirations of the people of Caen for major port status have consistently been thwarted, up to the present day, by the continued growth of Le Havre, Cherbourg, and Saint-Malo.  

The aspirations of the people of Limoges were not so lofty. Limoges could never become more than a regional center of trade, and its inhabitants seemed to sense that. The surrounding region boasted no thriving agriculture that might generate profits for commercial speculation. The Vienne River would never be navigable except for light boats and the occasional log boom bringing wood to the city for construction and fuel.  

The industry that had grown up around mid-century remained modest in scope on the eve of the Revolution. Textiles continued to employ the largest number of workers, approximately 30 percent of the total work force. The Laforest fabrique alone, built in 1765, employed nearly 1,800 workers by the late 1780s. The construction trades also provided work for a significant number of laborers, both in Limoges and through seasonal migration to Paris. The porcelain industry, which would make Limoges famous in the

¹². Ibid., I, 25, II, 598. For the 1747 petition, see A.N. F 142 B.
nineteenth century, was only in its infancy in the 1780s. Kaolin, the white clay used in the manufacture of porcelain, had been discovered in the area in the late 1760s. The Grellet brothers financed the first porcelain manufactory in Limoges in 1771, employing about two dozen workers. By 1783, with Gabriel Grellet now in sole control, the enterprise was selling kaolin to producers in Copenhagen, Amsterdam, St. Petersburg, Zurich, Paris, Marseille, and several other cities. In 1784, Grellet sold the manufactory to the king, and it became more or less a subsidiary of the porcelain works in Sèvres. Grellet remained as director, but business declined, perhaps because of neglect on Grellet's part. In 1785 and 1786, the accounts showed deficits of more than twenty thousand livres. The king dispatched royal inspectors to ascertain the problem, and in April, 1788, François Alluaud replaced Grellet as director. The business showed a brief resurgence, but then the Revolution intervened, and by 1794, the fledgling porcelain manufactory had virtually shut down. All three of these prominent commercial families—Laforest, Grellet, and Alluaud—would be influential in local politics during the Revolution.

The Church, the royal administrative and judicial offices, and regional commerce joined this modest industrial sector in supporting the town’s population. The local economy did improve over the course of the century and, as in Caen, the face and shape of the city changed somewhat. But credit for the urban renewal and road improvements that did take place after 1730 must go to a succession of ambitious intendants and not to the lethargic local elite. The intendants Louis Tourny (1730–1743), Anne Robert Jacques Turgot (1761–1774), and Marius Jean Baptiste Nicolas d'Aine (1775–1783) supervised the widening of roads, the demolition of the town walls, and efforts to purify the water supply. They received minimal support from the municipality, whose finances during this period have been described as “less than brilliant.” As a result, local main roads still required work in 1789, and Limoges continued to enjoy a reputation as a filthy, unpleasant city well into the nineteenth century. The walls, at least, had entirely disappeared by the 1780s.


The Limousin simply was not a wealthy province, and nothing changed that reality when a sizable portion of it became the Haute-Vienne in 1790. Indeed, with the Revolution came one disaster after another. The treaty of 1786 had mild repercussions in the Limoges textile industry, and 1788 brought the first of five successive poor harvests. In September, 1790, a serious fire ravaged a major section of Limoges. Throughout the Revolution, the department turned to its neighbors and to the national government for assistance in feeding its population. The departmental administration concluded a particularly bleak economic report to the Legislative Assembly by describing the Haute-Vienne as “one of the poorest and most unfortunate regions of the Empire.”

The Revolution, then, saw the economic contrasts between Caen and Limoges increase. Caen’s early shift from textiles into commerce spared it the crisis suffered by other northern French cities after the 1786 trade treaty between England and France. The fertile plains of Calvados rebounded more quickly from the poor harvests of 1788 and 1789 than did the inhospitable fields of the Haute-Vienne. After an abundant harvest in 1792, the infrequent shortages that recurred in Caen were caused only by the refusal of farmers to bring their grain to market. Their reluctance grew after May, 1793, when the Convention enacted the grain maximum. But it was not until the federalist revolt, when the central government prevented outside supplies from reaching Caen in the traditionally lean months on the eve of the harvest, that the grain situation became truly threatening for the people of Caen.

In the Haute-Vienne, on the other hand, grain shortages posed a persistent problem. In June, 1791, the city of Limoges owed up to 360,000 livres for grain purchases in 1789 and 1790 alone. The noble mayor of Limoges, Jean Baptiste Pétiniaud de Beaupeyrat, who had commercial contacts and credit in all the large ports of Europe, had advanced two-thirds of this sum; surrounding departments provided a portion of the grain, but purchases were also made in London, Hamburg, and Amsterdam. In No-


16. Louis Guibert, *La Dette Beaupeyrat* (Limoges, 1888). Pétiniaud, son of a bourgeois négociant who had acquired noble status for his son by purchasing the office of secrétaire du roi, was popular in Limoges when first elected mayor in 1789. He was reelected in 1790, but his popularity waned as he refused to join the Jacobin club. His requests for repayment of his loans were not popular either, and suspicions existed that he might have profited from the grain deals. Not until 1826 was the balance of 142,000 livres finally repaid to the Beaupeyrat family.
vember, 1791, a public fund drive raised nearly 22,000 livres in loans for the purchase of grain. Each year since 1787 had seen poor harvests, but 1792 promised to be more abundant. In October, however, the commissioners in charge of subsistence reported to the departmental administration that the situation had not improved. Spring frost and summer rain had ravaged what they had hoped would be a good harvest. Fog in August and frost in mid-September had hurt the buckwheat and chestnut crops. The chestnut trees, traditionally the last resource during periods of dearth, had already been severely depleted by a freeze in 1789. The departments of the Vienne, the Charente, and the Indre, suppliers of past years, were short themselves that year. Administrators predicted that the current harvest would feed the department only until February and that 600,000 quintals of grain would be needed to sustain the population through the rest of the year. The outlook for 1793 appeared bleak indeed.

The contrasting economic situations in the two towns were reflected in their patterns of population growth throughout the century. Caen’s population grew dynamically during its period of economic expansion, 1725 through 1775. In 1725, the town’s estimated population stood at just over 27,000. By 1753, that figure had grown modestly to 32,000; and the census of 1775, an accurate count, showed an impressive increase to 40,858 inhabitants, the high mark of the century. By 1793, after a period of economic stagnation and the disruption caused by the Revolution, the population had dipped to 34,996. Immigration accounted for roughly 75 percent of the population growth in Caen, with emigration responsible for virtually all of the decline. Even during the unstable early years of the Revolution, births exceeded deaths in the town. Between 1790 and 1793, when population declined by 2,799, there was a natural growth (births/deaths) of 1,211; 2,029 people moved into Caen, but 6,039 emigrated to the countryside, other towns, or abroad.

17. A.D. Haute-Vienne, L212 (correspondence, municipality of Limoges), and L215–216 (1791 grain loan, Limoges).
19. Perrot, Génése d’une ville moderne, I, 103–65. The 1725 and 1753 population figures were based on the gabelle rolls; in 1775, a rôle nominatif was compiled for half the town (probably the crowded, central districts), while population in the other half was estimated through a hearth count; in 1790, a head count was taken so that the five section boundaries could be drawn up; in 1793, a careful census was taken by municipal officials.
In Limoges, the population remained near 20,000 inhabitants throughout the century. The charity offered by the Church consistently drew the poor to Limoges, especially in hard times, but this immigration never produced a surge in population comparable to that experienced in Caen between 1750 and 1770. The general pattern of population movement in the two towns was in fact reversed. Whereas Limoges attracted the poor during periods of hardship, Caen’s population grew during prosperous times and declined in times of misfortune. This pattern prevailed during the early years of the Revolution. While Caen’s population dropped between 1790 and 1793, Limoges actually grew from 20,132 to 23,671 inhabitants during those years, despite a natural decline of 2,157.

That Limoges’ inhabitants were in general poorer than those of Caen, drawn to the town by desperate need rather than opportunity, is further evidenced by the number of “active” citizens in each town. In accordance with the law of December 22, 1789, 1,431 of the 20,132 people of Limoges paid sufficient taxes to enjoy the right to vote, whereas 3,566 out of 37,795 in Caen enjoyed that privilege. The ratio of “active” citizens to population was thus roughly 30 percent higher in Caen than in Limoges.

The dynamic population growth of Caen produced by 1789 an urban geography very different from that of Limoges. In the last half of the eighteenth century, Caen was beginning to assume the character of a modern city, particularly in the social differentiation of its neighborhoods. According to Jean-Claude Perrot, before 1770 the considerable numbers of immigrants into Caen tended to settle in the artisanal and commercial center, where they blended relatively quickly into the social fabric of the city. Around that time, however, the central parishes reached their saturation point, and a period of economic stagnation set in as well. Immigrants now settled in the faubourgs, joined there by the marginal population from the center, moving to the economically more diverse outskirts of town, where rents were lower and where a garden plot or fishing could easily supplement one’s income. By 1789, a circle of newer immigrants surrounded the band of older immigrants closer to the center. The line of the demolished town walls was replaced by an invisible boundary separating the prosperous, commercial central districts from the faubourgs, inhabited largely by the urban poor. The faubourgs resembled small villages, very tightly knit and commu-

nal, with a real sense of neighborhood solidarity. The inhabitants of those outlying districts were never well integrated in municipal affairs, either before or during the Revolution.\textsuperscript{21}

In Limoges, there was no shift of population to the faubourgs during the eighteenth century comparable to that in Caen. The town was physically smaller than Caen, and the demarcation between center and faubourgs was less severe. One reached the countryside more quickly walking from the center of Limoges, and the people of the faubourgs were thus in closer contact with their "downtown" neighbors.

R. Daudet, the principal historian of eighteenth-century Limoges urbanism, writes that while \textit{gens de robe} tended to live away from the artisanal and commercial quarter, the social differentiation of Limoges neighborhoods did not develop until the nineteenth century. Limoges neighborhoods had grown up around corporations— butchers lived on the rue Torte, tanners lived along the Enjoumard stream, and so on—and these patterns persisted at the end of the eighteenth century. The social segregation that had developed in Caen by the eve of the Revolution did not yet exist in Limoges.\textsuperscript{22}

The two towns also differed in the patterns of associational life and sociability among their inhabitants. Of particular interest here are the Freemason lodges that attracted the elite of both towns and the penitent confraternities that flourished in Limoges but were absent in Caen.

Freemason lodges first appeared in both Caen and Limoges in the 1760s. The idea that the Revolution grew out of a conspiratorial Freemason movement has long ago been laid to rest. Several studies, however, have suggested more subtle links between the social and cultural milieu of Freemason lodges and the democratic currents of the Revolution;\textsuperscript{23} It is not my intent to consider the larger question of the impact of Freemasonry on the Revolution but rather to examine Freemason lodges in Caen and Limoges as a locus of social contact. From membership rolls of the various lodges, we can gauge the extent to which the ties forged by Freemasonry carried over into political rivalries during the Revolution.\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} Daudet, \textit{L’Urbanisme à Limoges}, 56, 104.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Membership lists for Masonic lodges are located in the Salle des Manuscrits of the Biblio-
The Freemasons of Limoges have a particularly interesting history in the decade before the Revolution. In 1778, Pépiniaud de Beaupeyrat, a wealthy, noble merchant and future mayor of Limoges, sat as vénérable of the only lodge in Limoges, the Frères Unis. Four years later, an internal crisis developed within the Frères Unis, reportedly caused by Pierre Dumas, a young lawyer. The lodge assigned Pépiniaud to investigate the matter, and his report resulted in Dumas’ resignation and a splintering in the lodge. Dumas and several others immediately formed a second lodge, La Clairvoyante, which in 1783 became l’Heureuse Réunion. Members of l’Heureuse Réunion included François Alluaud, a future Jacobin and Limoges district director in the 1792–1793 term; Pierre Deroche, a Jacobin and mayor of Limoges from 1792 through 1794; Jean Baptiste Audouin, future adjunct to the minister of war, who regularly corresponded with the Limoges Jacobin club from Paris; and Pardoux Bordas, one of two Montagnards on the Haute-Vienne delegation to the National Convention. All four participated in steering Limoges and the Haute-Vienne away from federalism in 1793. Dumas himself was a Jacobin club member and sat on the departmental administration from 1790 until 1793. By contrast, the lodge of the Frères Unis in 1788 included a number of future members of the Amis de la Paix, a monarchical club responsible for considerable turmoil in Limoges from 1790 through 1792. Thus, the split among Limoges Freemasons foreshadowed, to some extent, the revolutionary conflict between Jacobins and the Amis de la Paix.

In Caen, on the other hand, all but one of the five lodges meeting in the 1780s placed members on one or more of the local administrations, and none was dominant in that respect. Far from quarreling among themselves, the Caen lodges demonstrated the compatibility and cooperativeness that characterized the Caen elite during the Revolution. The apparent social cohesion of the Caen elite was further cultivated by the town’s Académie des
Belles-lettres, which especially attracted to its meetings those men who supported Caen's urban development.25

Associations in Caen, then, tended to bind the elite together, while in Limoges the Freemasons had split into factions in the years before the Revolution. Among the lower classes of the two towns, however, quite the reverse was true. There is no trace of an organized associational life among the *menu peuple* of Caen, particularly those who had settled in the faubourgs. In Limoges, by contrast, virtually every adult male belonged to a penitent confraternity.

Seven penitent confraternities existed in Limoges at the end of the Old Regime. These lay societies, generally organized around a parish church, drew their members from all levels of society, from among the wealthy and the poor, and offered to their members a rich associational experience. Each confraternity elected officers, maintained a membership roll, recorded minutes of meetings, and made important contributions to charity and public assistance in the community, functions that by the eighteenth century had superseded the confraternities' original purpose as devotional and pietist groups. Each confraternity met in a particular parish church, but the confreres were intensely insistent on their independence from both clerical and civil authorities. After a period of decline in the late seventeenth century, the confraternities rebounded strongly in the mid-eighteenth century, and on the eve of the Revolution virtually every male head of a household in Limoges belonged to a confraternity. The importance of these organizations to Limoges' sociability is attested to by the fact that although they were suppressed by law in 1792, they revived after the Revolution and by 1809 again counted nearly four thousand members.26

Maurice Agulhon has argued that these confraternities left a substantial legacy to the popular societies that formed during the Revolution.27 The case of Limoges is among the most striking. The Limoges Jacobin club held its meetings in the former assembly hall of the *pénitents gris*, used a method of voting similar to that of the confraternity, and adopted a form of membership roll identical to that which the old confraternity had used. Jacobin club

members urged their confreres to join the club and to donate chapel funds to the patriotic contribution.\textsuperscript{28}

More importantly, the penitent groups created men who were accustomed to associational life and inculcated values that would later be associated with the Revolution. Louis Guibert writes that a commitment to equality and fraternity was among the most salient features of Limoges confraternities. Agulhon suggests that many of these men became Jacobin militants after 1789, although he does not go so far as to argue that a direct correlation exists between Jacobinism and confraternities. In Limoges, where nearly all men belonged to a penitent confraternity, obviously not all penitents became Jacobins. No clear pattern emerges from the few membership rolls that still exist, but the names of many men who were leaders in Limoges during the Revolution—François Alluaud, Jean Baptiste Audouin, de Chaise Martin (leader of the Amis de la Paix), J. Pétiniaud, and a number of other Jacobin club leaders and municipal officials—also appear as officers of Limoges confraternities in the decade before 1789.\textsuperscript{29}

One exception to the social heterogeneity of these groups was the confraternity organized around the parish of Saint-Pierre-du-Queyroix. This group distinguished itself from other Limoges confraternities in that its membership seems to have been restricted to rich négociants and petty noble families.\textsuperscript{30} No membership list survives for the Saint-Pierre penitents in the 1780s, but there may have been some continuity between this group and the Amis de la Paix.

Confraternities did not flourish in northern France, and there appears to have been no comparable social association among the lower classes of Caen. This may explain, in part, the weakness of the popular movement in Caen during the Revolution. By contrast, the existence of confraternities certainly contributed to the vitality of popular politics in Limoges in 1792 and 1793. There seems to have been a relationship linking the confraternities, the formation of the Jacobin club, and the later political divisions in Limoges, even if the evidence is suggestive rather than conclusive. Clearly, the penitent confraternities and the larger question of the link between pat-

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 279–80; Guibert, "Les Confréries," 156–57.

\textsuperscript{29} Guibert, "Les Confréries," 19, 111; A.D. Haute-Vienne, G731, 13G1, 16G14 (papers relating to penitent confraternities).

terns of sociability under the Old Regime and revolutionary politics represent fruitful areas for future research.

The social fabric of the two towns had little effect on local politics under the monarchy, because political activity itself was extremely limited. During the Revolution, this would change. But the contrasting economic situations of the two towns did have an impact on the character of their local governments at the end of the Old Regime, as it would in later years.

In Caen, the mayor, échevins, and town notables defended local prerogatives vis-à-vis the intendants and consistently protested royal encroachments. The substantial public works undertaken between 1750 and 1789 were funded principally by local taxes (both from the city and the rich, surrounding farmlands), and not by the royal treasury. The situation in Limoges was nearly the reverse. The local elite took little initiative in public improvement projects, largely because of the paltry state of municipal finances. They looked instead to the intendants for planning and to the royal coffers for support.31

The comparison here is strikingly similar to that which Tocqueville makes between the self-reliant pays d'état and the politically lethargic pays d'élection.32 Tocqueville argues that provincial self-government had been eroded in the pays d'élection by the expanding monarchical bureaucracy, leaving those regions politically inert and dependent on the central government. The economic disparity between Calvados and the Haute-Vienne had produced very different attitudes toward the central government. The burgeoning commercial community of Caen looked abroad, to foreign ports, for the source of its vitality and resented the restrictions and impositions that emanated from the capital. Limoges, on the other hand, looked to Paris and Versailles for much-needed assistance during periods of hardship. These attitudes toward the state, developing under the Old Regime as well as under the Revolution, would receive full expression during the chaotic months of the federalist revolt.