

H-France Salon  
Volume 11, 1, #11

### Choosing Sides in Revolutionary Times: the Diarists of Orléans

Peter McPhee  
University of Melbourne

The history of the momentous years of the French Revolution has always attracted a disproportionate number of outstanding historians; among them, Timothy Tackett has produced a series of unusually fine books which have earned him an enviable reputation as being in the very top rank of historians—whether French or Anglophone—writing about the period. This is an extraordinary achievement. The contribution I am writing in his honor, however, takes its inspiration from a superb article he wrote more than thirty years ago about a violent riot in the small southern town of Sommières on 30 January 1791 and the subsequent political feuding. In this town of about 3,500 people, evenly divided between Catholics and Protestants, the response of many Catholic women to the ecclesiastical reforms of 1790 was particularly visceral and violent as they expressed their anxiety, dismay, and rage about changes to familiar patterns of ritual and support. Crowds of poor women (many elderly and illiterate) and children aimed their anger both at local Protestants and pro-revolutionary Catholic administrators deemed complicit in destroying religious and social certainty.<sup>1</sup>

The place of religious attachment in the choices men and women had to make after 1789 and in particular after 1792 is one of the questions which has most intrigued Tim Tackett. I am offering another approach to it, through a case-study of Orléans, a very different place to Sommières—a major provincial town of almost 45,000 people, and overwhelmingly Catholic. It is not an easy place to study the French Revolutionary period because of the extensive damage to its archives during German bombing in 1940. We are dependent for much of the detail on pre-war historians, such as the massive chronicle established during the July Monarchy by the priest Denis Lottin and the interwar work of Georges Lefebvre. Lefebvre, born in 1874, was teaching high school in Orléans at the end of World War I and undertook a study of the economic and social structures of the region before and during the Revolution. It was completed in 1944 and published posthumously by Albert Soboul as *Études orléanaises* in 1962.<sup>2</sup>

My case-study is based on the diaries of four people from in and around Orléans—a parish priest, a wine-barrel maker and two seamstresses. The conviction that they were living in extraordinary times

---

<sup>1</sup> Timothy Tackett, “Women and Men in Counterrevolution: The Sommières Riot of 1791,” *Journal of Modern History* 59, no. 4 (December 1987): 680-704.

<sup>2</sup> Denis Lottin, *Recherches historiques sur la ville d’Orléans, depuis Aurélien, l’an 274, jusqu’en 1789* (Orléans: Jacob, 1836-7), 5 vols.; Georges Lefebvre, *Études orléanaises* (Paris: CNRS, 1962), 2 vols. A more recent survey is Jacques Debal, Jean Vassort and Christian Poitou, eds. *Histoire d’Orléans et de son terroir* (Le Couteau, France: Horvath, 1982), vol. 2, *XVIIe, XVIIIe et XIXe siècles*, ch. IV.

led two working women of the St-Paul parish in the heart of the town to begin diaries in 1788.<sup>3</sup> Jeanne-Victoire Dellezigne (or Delzigne) was a twenty-year old apprentice dressmaker; Marie-Anne Charpentier was probably a little older but also from an artisan background, and decided to keep a diary of “only what I see with my own eyes”. So these precious and very rare accounts—114 and 94 pages respectively—tell us about marketplaces and public contention rather than male spaces such as electoral assemblies and municipal council meetings. Their entries are lucid and direct accounts, albeit often marked by distinctive spelling: Dellezigne referred to the “cens culote” and the “giuatine”, and supplied the words of the “A cayra!” and its hatred of “les haristrocatre”. From 1786 to 1818 the priest of St-Denis-en-Val, located in Orléans’ food bowl just across the River Loire, kept a remarkably detailed diary of 190 pages, chronicling the weather, crop prices, his religious services, and an annual reflection on relative prosperity or penury, while inserting occasional political remarks. The latter were often as perfunctory as his comments on the weather, but his blunt republican patriotism transpires occasionally. The fourth diary was kept across almost the same period by one of the priest’s parishioners, a landowner and wine-barrel maker named Billard.<sup>4</sup>

The women’s accounts began with events that also shocked the other two diary-keepers: the summer hailstorms in July 1788 which devastated crops across northern France. Thereafter, a bitterly cold winter was followed by torrential rains which fractured ice in the Loire into devastating blocks which smashed the river defences at St-Denis in January 1789, inundating the lowlands, drowning livestock, and flooding the textile works. Jeanne-Victoire Dellezigne headed her first page “1789, a year of sadness everywhere”.<sup>5</sup> But this was a rare personal comment from Dellezigne, whose diary is an extraordinarily detailed, observant chronicle until it abruptly ended in April 1796.

The female diarists reported on the highly charged atmosphere of debate and reform in 1789, fueled by anxiety about the price and availability of foodstuffs, in Orléans much as in Paris. At the time of the Estates-General elections on 24-25 April, river-workers on the Loire invaded the town, smashing windows and menacing grain merchants. The food riot lasted thirty hours and resulted in a merchant’s house being demolished. Finally, troops were sent in with orders to suppress it without mercy, which they did, killing an estimated ninety-six people.<sup>6</sup> Despite the bumper crop of 1789, Orléans remained

---

<sup>3</sup> Archives départementales du Loiret (hereafter ADL) 2J 1983 “Liste des événements arrivés dans la ville d’Orléans, 1788-1848” (Marie-Anne Charpentier); 2J 1984 “Journal orléanais, 1787-1797” (Jeanne-Victoire Dellezigne). Charpentier married one Rougeaux, and some additions were made after 1823 by Sophie Rougeaux. Dellezigne, the daughter of a hat-maker, was born in 1769 and died, unmarried, in 1855, aged 86. She was sometimes referred to as Delzigne, and lived in the Rue de Tabour. I incorrectly identified her as Delzigne in *Liberty or Death: The French Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016). On their church of St-Paul, see Pierre Hamel and Pierre Jouvellier, “L’Église Saint-Paul d’Orléans”, *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de l’Orléanais*, Société archéologique et historique de l’Orléanais, t. 2, n° 9 (1961): 12-14.

<sup>4</sup> ADL Paul Guillaume, “La Vie dans l’Orléanais de 1788 à 1818, d’après le journal inédit d’une famille”, ms, Orléans c1960; ADL J 557, “Journal du curé de St-Denis-en-Val (1786-1818)”.

<sup>5</sup> ADL 2J 1984.

<sup>6</sup> Lottin, *Recherches*, vol. 3, 47-50. See also “Journal de Silvain Rousseau, marchand grainetier à Orléans, place du Martroy, à l’enseigne du barillet, décédé à Orléans le 8 septembre 1805,” 3 vols, 1766-1805, Orléans: manuscript held by the Société Archéologique et Historique de l’Orléanais.

vulnerable to grain shortages as much of its crops were exported to Paris. On 12 September, royal troops escorting grain through the Place du Martroi, in the heart of the town, were attacked with stones and flower-pots thrown from windows. A huge crowd from villages south of the river then converged on Orléans but were forced back. One rioter was summarily tried and hanged on the Place as troops restored order.<sup>7</sup>

Local participation rates in the municipal elections of January 1790 were high and the mood buoyant. Almost 90 per cent of eligible voters in Orléans elected the new council.<sup>8</sup> But increasing awareness that large numbers of fellow citizens, particularly among the old elites, did not share the same revolutionary *élan* as patriots sparked gatherings of increasing numbers of revolutionary supporters, led by national guardsmen, in a “federation movement.” From humble beginnings along the Loire in 1789, this movement spread across the nation. In May 1790, about 3,500 delegates from well over one hundred nearby towns and villages assembled on 9 May south of Orléans to take oaths. As they returned to the city, diarists reported that municipal officers had to rescue a noble refusing to respond to requests to shout “Vive Le Roi! Vive la Nation!” and had to imprison him for his own safety as crowds sought to seize and hang him.<sup>9</sup>

There was general acceptance of revolutionary religious reforms in Orléans, led by the bishop, even though the city’s twenty-five parishes were reduced to six. About 90 per cent of clergy took the constitutional oath in the Loiret department. However, the Pope’s intransigence led many religious to subsequently retract their oaths, such as an Orléans seminary prior who informed the mayor that he was “no longer being able to resist the cries of my conscience ... I prefer indigence and death to the misfortune of being separated from the leader [of the Church] and members”.<sup>10</sup> And, even though her parish church of St-Paul was one of the six remaining open for worship, for the devout Marie-Anne Charpentier it was the church reforms above all which convinced her that the Revolution was evil: her first negative comments about the Revolution were on 16 May 1791 when she reported that “*la canaille*” had destroyed marble statuary in the cathedral of Ste-Croix.

In contrast, the patriotic priest from St. Denis-en-Val across the river from Orléans simply noted that elections had been held for parish positions and expressed no sympathy whatsoever for non-jurors or anxiety after the Pope’s strictures. The *curé* was soon convinced that it was counterrevolutionaries’ malevolence and duplicity that caused the nation’s woes. In June 1791 he noted simply in his diary that “the King had fled to escape with his wife and children to join his brothers outside France, but it was good fortune for France that he was arrested at Varennes ....”<sup>11</sup>

---

Rousseau left this 600-page diary of matters affecting his business but also about political life. He was at first enthusiastic about the Revolution, but from 1792 increasingly anxious about popular unrest.

<sup>7</sup> ADL J 557; 2J 1983, 1984; Lottin, *Recherches*, vol. 3, 59-60.

<sup>8</sup> Lottin, *Recherches*, vol. 3, 77-79. In general, see Malcolm Crook, *Elections in the French Revolution: An Apprenticeship in Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Melvin Edelstein, *The French Revolution and the Birth of Electoral Democracy* (London: Ashgate, 2014).

<sup>9</sup> Lottin, *Recherches*, vol. 3, 120-50; ADL J 557; 2J 1984.

<sup>10</sup> Lottin, *Recherches*, vol. 3, 314-15.

<sup>11</sup> ADL J 557.

In Orléans, as in much of northern France, summer and autumn 1792 were months when a combination of military crisis and political uncertainty after the king's overthrow combined into a visceral hatred of the people's enemies. The September massacres spread to Orléans where, on 16 September, a crowd killed a grain merchant who allegedly shouted, "If you're not happy with the price, go and eat grass!", and paraded his head through the streets. They then sacked houses of merchants, burning their furniture on the Place du Martroi before these agreed to cut the price of a 9lb loaf from 24 to 20 *sous*.<sup>12</sup> From late 1792 the diarists of Orléans were regularly confronted with the reality of war and counterrevolution, with mass movements of troops and prisoners to and from the Vendée, and prisoners of war from the east being transported to the prisons of the west coast.

Orléans' department of Loiret had been solidly pro-revolutionary but had elected mostly Girondins in September 1792 alongside the Jacobin Léonard Bourdon. In November the *Société populaire* of Orléans appealed to the National Convention for moderation and order: "Paris, you believed yourself to be another Rome and you are only the commune of Paris: we are not your allies; we are your brothers, your equals."<sup>13</sup> Then, on 15 March 1793, three deputies on mission were humiliated on Orléans' streets, with young men climbing onto their carriage to spit at them. The next day Bourdon himself was physically assaulted to shouts of "go and join Le Peletier!", in reference to the regicide former noble murdered after the final vote at the king's trial. But the repression meted out by representatives of the beleaguered National Convention seemed disproportionate to local expressions of discontent. Sixty people were arrested and nine tried by the Revolutionary Tribunal. On 13 July, the same day that Charlotte Corday assassinated Jean-Paul Marat, these nine citizens went to the Paris guillotine in the red shirts of parricides for assaulting the deputies-on-mission.<sup>14</sup>

However, Orléans was by no means a counter-revolutionary city. For example, the priest of St-Denis-en-Val reported the king's execution "for having conspired in the counter-revolution" in his diary without emotion and showed no sympathy whatever for fellow priests arrested in the Vendée by "*nos braves sans-culottes*." To celebrate the final abolition of seigneurial titles, as well as the anniversary of the monarchy's overthrow, diarists recorded that the festival of 10 August 1793 in Orléans included the burning of eighteen carriages of feudal titles.<sup>15</sup> The priest accepted without complaint in 1793 the inventory and seizure of precious metals in his church and the new calendar (although he himself did not use it). He simply noted that on 21 October a metal rooster and liberty cap had been placed on top of his steeple; ten days later he noted twenty-one Girondin deputies had been guillotined "for wanting to betray the Convention and the whole of France".<sup>16</sup> The same was true of the Hébertists in March 1794.

Dellezigne reported in great detail everything from prices of foodstuffs to public strife with minimal commentary. As was her practice, she simply noted that the annual May procession for Jeanne d'Arc

---

<sup>12</sup> ADL J 557; 2J 1983, 1984; Lefebvre, *Études*, vol. 2, 62-67.

<sup>13</sup> Lottin, *Recherches*, vol. 3, 429-31.

<sup>14</sup> ADL 2J 1983, 1984; Debal *et al*, *Histoire*, vol. 2, 81; Michael J. Sydenham, *Léonard Bourdon : The Career of a Revolutionary* (Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2006), ch. 7.

<sup>15</sup> ADL, J 557.

<sup>16</sup> ADL J 557.

was not conducted in 1793 “because it was *ancien régime*”. In contrast, Charpentier was outraged that the statue (or parts: it is not clear) of Jeanne d’Arc in the former Rue Royale – now Rue de l’Égalité – was seized in August 1792 to be melted down for arms manufacturing. The feast of Pentecost could not be celebrated in the cathedral in 1793 because so many soldiers were billeted there. While she reported in great detail the republican festival of 28 April 1793, she found it “pitiful” that the constitutional bishop and clergy attended wearing red liberty caps. Surprisingly, however, when on 22 October 1793 Charpentier reported that her own *curé* Paris of St-Paul had married, she was not shocked; on the contrary she found it particularly “*édifiant*” when priests married former nuns.

Across the nation, a triangular battle was played out in 1793-94 between the military needs of the Republic, the large-scale producers of grain crops in particular, and urban populations determined both to avoid paying very high prices for bread and ensure there was enough for local consumption. The diaries of the two artisan women of Orléans make clear that this was for them essentially a period of fearful shortages in which local Jacobins’ elaborate festivals seemed meagre alternatives to older religious rituals. The priest of St-Denis-en-Val also recorded in his diary that in April-May 1794 “there was no bread to be had at the bakers. It was the greatest misery that anyone had ever seen, since a number of people went several days without eating”. He seems to have felt more sympathy for them than for his fellow priest Pierre Porche, a non-juror found hiding in his uncle’s wardrobe and guillotined.<sup>17</sup> Unlike Marie-Anne Charpentier, the priest expressed his rage and despair at the former king and the counter-revolution for the daily privations he had to observe.

\*\*\*

For all French people, the potentially deadly choices of mid-1793 were a matter of individual and family choice based on the perceived desirability of revolutionary change, and, in this, attitudes to religion were crucial. Everywhere, however, people disagreed, accepting some changes with relish and opposing or sidestepping others. Everywhere, however, they had made up their minds.

So what do these four diaries suggest about “choosing sides in revolutionary times”?<sup>18</sup> This is not a simple question. Although the diarists made their views plain, to varying degrees, none of them reflected explicitly on why they had come to such points of view. Already by mid-1791, however, these four individuals were making up their minds that pervasive insecurity resulted from either counterrevolutionary malevolence or revolutionary destruction.

The choices people made by 1793 were a function of individual and family position and outlook, but these were embedded in the particular circumstances of the person’s gender, occupation,

---

<sup>17</sup> ADL J 557; 2J 1983, 1984.

<sup>18</sup> General discussions of choice are by Timothy Tackett, *Religion, Revolution and Regional Culture in Eighteenth-Century France: The Ecclesiastical Oath of 1791* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), ch. 11; Peter M. Jones, “Choosing Revolution and Counter-Revolution” in McPhee, ed. *A Companion to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013); Michel Vovelle, *La Découverte de la politique* (Paris: Découverte, 1993); Laurent Brassart, “‘Plus de vingt paysanneries contrastées en révolution’: De la pluralité des dynamiques sociales du politique en milieu rural pendant la révolution” *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 359 (2010): 53-74; McPhee, *Liberty*, ch. 10.

neighborhood and region. Like other French people, our four diarists made choices on the basis of how they felt the Revolution had advantaged or disadvantaged themselves, in both material and emotional ways. The key determinants may have been material but were also affective: in particular, the place of the Catholic Church in one's life and the personal resonance of revolutionary ideas. Where revolutionary change had disrupted valued rhythms of spiritual and community life without compensating material improvement, or had caused impoverishment, then an individual was most likely to be opposed to the Revolution, as in Marie-Anne Charpentier's case. Where people had a distant or hostile relationship with the Church elite, like the parish priest, then the promise of a new social order was most likely to be appealing.

Historians know to be judicious when considering the motivations of people in the past, even when we are fortunate to have lengthy diaries such as those from Orléans discussed in this essay. With all due caution, however, we may align the attitudes of our four diarists with what else we know about common reactions to the French Revolution, especially as mediated through degrees of religious commitment. The two women of the St-Paul parish seem to have reacted to the Revolution in response to economic uncertainty and reforms to the Church. As captured movingly long ago by Olwen Hufton, these responses were visceral: even though their parish and its priest remained in place, they were acutely aware of wider changes to the Church which they saw as intrinsic to the economic uncertainties which so threatened them.<sup>19</sup> Neither commented on their priest, who was perhaps the man who had taught them to write. There was a stark contrast between Charpentier and Dellezigne, however, as the former's horror at those events finally took precedence over detail while the latter remained true to her intention of keeping a detailed and detached record of events, including the secular revolutionary negation of the Jeanne d'Arc cult.

The wine-barrel maker of St-Denis-en-Val seems like one of the great mass of peasant landowners who would never regret the great reforms of 1789 that so benefitted them but for whom disruption to church ritual combined with economic uncertainty and the menace of war were sources of deep anxiety and resentment after 1791. In contrast, his parish priest, convinced that the Revolution was the victory of justice and equality, was furious with all those whom he, from the time of the king's attempted flight, blamed for the bloodshed. The priest came from a region where demands for sweeping Church reforms, often couched in "secularized" tone, had characterized the district's *cahiers* in 1789, and he evidently agreed with them.<sup>20</sup>

What is challenging and provocative in Tim Tackett's latest book, *The Coming of the Terror*, is his focus on a "proto-Terrorist mentality" in the Revolution's early years, the so-called "liberal Revolution", when a will to create a constitutional monarchy based on individual rights was sapped by the Revolution's opponents. Tackett argues that the threat—real as well as imagined—of counter-revolution was a dynamic in creating this obsessive mentality, but he goes further in suggesting that the "force of circumstance" thesis for the Terror is not enough, that there was also a mindset predisposed to believing in a Manichean struggle which led to the Terror. This is what is most

---

<sup>19</sup> Olwen Hufton, "Women in Revolution, 1789-1796" *Past & Present* 53 (1971): 90-108. See, too, another rare woman's diary: Marie-Victoire Monnard, *Souvenirs d'une femme du peuple, 1777-1802* (Creil : Bernard Dumerchez, 1989).

<sup>20</sup> ADL 2J 1978; Gaël Rideau, "De l'impôt à la sécularisation: reconstruire l'église," *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 345 (2006): 3-29; Tackett, *Religion*, ch. 11.

provocative about his brilliant discussion, for the “force of circumstance” thesis has been the comfortable explanation of generations of historians, myself included, who have argued that it was actual, and not imagined, counter-revolution that drove revolutionaries to impose martial law and sweeping surveillance and repression in 1793. Certainly, however, there is no trace in these diaries of a mentality that one could describe as “proto-Terrorist”.

But why the willingness to believe in conspiracy? Tackett emphasizes the power vacuum after 1789, the horror of returning to an increasingly caricatured Ancien Régime, and a culture of suspicion. It is true indeed that there are traces in these diaries of a rhetoric of verbal imagery which defined opponents as conspirators, traitors and enemies. While Tackett argues that this rhetoric was not strong before the Revolution but emerged rapidly after 1789, I would suggest that there survived a previous culture of autocracy which created fertile soil for rumor. This is not surprising in a society where until 1789 politics was the preserve of court factions and their intrigues and where the Church expelled the troublesome as heretics.

The power of rumor was increased by the difficulty of rapid communication, which created a context in which news was delayed and inflated. Charpentier reported solemnly that the *sans-culottes* had killed 5,000 (not 800) of the king’s guards in August 1792. Like Tackett, I would stress that rumors of conspiracies to reimpose the Ancien Régime were fueled by news of actual counterrevolutionary activities and, in regions close to the frontiers, by fear of invasion and war. Once the king attempted to flee in June 1791 and his fellow monarchs felt impelled to voice more bellicose attitudes to the Revolution, such rumors of war sharpened the certainty that counterrevolution was even more dangerous than it was. Just as clear, however, is evidence that the women diarists also used Parisian newspapers to write detailed reports, for example, on the death of Louis XVI.

\*\*\*

In Orléans, minds remained convinced after 9 Thermidor. The patriotic priest could not bring himself to write anything about Robespierre’s execution, but Maximilien almost immediately became the personification of “the Terror” across France and the subject of preposterous claims and rumours. Charpentier was also strangely silent about Robespierre, but Jeanne-Victoire Dellezigne made her only openly political statement when she wrote solemnly in her diary on 2 August 1794 that:

the good fortune for those who had been imprisoned as suspects was that as soon as Robespierre was dead all the prisons of France were opened ... Robespierre had said before his death that my head is going to be cut off but they won’t cut off my *queue* (penis), which is much worse ...<sup>21</sup>

The years after 1794 were times of protracted instability and economic uncertainty for a region such as the Orléanais which was so dependent on the grain trade. The collapse of charity and structures of law enforcement impelled some to criminality. On 19 Vendémiaire Year III (11 October 1795) a band of twenty-one men and women from Orléans bound a farmer and tortured him to reveal the

---

<sup>21</sup> ADL 2J 1984. On the obsession with Robespierre’s *queue* (tail or penis), see Antoine de Baecque, *Glory and Terror: Seven Deaths Under the French Revolution* (Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2013), 160-65; Howard G. Brown, “Robespierre’s Tail: The Possibilities of Justice After the Terror,” *Canadian Journal of History* 45, no. 3 (2016): 503-36.

whereabouts of his money.<sup>22</sup> Two of the band were guillotined, but for the next two years the Beauce region between Orléans and Paris was terrified by the much larger “bande d’Orgères”, an organized, violent sub-culture of perhaps 150 men and women of all ages whose violent forays resulted in 75 murders. There was also food-rioting in Orléans. On 13 February 1795 hungry women confronted the deputy-on-mission Porcher, wanting to know if they all had to die of hunger and shouting “Vive Louis XVII! May the nation go to the devil with its republic!”<sup>23</sup> So meagre were town food supplies by May that Charpentier wrote in her diary that “those who see these writings will shudder at the great misery their fathers and mothers suffered during this cruel revolution and seeing their poor children asking for bread without being able to give them any”.<sup>24</sup>

In 1796, St-Paul’s stand-alone *clocher* had been sold to the architect Benoît Lebrun, one of many purchases he made, and only virulent parish opposition convinced him not to demolish it.<sup>25</sup> The next year, however, Charpentier expressed her joy at the re-opening of churches at Easter, including her own: “all right-thinking people were delighted to see churches open which had been so soiled by a group of scoundrels who had committed so many ignominious acts in all the temples consecrated to God.” But she was scathing that markets continued to follow the revolutionary calendar, which she refused to use in her diary. Sometimes a market day even fell on a Sunday: “those who follow their religion mocked this abomination”.<sup>26</sup>

The patriotic priest of St-Denis-en-Val did not use the republican calendar in his diary but, unlike the pious women of Orléans, he was intransigent in his opposition to the refractory clergy he saw as “counter-revolutionary”. He was outraged when the abbé Étienne-Alexandre Bernier was named Bishop of Orléans by Napoleon in 1802. Bernier had refused to take the Civic Oath in 1791 and in 1793 joined the Vendée insurrection, where he became a leader. He negotiated the peace with General Hoche and under Napoleon was appointed to negotiate the reunification of nation and church with the Papal delegation of Pius VII, leading to the 1801 Concordat. For the priest, however, this new bishop was totally unacceptable: in his longest diary entry he fulminated against Bernier, who had led the counter-revolution “with a crucifix in one hand and a pistol in the other”, in a civil war in which “the father killed his son or the son killed his father and his mother, where one brother killed the other, the uncle killed the nephew or the nephew killed the uncle and aunt ....” The Church hierarchy’s reestablishment in the diocese, and the new oaths he was obliged to take, were reported without emotion or pleasure.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Lottin, *Recherches*, vol. 5, 413.

<sup>23</sup> ADL, J 557. On the highway bands, see Michel Vovelle, “From Beggary to Brigandage: The Wanderers in the Beauce During the French Revolution,” in Jeffrey Kaplow, ed. *New Perspectives on the French Revolution* (New York: Wiley, 1965), 287-304; Richard Cobb, *Reactions to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), ch. 5.

<sup>24</sup> ADL, 2J 1983.

<sup>25</sup> Pierre Hamel and Pierre Jouvellier, “Le mobilier de l’église Saint-Paul d’Orléans d’après d’anciens inventaires,” *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de l’Orléanais* 4 (1965): 18-28; Jacques-Henri Pelletier, “L’ancien théâtre d’Orléans et l’architecte Benoît Lebrun,” *Mémoires de la société d’agriculture, sciences, belles-lettres et arts d’Orléans*, Académie d’Orléans, 6<sup>e</sup> série, t. 1 (October 1992): 130-31.

<sup>26</sup> ADL 2J 1983.

<sup>27</sup> ADL J 557.



The priest rarely referred to Napoleon. In contrast, two of the other diaries underline the importance of the hopes invested in the general for a return to religious stability just as much as for military glory. The wine-barrel maker Billard noted with pleasure that “on 3 January 1803, for the first time since the Terror, mass was celebrated on the great altar” of Orléans’ cathedral. A few months later, thirty-nine boys and twenty-four girls took their first communion in his own parish church of St-Denis, as the priest recorded. The Concordat was Marie-Anne Charpentier’s great comfort: she reported with exuberance and great detail the celebration of Easter 1802 at Notre Dame in Paris and she blessed Napoleon for having brought peace to the Church and, after so many victories, peace to France. She noted that she had not seen that mass with her own eyes, as she had promised at the opening of her diary, but had read about it, and “believe[d] it to be true”, in the *Gazette de France*.<sup>28</sup> Her joy was complete when she saw the new statue of Jeanne d’Arc—“*la pucelle d’Orléans*”—unveiled on the Place du Martroi in 1804.<sup>29</sup> When Charpentier closed her account in that year of “only what she had seen with her own eyes” since 1788, she was sure that later generations would know that “their ancestors had suffered during the revolution of that century” and hoped that “God would show the grace to allow you to pass through theirs more easily”. The great floods of the summer of 1804 offered the final proof that “the world has never been as perverted as at the present time and that God sends us these scourges.”

Peter McPhee  
University of Melbourne

*H-France Salon*

ISSN 2150-4873

Copyright © 2019 by the H-France, all rights reserved.

---

<sup>28</sup> ADL 2J 1983, J 557, Guillaume, “La Vie dans l’Orléanais”.

<sup>29</sup> See Françoise Michaud-Fréjaville, “Orléans et le culte public de ses saints fondateurs,” *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* 12 (2005): 131-41.