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Abstract

The Parlement of Paris undertook the confiscation of the Jesuit property in its territory in 1762. On the order of the Parlement, local officials seized the Jesuits' colleges, noviciates, professed house, missions, and attached property, including ecclesiastical benefices. Adopting the principle that Jesuit property should fulfill Jesuit obligations, the court then decided to repay the creditors of the Jesuits and to pay pensions to former Jesuits with the revenues raised by the sale or leasing of Jesuit property. In practice, however, it subordinated these intentions to another: to maintain the Jesuits' colleges and attached property, under its own auspices.

Commissioners of the Parlement decided on a new form of administration for most former Jesuit colleges and persuaded the crown to authorize it in the Edict of February 1763. According to this statute, local bureaux of administration would oversee the affairs of the colleges and appoint secular teachers. But this policy was not followed. By 1771, the Parlement and the new bureaux had begun to neglect the colleges; by 1789, many were again in the hands of religious congregations and in financial trouble.

In the meantime, the Parlement had fashioned a centralized administration to hold or to sell all the other Jesuit property under its jurisdiction. In April 1762, it created provincial économes séquestres under the direction of the Econome Séquestre of Paris. Together, they administered all Jesuit property until it was taken over by college bureaux or other officials. The work of most économes séquestres was finished in the initial five years of the confiscation, although the
first Econome Séquestre of Paris held property until 1781. He did the bulk of his work before 1774, and at the time of his death and bankruptcy in 1781, his holdings and debts were small.

Similarly, in May 1762, the Parlement authorized the creditors of the French Jesuits to form a union to advance their claims. The syndics of the Union of Creditors were supposed to sell the Jesuit property assigned to the Union and to repay the members' capital and interest. By 1790, they had repaid most of the capital but not the interest, and their administrative expenses had been great. Nevertheless, the syndics had dealt conscientiously with all recognized creditors, according to traditional legal practices.

On the recommendation of the Parlement, the crown created a third part of the administration in February 1763. It authorized the Econome Général du Clergé, who already held vacant benefices in the king's nomination, to administer Jesuit benefices, and, with their revenue, to pay Jesuit pensions. In practice, the crown departed slightly from the principle that Jesuit property should pay for Jesuit needs. It sometimes used the revenue from the benefices for its own purposes. In return, it offered the Econome Général du Clergé grants from the Royal Treasury for pensions. Hence, although an Econome Général declared his bankruptcy in 1787, the payment of Jesuit pensions was assured until the Revolution.

The Revolutionaries put an end to the entire administration. They nationalized all Jesuit property which had not passed into private hands before 1789, including former Jesuit colleges. And they severed the connection between the Jesuits' property and their obligations. The state assumed responsibility for paying the surviving Jesuits' pensions and the outstanding claims of the creditors of the Jesuits, from the Public Treasury. By 1798, the affairs of the administration
created by the Parlement and crown had been taken over by the bureaucracy of the new French state and of the new municipality and department of Paris. The new state put an official end to the unfinished business arising from the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762.
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Note on French words used in the text

Whenever a French word, or, more often, a French title of an office-holder, has no English equivalent, that French word or title has appeared in the text and has been underscored to indicate that it is indeed a foreign word, not intended to be translated or anglicized. In the case of well-known French titles with English equivalents (example: Controller General of Finances), the English equivalent has been used. In the case of obscure French titles or other nouns with no English equivalent (example: Econome Général du Clergé or sénéchaussée) the French has been retained. The name of the Parlement of Paris (or of the Châtelet) has been deliberately kept in French.

Many French words have entered the English language and have been given English pronunciation. To spell Parlement as "Parlement" and to pronounce it as though it were our own word "Parliament" is misleading. The Parlement with which this thesis is so much concerned was a court, not an assembly, and its legislative and judicial functions are by far its most important ones in the history told here. The retention of the French word Parlement is a reminder of this fact.

It has often been difficult to determine whether a French title left in French should be capitalized or not. Eighteenth century secretaries capitalized most titles, but not all, and excessive capitalization is confusing in a twentieth-century English text. Hence, the rule followed in this thesis has been to capitalize the title of a specific office when it described a particular man (example: the Econome Séquestre of Paris, Edme-Louis Bronod) and to use the lower case when the title refers to a general category of officials (example:
the *économes séquestres* in the provinces). It has frequently been difficult to be entirely consistent—a weakness which the eighteenth century French writers on this subject also displayed.
A List of Jesuit institutions under the
jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in 1761

Colleges of:

Aire (Sainte Marthe)
Amiens (Saint Nicolas)
Angoulême (Saint Louis)
Arras
Aurillac
Auxerre (Saint-Xiste)
Bar-le-Duc
Béthune
Billom
Blois
Bourges (Sainte Marthe)
Châlons-sur-Marne
Charleville
Chaumont-en-Bassigny
Clermont-Ferrand
Compiègne (Collège Royal)
Eu
Fontenay-le-Comte
Hesdin
La Flèche (Collège Henri IV)
Langres
Laon
La Rochelle (Collège Royal)
Lyon (La Trinité)
(Notre-Dame de Bon-Secours)
Mâcon
Mauriac
Moulins (Sainte Marie)
Nevers
Orléans
Paris (Louis-le-Grand, formerly Collège de Clermont)
Poitiers (Collège Royal de Sainte Marthe)
Reims
Roanne
Saint-Flour
Saint-Omer (Collège Wallon)
(Collège Anglais)
Sens
Tours
Pensionnats attached to Colleges of:

Arras
Bourges
Clermont Ferrand
La Flèche
Lyon, Collège of La Trinité
Moulins
Poitiers (Collège de Puygarreau)
             (Collège Irlandais)
Reims

Residences:

Guéret
Pontoise

Noviciates:

Lyon (Saint Joseph)
Paris (rue Pot-de-Fer)

Professed house:

Paris (Saint Louis, rue Saint-Antoine)

Independent mission:

Bapaume

Seminaries:

La Rochelle
Nevers (Saint-Sauveur)
Reims
Introduction

The history of the suppression of the Jesuits in France in 1762 and the years that followed has been told before and is readily available in the standard works. But the history of the confiscation of Jesuit property, which accompanied that suppression, has not been told before. It has been treated generally in histories of the Jesuit order, histories of the Parlement of Paris, and histories of French education. None of those histories explains fully why, how, or with what effects the confiscation occurred, however. It has been the purpose of this dissertation to discover the answers to those questions.

Since the Jesuit order owned a great deal of property in France in 1762, it was sensible to restrict this study to one geographical area of France. The jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris was the logical choice, since it was that parlement which initiated the policies and passed the legislation which led to the confiscation of Jesuit property everywhere in the kingdom. Since the Parlement of Paris made the decisions which affected every other part of France, to study the confiscation in its territory is to study France in microcosm. Moreover, since the Parlement of Paris deliberately made decisions intended to affect the whole kingdom, and since it created several administrations which worked beyond the strictly geographical limits of its authority, to study the confiscation in its jurisdiction is often to study France as a whole. What follows is intended to be a specific study with a wide application. It is doubtful whether the study would have been more illuminating if it had dealt with the confiscation of all colleges, noviciates, professed houses, residences, and missions in France rather
than just those in that central one-third of France over which the Parlement of Paris had so much direct power.

The research for this thesis, then, was undertaken to find out the reasons for the confiscation and the ways in which that confiscation was carried out. The result has been the history of three centralized and interconnected administrations: the administration of the économies séquestres, the administration of the syndics of the Union of Creditors, and the administration of the Econome Général du Clergé. These administrations have been studied from their creation to their end.

The nature of the evidence made it more feasible to discover what kind of administration seized, held, and eventually disposed of the property than to study the fate of the property per se. It would have been interesting to find out exactly how specific pieces of Jesuit property changed hands in the fifty-two years of the suppression of the Jesuit order in France, but this kind of inquiry would have called for many more years of research or else the choice of too limited a geographical area. The second alternative would not have permitted me to discover the general characteristics of the administration directed from Paris.

Hence, this dissertation is a history of administration rather than a history of property. The exercise would have been a barren one if its only intention had been to describe the functions which the administration was intended to perform, however. Individual administrators had precise duties to carry out, and these duties have been described. But it has also been my intention to discover whether or not they performed those duties. The intervention of the Revolutionaries in the affairs of the old régime administrators and the Revolutionaries' readiness to judge the officials appointed by the royal government and the Parlement of Paris generated a fund of information on this subject. It is possible
to know what the creators and contemporary judges of the administration which seized, held, and disposed of Jesuit property thought of the administration. It is also possible to know what late eighteenth century critics of the old régime thought of it, and how they would have improved it. The story comes to a natural conclusion in 1790 to 1798, when the Revolutionaries put an end to the work of the old régime administrators of Jesuit property and attempted to provide new solutions to the problems created by the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762.

Because of a clerical error, this dissertation contains no page 245. The text on page 244 is continued immediately on the page numbered 246. All subsequent pages are numbered consecutively after page 246.
Part I

The Background
Chapter I  The Jesuit property under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris at the time of the confiscation

I Jesuit education

The Jesuits owned a great deal of property in the territory of the Parlement of Paris at the time of the confiscation.\(^1\) By 1762, most of the property which the Jesuits held there, as well as in other parts of France, consisted either of colleges or of property attached to colleges. The order had acquired this property over the previous two centuries, as its members had become the chief teachers of France. To understand the nature of Jesuit property under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in 1762, we may begin by considering how the Jesuits had assumed such an important role in French life.

The original vow which Ignatius Loyola and his six companions had made on 15 August 1534, expressed no expectation that the Jesuits would rapidly become the most important teaching order in Western Europe. Ignatius's first intention had been to create a company of preachers and ministers of the word of God, who, although well-trained in the new humanism, would not undertake any formal teaching. Even the intellectual preparation of the first Jesuit recruits was to be entrusted to the universities, while within the company there were to be, in the words of Ignatius, "neither lessons nor houses of instruction".\(^2\) In 1540, in accordance with this plan and Paul III's bull of the same year, which authorized Jesuits to open residential colleges in existing universities, Ignatius sent his first postulants to the University of Paris.\(^3\)

In Paris, the postulants lived together in special colleges and undertook the studies required by the university. Gradually, however,
to introduce a certain formality lacking in the courses given at the university, Jesuit scholastics began to supervise the work of the postulants. At the same time, for reasons which are not entirely clear, but which included a desire to profit from the formal instruction given by the scholastics, non-Jesuit students began to seek admission to these colleges. This development coincided with Ignatius's acceptance of many of the arguments in favour of a general reform of education put to him by Claude Le Jay and Guillaume du Prat.

The reform ran counter to the cathedral chapter schools which were still devoted to a basically medieval curriculum based on the study of logic. By 1544, Ignatius was so distressed by the inadequacy of the Latin schools, as well as by the success of Protestantism in Western Europe, that he authorized the establishment of Jesuit colleges for non-Jesuit students in towns which had no universities and in which the threat of heresy was particularly great. In this way, within slightly more than a decade, the Jesuits, who had not wanted to assume responsibility even for their own education, began to establish formal colleges first for their own members, then for a mixture of Jesuits and non-Jesuits, and finally just for non-Jesuits. The order was to maintain institutions serving all three groups for the next two centuries, but the colleges serving ordinary laymen were to remain the most important.

The revised Jesuit constitutions of 1556, following Julius III's decision in 1552 to allow Jesuit colleges to grant degrees, expressed the Company's new involvement in public education. The new constitutions encouraged Jesuits to seek permission from the general of the order to open public colleges wherever they could easily do so. There was not yet a detailed plan of studies for any of the three kinds of Jesuit colleges, but from the beginning the curricula stressed
classical languages, humanities, and Christian doctrine. Where appropriate, the Jesuit masters of the new colleges might preach and hear confessions. If they wished, they might also add courses in philosophy to the subjects listed above. All courses were taught in Latin and this education was free.

So far as we can tell, Ignatius fostered these new developments with enthusiasm. In the same year as the revised constitutions were published, he expressed his satisfaction in a letter written by his secretary to King Philip II of Spain:

...each day...shows...how important it is for Christianity and for society as a whole that a good education should be given to youth at an age when, still flexible, it receives readily the imprint of discipline. But, as we meet few masters who combine virtue and learning, [or] example and teaching, the Company [of Jesus], obeying the Spirit of Our Lord Jesus Christ, has not disdained to lower itself for the sake of the great good which may thereby result, to the work of teaching children and young people. It regards as one of its principal tasks to open, not only to its own members, but also to outsiders, colleges at which [all] may learn without paying, with the special awareness of a Christian, the sciences of man from the rudiments of grammar to the highest sciences.

By the time of Ignatius's death later in 1556, the Jesuits had established thirty-nine colleges in Europe, of which one was in France.

In 1562, the new general, Laynez, issued a formula which distinguished between three programmes of studies intended for three kinds of public Jesuit colleges. The first programme, normally intended for colleges in small towns, consisted of a complete course in grammar and humanities which might or might not be followed by rhetoric. The second programme, intended for larger towns, consisted of a complete course in grammar, humanities, rhetoric, and philosophy. The third programme, meant for colleges attached to universities, included not only the four subjects just listed but also theology and sacred scripture.
These early programmes of study provided a foundation for the Ratio Studiorum, developed between 1584 and 1591 by a commission appointed by Claude Aquaviva, and published in 1598. This famous, comprehensive plan endured with little alteration for the next two centuries. It prescribed both the form of organization to be used by Jesuit colleges and the nature of the studies to be pursued in them.

The administration of each college was based on the model provided by the University of Paris. At the head of each college there was a rector appointed for an indefinite period to carry out the honorific and other functions associated with overseeing the management of the college as a whole. As time went on, a procureur assumed responsibility for the financial administration of the college. Below the rector there were prefects appointed annually who scrutinized the work of the individual teachers, administered examinations, and, with the help of a non-Jesuit official specially hired for the task of administering corporal punishment, maintained discipline. Individual teachers were appointed to teach specific years of the academic programme and, although they might share the task of teaching a particular class with other teachers, they had no other functions.

The colleges created by the Ratio remained conservative, static institutions in which the prefect held sway. One kind of prefect constantly supervised the behaviour of the students to make sure that they committed none of the sins of idleness, greed, sloth, or fractiousness into which, in the judgment of the age, youth might so readily fall. Another made sure that teachers maintained the methods and practices of their predecessors, and that they in no way altered the curriculum laid down in the sixteenth century.
prefects also administered the system of rewards and punishments and
general competition by which the Jesuits sought to encourage learning.

The plan of studies outlined in the *Ratio*, and used for the next
two centuries, was, like its predecessors, a modification of the old
medieval programme. The first three years were devoted to grammar
and the next two to humanities and rhetoric. After passing the
examinations at the end of these five years, a student might begin
a two year course of philosophy, consisting of a year of logic
followed by a year of physics, mathematics, and the study of the
sphere. Sometimes the last year included the study of geography as
well. In a few colleges, the two years of philosophy were followed
by a third entitled "metaphysics". And, in even fewer colleges, the
programme initiated by the Council of Trent was gradually introduced.
In those cases, after philosophy there came four years of theology.
These last four years were normally taken only by Jesuit scholastics.

The novelty of this system of education lay in its use of
classical literature, particularly the Latin classics of the republican
period, to teach perfect language and, through perfect language,
Christian piety. In the atmosphere of the cloister, and under the
constant gaze of the prefect, it bred cultivated civic humanists
capable of expressing ideas in graceful classical Latin. It replaced
the medieval system which had taught logic and had produced *disputeurs*
and *rhéteurs* who spoke vulgarized medieval Latin. At the same time,
the deeper aim of the system remained the same: to teach men to be
Christians. This underlying object was stated in the first edition
of the *Ratio* as an intention to offer "to our neighbour" all the
intellectual discipline necessary "to develop in him the knowledge and
love of our Creator and Redeemer". It found more precise expression
in Jouvency's statement of 1711: "A Christian master must teach two
things: piety and belles lettres, [but it is] piety which holds the first place.  

The main outlines of this system were adopted in France not only by the Jesuits themselves but also, quite independently, by the other great French teachers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: the faculty of the University of Paris, the Oratorians, and even the Jansenists. It would therefore seem that the Jesuits became the chief teachers of seventeenth and eighteenth century France partly because they were innovators and partly because they were trained in the new humanism, but mainly they were the most willing to go to the provinces, and especially to those tainted with heresy, to establish colleges. Having established a college in one place, they were invited or encouraged to found another somewhere else. In this process they came to educate more young Frenchmen than any other group of teachers in the seventeenth century and in much of the eighteenth century as well. They remained the principal teachers of France so long as Latin was accepted as the language of instruction and the development of Christian piety remained the object of French education.

Jesuit education became the object of limited criticism in the latter half of the seventeenth century and of much more widespread criticism in the first half of the eighteenth. It is not our task to understand the reforms proposed by Malebranche, Fénélon, and Fleury; the innovations of the Jansenist petites écoles or of the Oratorian colleges; or the revolutionary educational programmes of Voltaire, Diderot, or the lesser Encyclopédistes. Nor need we evaluate the influence on educational theory of an increasingly vocal bourgeoisie. But it is worth stressing that before the parlementaires launched their attacks on the Jesuits in 1759 to 1762, a large body of
influential men were seeking to change the general educational curriculum. They wanted to replace the teaching of Latin and the study of republican Rome with instruction in French and preparation for life in the present by means of studies dealing more directly with the present. They wanted to see more teaching of history, natural sciences, and mathematics, and less teaching of classical literature. Some of them wanted education to be secularized. And their voices were being heard before those parlementaires who supported the new educational programmes launched their attack on the Jesuits in 1759. It was partly because Jesuit educational theory was in increasing disfavour by this time, and enrolments in Jesuit colleges were correspondingly fewer, that the parlementaires were able to initiate their attacks on the Jesuit order when they did. But before we consider the changes of the eighteenth century, we must look more carefully at the institutions which the Jesuits had founded in the previous two centuries. What was the nature of the educational system which, for so long, had enabled them to be the teachers of France?
II Jesuit institutions in the jurisdiction of the Parlement

When the Jesuits established their first college in France, the details of their educational programme had not yet been worked out. For more than a decade after their initial enrolment at the University of Paris, the Jesuit postulants, novices, scholastics, and their non-Jesuit associates, now living informally at the College of the Lombards, remained the only Jesuit establishment in France. The explanation for this state of affairs is that although the crown approved their presence in lettres patentes in 1551 and twice again in 1560, the Parlement of Paris persistently refused to register the royal legislation, on the grounds that the existence of the Jesuit order in France was incompatible with the liberties of the Gallican Church. ¹ Parlementary resistance was sufficient to prevent Ignatius Loyola from authorizing non-French Jesuits to go to teach in France where, for several years, there were not enough French Jesuits to found a college. ² It was only the repeated efforts of the French bishop Guillaume du Prat of Auvergne that caused the first Jesuit college, that of Billom, to be founded in a formal way as early as 1556. ³

Guillaume du Prat was largely instrumental in founding three of the first eight Jesuit colleges in France. His initial interest in the revival of Catholic education developed before he had heard of the Jesuits and resulted from his experience of the success of Protestantism in Auvergne. It was only in 1545, at the Council of Trent, that he met the Jesuit theologian Claude Le Jay, and learned of the reputation which Jesuit education was gaining elsewhere in Europe. He had been so disappointed by his own earlier, independent efforts to re-establish
the University of Billom as a bulwark against Protestantism that he henceforth made every attempt to persuade the Jesuits to establish colleges in Auvergne. The removal of the Council of Trent to Bologna in 1547 enabled him to pass through Paris and to visit the Jesuits of the College of the Lombards and his own students living on the rue de la Harpe. He was impressed by the superiority of the Jesuits' institution and, from this date on, he sought to provide them with a larger and better building. To this end, in 1550 he gave the Parisian Jesuits the Hôtel de Clermont, a building owned by his diocese on the rue de la Harpe. Here, although they did not gain the title to the property, the Jesuits carried on their own studies and accommodated and educated du Prat's students from Auvergne.5

The opening of the Jesuit college in Billom in 1556, and the foundation of the College of Mauriac in 1560 on the instructions contained in his will, marked the success of Guillaume du Prat's efforts to enlist the help of the Jesuits in his work against heresy in Auvergne. Du Prat did not forget the Parisian Jesuits, however. The provisions of his will, once sanctioned by the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561 and accepted by the Parlement of Paris in 1562, also made possible the proper establishment of the College of Clermont in Paris in 1564.6 It was located in a new building, the Cour de Langres, the Hôtel de Clermont having proved too small. The Parlement of Paris probably did not intend to accept the presence of the Jesuit order when it accepted the provisions of du Prat's will, but this was the de facto result of its action.7 After 1562, the Company of Jesus embarked on its first period of expansion in France.

From the time of Monseigneur du Prat until the mid-eighteenth century, there was a tendency in continental France to establish
colleges first and only then to create the other kinds of foundation which seemed necessary. These other foundations were authorized by Ignatius's constitutions. They included noviciates for the training and preparation of young Jesuits, professed houses for those members of the order who were engaged solely in preaching and ministering to the poor, residences meant for the old and sick members of the order, and, very rarely, independent missions from which Jesuits conducted courses of religious instruction for residents of the countryside. To colleges, noviciates, and other independent religious houses, with the exception of professed houses, might be attached other forms of real property.

These dependent forms of property included ecclesiastical benefices, where members of the parent institution, invariably a college, often acted as parish priests if the benefice included a church; country houses, to which members of the colleges or other independent foundations went for holidays; pensionnats, which at some colleges housed the poorer students; and a second category of missions which depended on colleges established in areas prone to heresy. Outside France there also existed, from the sixteenth century on, a variety of foreign missions which attracted some of the most ardent members of the order. The French foreign missions were normally attached to a Jesuit college in France, though by the eighteenth century their financial affairs were overseen by an independent official of the order, known as procureur of missions. Nevertheless, from the time of the establishment of the first Jesuit college in France until the suppression of the French Jesuits in 1762, the colleges were always by far the most numerous of all Jesuit institutions. All the others, with the possible exception of the foreign missions, existed only as
natural adjuncts or outgrowths of the colleges.

It is difficult to determine how many Jesuit foundations were established during the first period of expansion, but it is probable that by the end of the sixteenth century there were between thirty and thirty-five colleges, two or three noviciates, and two or three residences within the French borders of the late sixteenth century. Seven of these colleges existed within the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. They included not only the Colleges of Billom, Mauriac, and Paris, sponsored by du Prat, but also those of Lyon, Bourges, Nevers, and Eu. The foundation of the College of La Trinité in Lyon in 1565 and that of Bourges in 1572 was brought about primarily through the work of the municipal councils of those cities, while the other two colleges were princely foundations. The College of Nevers was established by Louis de Gonzague and his wife Henrietta of Cleves in 1572 and the College of Eu, in 1581 by the Duke of Guise.

Outside France at this time, but to be included within its borders and those of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris by 1678, were founded the Wallon College in 1568 and the English College in 1593, both in Saint-Omer. The first was a municipal foundation and the second a private one initiated by English Catholics seeking a Catholic education for their sons in the time of Elizabeth. In Paris, the professed house of Saint Louis was established in 1580 through the agency of Cardinal Charles I of Bourbon, the uncle of Henri IV.

The growth in the number of Jesuit foundations throughout France forced the Jesuits to reform their system of internal administration. By 1564, the original Jesuit province, Provinciae Galliae, which had been administered under the Assistancy of Germany, had to be divided
into two parts. It became the Province of Ile de France, known somewhat confusingly as the Province of France, and the Province of Aquitaine, also known as the Province of Guyenne. In 1582, part of the Province of Aquitaine or Guyenne became the Province of Lyon. In spite of the requests addressed to Rome by many French Jesuits, all three provinces remained under the Assistancy of Germany until the early seventeenth century. 15

The rapid expansion of the Company of Jesus in France was interrupted for a brief period after 1594. In that year, Jean Châtel, who had probably once been a pupil of the Jesuits, made an attempt on the life of Henri IV and gave the Parlement of Paris an excuse to expel the order from France. 16 As it happened, the Parlements of Bordeaux and Toulouse refused to abide by the decision of their counterpart in Paris which, nevertheless, enforced its legislation within its own territory. As a result, all the establishments referred to above were temporarily abandoned. Fortunately for the Jesuits, the measure never had the king's firm support, and by the Edict of Rouen of 1603, he undid the Parlement's work. 17 In the meantime, in 1598, the king had also issued the Edict of Nantes, which made Protestantism legal in France and thereby encouraged its growth. The effect of the two edicts was to open the way for an astonishing increase in the number of Jesuits and Jesuit establishments in France.

Within fifty years of the publication of the Edict of Rouen, the number of Jesuit establishments in France tripled. The country as a whole, which in 1594 had had no more than thirty-five colleges, three residences, and three noviciates, could boast an additional sixty-three colleges, seven or eight noviciates, six independent missions, eleven residences, and three professed houses by 1653. In that part
of Spanish Artois which by 1678 would be French, an additional six colleges were established. And, in the same period, France also gained two or three seminaries which were owned by various dioceses, and in which Jesuits taught. Even allowing for some enlargement of French territory resulting from Louis XIII's wars, the increase was remarkable.  

The rate of growth in the territory of the Parlement of Paris was greater than that in the rest of France. Twenty-eight of the new colleges, two of the noviciates, and one of the residences were to be found in the jurisdiction of that Parlement. In Spanish Artois, one college which would eventually come under the Parlement's authority was also founded. Thus, by 1653, the territory which was to make up the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris at the time of the suppression included within its boundaries thirty-eight colleges, probably as many as seven pensionnats, two noviciates, one professed house, one residence, and one mission. After 1653, the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris would acquire only one more college, two more pensionnats, one more residence, and three seminaries. In short, almost all the Jesuit establishments which the Parlement of Paris suppressed in 1762 had come into existence between one hundred and one hundred and twenty years before. This fact alone will explain some of the confusion which arose in 1762 and 1763 over the ownership of these establishments. 

The twenty-nine new colleges and other Jesuit establishments founded under the eventual jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris after 1603, were established in much the same way as the earlier Jesuit institutions. Jesuit colleges went on being created by powerful individuals or groups of people. In thirteen cases, the founders of
the new colleges were the town councils; in ten cases powerful laymen or women, including princes; in four cases kings; and in only two cases the Jesuits themselves. Although it would be tedious to review in detail the circumstances of the foundation of each college, it may be instructive to consider a few cases.

The municipal foundations included the College of Langres, established in 1630 after three decades of wrangling and appeals to the crown by the local inhabitants, the bishop, the chapter, and the town council. The latter only became the founder in the end because the crown actively encouraged the foundation of the college at a moment when the council wanted it. The second College of Lyon was founded by the mayor and aldermen in 1630 so that the pupils who presently travelled from one side of Lyon to the other to attend the College of La Trinité would not have to cross a dangerous bridge. And the College of Auxerre, founded eight years earlier, was also a municipal foundation, although unlike other municipal foundations it was never popular in the town which nurtured it.

Among the ten private foundations was the College of Charleville, established in 1612 as part of the new town created and named by Charles de Gonzagua, governor of Champagne, and son of Louis de Gonzagua who had founded the College of Nevers in the previous century. On the other hand, the royal foundation which impressed contemporaries the most was the College of La Flèche established by Henri IV in his château in that town in 1603. The king had originally hoped to make it a complete university, but apparently because of the Jesuits' objections, he had to be content to allow it to be, instead, a major college which also seems to have been one of the richest in France. In Orléans in 1617, and in Mâcon in 1650, the Jesuits themselves,
frightened by the spread of Protestantism, took the initiative. In spite of local pressure against them and the threat of inadequate endowments, they became the founders of colleges in these towns.\(^{25}\)

The establishment of all these colleges in 1603 to 1653 was accompanied once again by the creation of other Jesuit institutions. Within the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris a residence indirectly attached to the College of Clermont in Paris and used for old or sick Jesuits was established in 1614 through the gift of a lay person at Pontoise.\(^{26}\) At Lyon, in 1605, because of the generosity of a young man who had recently entered the order, and in Paris, in 1610, through the generosity of a woman patron and the queen, two Jesuit noviciates were founded. They were intended to relieve the existing noviciates of Rouen and Nancy and to serve the needs of the relatively new Jesuit Provinces of France and Lyon.\(^{27}\) Between 1619 and 1636, the mission in Bapaume was established in a part of Artois which became French, and, at the same time, part of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in 1641. Although intended by the private founder to be a residence, it was never more than a mission with two or three priests attached to it, and a chapel serving the nearby area.\(^{28}\) In all cases except that of Bapaume, royal sanction was granted before these institutions were founded.

Despite the rapid growth of Jesuit foundations between 1603 and 1653, in the one hundred and twenty years after 1653, the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, like the rest of France, acquired very few additional Jesuit institutions. The obvious reason for this development was the royal policy of the 1660's sponsored by Louis XIV and actively pursued by Colbert de Croissy which sought to limit the number of new ecclesiastical foundations in France.\(^{29}\) Nevertheless, in
1730, after two unsuccessful attempts in the seventeenth century, the efforts of the local bishop led to the establishment of the Jesuit College of Laon. It could hardly have survived the quarrels of the Jesuits and the town council had not the successor of the founding bishop assumed the administration of the college himself.\(^{30}\) In addition, the college of Sainte Marthe of Poitiers which had been established in 1607, had the Irish College and the College of Puygarreau united to it in 1674 and 1687. They were both to serve as *pensionnats*, or residences, for pupils of the original college of Poitiers.\(^{31}\) In 1694, 1709, and 1716, the Jesuits, under the auspices of local bishops, assumed responsibility for the diocesan seminaries of La Rochelle, Nevers, and Reims. In 1710, in response to the demands of local inhabitants, the order opened its second residence in the jurisdiction of the *Parlement* of Paris, this time at Guéret.\(^{32}\)

Thus, the Jesuit institutions founded within the territory of the *Parlement* of Paris between 1556 and 1730, like those founded elsewhere in France, were established in a diversity of circumstances, but normally because someone or a corporate body other than the Jesuits wanted to establish a Jesuit college, residence, or mission. The founder might be the town council, the bishop, a private layman, or the Jesuits themselves. Sometimes more than one of the five were involved. Behind the founding of every Jesuit college, whether it was the revival of an old local college which had fallen into disuse or a completely new foundation, was the conviction that establishing a Jesuit college was a useful way to provide a Catholic education for French youth and thus to combat the Protestant heresy.\(^{33}\) The Jesuits played an active part in the establishment of their professed house and two noviciates, but even these depended entirely on other people's
The period of unprecedented growth in the first decades of the seventeenth century resulted in 1608 in the creation out of the Province of Guyenne of a fourth Jesuit province in France, the Province of Toulouse. In the same year, all four French Jesuit provinces were organized as the *Assistentiae Galliae* or Assistancy of France. Initially, the Assistancy was to be under the authority of the assistant of France, who was responsible to the Roman general. The first man to hold this position was Louis Richeome, but it was his successor, Christophe Balthasar, who oversaw the creation of the fifth Jesuit province in France, that of Champagne, in 1616. After that date, the Assistancy of France got no bigger, although those houses of the parts of Artois which had become French by 1678, while remaining in the German Provinces of Gallo-Belgique and Flandro-Belgique, were subject to regulation by the Jesuit officials of the Assistancy of France because of the wishes of Louis XIV. Furthermore, by the eighteenth century, the assistant of France ceased to have any significant authority. The Jesuit officials who held power over Jesuit affairs and property in France at the time of the suppression of 1762 were the provincials and procureurs of the five French provinces. All five French provinces and the German Province of Gallo-Belgique had property in the continental jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in 1762.

While most French Jesuits were gaining property in France and assuming an increasingly important rôle in French life, others were establishing foreign missions. By the eighteenth century, French Jesuits had missions in all parts of the world: India, China, Canada, Louisiana, the Windward Islands, Paraguay, and the Near East. Each
of the five provinces sent some Jesuits to foreign missions, and autonomous houses, including the colleges and, unofficially, professed houses or even noviciates, had varying degrees of control over foreign missions. In the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, the college and professed house in Paris apparently had a controlling financial interest in missions in India and probably in Louisiana, while the College of La Flèche was responsible for the missions in the Windward Islands.\(^{38}\) Needless to say, although the train of events which led to the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762 began in the missions of the Windward Islands, the men who eventually seized Jesuit property had comparatively little interest in the property of the foreign missions and little control over it. For this reason, it is difficult to discover much about the extent of this property in 1762.\(^{39}\)

The rapid growth in the number of Jesuit colleges, and other establishments naturally led to a very great increase in the number of Jesuits and Jesuit pupils in France. No general statistics exist, however, and we must be content with impressions or estimates of this growth. In 1608, Pierre Coton, the Jesuit confessor to the king, estimated that there were 24,000 pupils in French Jesuit colleges.\(^{40}\) In 1626, in the three Jesuit Provinces of Ile de France, Champagne, and Toulouse, there were apparently 25,227 students in Jesuit colleges, and, if the same level of attendance was realized throughout France, there may have been as many as 10,000 more students in the Provinces of Lyon and Guyenne.\(^{41}\) It is probable that this was the high point of enrolments in Jesuit colleges.\(^{42}\) There are no reliable figures for the eighteenth century. Nor do we have any complete statements about the number of Jesuits in the various colleges and other institutions, although in this case it is possible to estimate that by 1626 there
were as many as 2,000 Jesuits in continental France. After this date and before 1750, the number of Jesuits in France apparently increased to at least 3,350. As we have seen, the number of Jesuit institutions nearly doubled between the early seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Clearly, then, by the mid-seventeenth century, the Jesuit colleges had gained widespread support from the population of France as well as from the local authorities and the crown. This development is complex and difficult to explain. Many men apparently sent their sons to Jesuit colleges for the reasons offered by the founders of the colleges in the beginning. Men wished to remove their sons from the influence of heresy or to place them in an environment where they would be untouched by it. But other reasons were also important. Many young men living in towns where there were Jesuit colleges, undoubtedly attended the colleges because the instruction was free. They might then enter professions or assume positions not normally open to men of their class. But, while education was free, the fact that even reduced fees were charged at the pensionnats attached to many of the colleges prevented other young men from attending Jesuit colleges. The existence of a few scholarships helped some poor scholars, and the sons of some peasants did attend Jesuit colleges, though generally not for very long.

As a result of the widespread support and influx of pupils that they received as the century progressed, the Jesuits were able to introduce more advanced courses of study than they had at first envisaged for some colleges. By the end of the seventeenth century, there were only five colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.
offering the three years of grammar, one year of humanities, and one year of rhetoric. No less than twenty colleges were offering a full programme of grammar, humanities, rhetoric, and two years of philosophy. A further thirteen colleges offered courses in theology as well, although in five and possibly more of them, the course did not last the full four years prescribed by the Council of Trent. The Colleges of La Trinité in Lyon, of Reims, and of Paris, besides offering full courses in letters and theology, also offered a year of metaphysics. At the College of La Trinité and the College of Clermont in Paris, practical experiments in physics were often carried out even before the end of the seventeenth century, and these institutions retained science masters until the time of the suppression. The College of Laon, which did not come into existence until 1730, offered courses in grammar, humanities, rhetoric and philosophy.

Academic subjects were not the only ones taught in the colleges. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Jesuits developed forms of classical theatre. More important, because it was more widespread, a good deal of spiritual instruction was carried out in the colleges as well. Its principal instrument was the sodality or marial congregation. All the colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris and the rest of France seem to have had a Congrégation des écoliers by the end of the seventeenth century. It was in such groups that scholars, often divided into groups based on their academic years, received instruction or meditated or prayed together.

Men not only sent their sons to Jesuit colleges; they also went themselves. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, counterparts of the student sodalities existed for the men of the town as well. They met, often according to occupation or social class, in the chapels
and the nearby parlors or meeting rooms of the Jesuit colleges. The most usual congregations were the Congrégation des messieurs, the Congrégation des bourgeois, and the Congrégation des artisans. In Paris, nobles and bourgeois met in the professed house of the rue Saint Antoine, while the petits bourgeois joined with the grands artisans who met in the College of Louis-le-Grand, as the College of Clermont came to be called by the end of the seventeenth century. The second group provided the members who were to become the nucleus of the community of bons amis devoted to doing good works for the poor of the city of Paris. It was more usual, however, for meetings of the sodalities to be devoted to prayer and the celebration of the Mass together. The marial congregations in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris were suppressed by that Parlement in 1760.

Just as they served the Catholic citizens of the towns through their colleges in these ways, so the Jesuits also attempted to serve the cause of Catholicism in the countryside and in the colonies by means of missions. Under the continental jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris the permanent mission of Bapaume and the temporary ones of Bourges and Poitiers seem to have been the most widely supported in the eighteenth century. There is no doubt that in the seventeenth century and for part of the eighteenth century, Jesuit colleges and other Jesuit institutions played an important part in the life of many Frenchmen. Nowhere were they more important than under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

In considering the Jesuit institutions within the territory of the Parlement of Paris, we have thus far dealt with intangible matters. But all such institutions, including the colleges, were not merely an intangible influence on many Frenchmen, but also a form of real property containing various forms of movable property, and often controlling
or owning other forms of real property. We may begin our examination of the Jesuit institutions as tangible property by considering the structure of Jesuit buildings. It naturally reflected the kinds of work done and the life lived in them. As we would expect, the largest and most valuable were the college buildings. In twenty-six cases out of thirty-nine, they had been provided by the local authorities. They varied greatly from place to place. The College of La Flèche was established in the conglomeration of buildings making up the royal château of that town and there it remained. The College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris rapidly proved too large for both the Hôtel de Clermont and the Cour de Langres, and finally took over a group of buildings on the rue Saint Jacques. La Flèche and Paris were exceptional, however. Most of the other colleges remained in single buildings. Only about ten of the thirty-nine colleges were originally established in new buildings, but even in those cases in which Jesuits took over and remained in old college buildings throughout the century or century and a half of the colleges' existence, the Jesuits transformed the original structures through a process of rebuilding, remodelling, or adding on. In general, the greatest period of construction or reconstruction appears to have coincided with the period of greatest growth in the number of colleges and pupils. The result is that most of the college buildings described and depicted in the architects' reports of 1762, except for those of Flanders, are mid or late seventeenth century edifices with the courtyards and gardens of that period. The colleges of Flanders are of an earlier period and distinctively Flemish.

Whatever the similarities or differences in the shape or outward appearance of the college buildings, they were similar inside. Every college contained classrooms, living quarters for the Jesuits, kitchens, cellars, storage rooms, special entrances for Jesuits and pupils,
parlors or meeting rooms in which guests were received and congregations met, a library, and at least one chapel. The size and nature of the library and chapel depended on the wealth of the college. By the end of the seventeenth century, several colleges had also acquired churches. 57

Another sign of the wealth of a college was the extent and nature of its movable property. This category of property included the books of the library and sometimes other property attached to the library. In the case of La Trinité and Louis-le-Grand, the contents of the library included a coin and medal collection. Moreover, La Trinité had an observatory filled with astronomical instruments attached to its library. 58 Another college had a famous mural and others had lesser works of art. The chapels housed movable property of considerable value, as well. Here, along with the usual statuary and furniture, were to be found the various vestments and sacred vessels which the Jesuits required for the saying of their Office and daily Masses. Besides the property acquired by the Jesuits for their own private use, the chapels also still contained many of the more costly and more ornate vestments and sacred vessels provided by the sodalities or congregations before their suppression in 1760. 59 Finally, the movable property of the colleges included all the furniture and furnishings of the hallways and of the various rooms including the kitchens, classrooms, and Jesuits' own apartments. And it included the contents of the storage places, of which the most noteworthy were the cellars containing wine.

The pensionnats attached to eight of the colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement were a form of real property and they contained the same kinds of movable property as the colleges, although the pensionnats were normally more sparsely furnished and provided for than the colleges. Ecclesiastical benefices were attached to twenty-
four of the thirty-nine colleges with which we are concerned. The
benefices normally comprised at least one building and lands that could
be leased at a profit by the college controlling them. Benefices,
particularly if they included a chapel or a church, also had their
complement of movable property. Several colleges, including those
of Paris and Lyon, owned small houses within the town; most colleges
also owned country property other than the ecclesiastical benefices
which they leased to individual people or private companies.

The colleges were the largest establishments held by the Jesuits,
but they were not the only ones. The professed house, the residences,
the noviciates, and the missions under the jurisdiction of the Parlement
were all forms of real property belonging to the Jesuits and containing
movable property. The buildings were smaller, but most had chapels of
their own, although the Jesuits living in these lesser institutions
might also officiate in local parish or college churches. These
smaller edifices housed the necessary furniture and furnishings and
most had libraries. The Jesuits of Paris owned country houses at
Gentilly, Montrouge, Montlouis, Charonne, and Belleville. While the
Jesuits held titled to and administered the colleges, pensionnats,
professed house, residences, and the mission in the territory of the
Parlement of Paris, they did not have the same rights over the seminaries
they served. These were owned and administered by the dioceses in which
they were found.

The foreign missions were composed of many kinds of real and mov­
able property. There were religious houses in which missionaries lived,
country houses and property, the produce of the fields, and often
slaves who worked the fields. By the mid-eighteenth century, the
missions of the Windward Islands owned valuable goods which were used
for trade. And all missions owned other movable property.
All Jesuit institutions required considerable financial support. All needed enough money to provide for their resident Jesuits who received no salary and who apparently could not survive on a basic grant of less than 200 livres per year in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries or 300 livres per year in the eighteenth. Jesuit institutions also needed varying amounts of money to pay servants, maintain buildings in good repair, and pay the local alms or allowances which, in affluent moments of their history, they had assumed as a permanent responsibility. Colleges were undoubtedly the most costly enterprises to support. Libraries had to be maintained. Larger buildings required more heat and lighting than smaller ones; they also required more domestic servants. And even small institutions required a constant source of revenue.

The methods by which the Jesuits were permitted to raise the money they needed were laid down by Ignatius in his Institute. From the beginning, the French Jesuits had followed its very strict regulations about internal finance, and the French state had not interfered. All Jesuit houses were financially independent of each other. Hence, while a college might support a mission, a pensionnat, or even a residence, any dependent institution was administered as part of the original, independent foundation. Similarly, independent foundations, whether colleges, professed houses, independent missions, independent residences, or novicaties, were administered quite separately from each other, regardless of their geographical proximity to one another. If the revenue of a particular house exceeded its needs, the excess revenue could be used by that house to pay its long-term debts or it could be invested to increase the revenues of the house. On the other hand, if
the revenue of a particular house were insufficient, it could not
appeal to another house for help. A Jesuit institution in financial
difficulties could appeal to its provincial. A provincial in his turn
might appeal to the general of the order. The chances of receiving
help from these sources were limited by the amount of the gifts which
the provincials or the general had received and might, in their turn,
use to help houses in financial trouble. 4

The Institute further defined the nature of the financial arrange-
ments any Jesuit house might make by specifying what kinds of property
each category of Jesuit foundation might possess. The gifts each
might receive were specified and the use to which the gifts might be
put was limited. Professed houses, and, in practice, even independent
residences in France were not allowed to own real property aside from
the houses constituting the institutions in question. They depended
entirely on alms. Colleges and noviciates, as well as residences in
the colonies, might possess real estate and invest gifts of money. In
all cases, superiors of Jesuit institutions might receive property
only when it was profitable to do so, they might not alienate Jesuit
property, and they were supposed to engage in only those financial
transactions which were beneficial for their institutions. Normally it
happened that the revenues enjoyed by Jesuit houses came from gifts for
specific purposes such as for the saying of Masses for the soul of the
benefactor, for the endowment of a chapel, or, for the support of
specific years of a college curriculum. 5

Under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris on the eve of
the suppression, the activities and maintenance of Jesuit institutions
were, so far as we know, financed in the following ways, consistent
with the requirements laid down in the Institute. The professed house
in Paris, according to a statement made by its last superior in 1762, received an annual allowance from the quinquennial Assemblies of the Clergy or from the French Jesuit provincials. Since the professed house did not officially hold a title to the rentes from which this revenue was derived, the professed house may be said to have received alms rather than rentes. It also apparently received small money gifts from private donors and these were not supposed to be invested but to be used to pay day-to-day expenses. Finally, the professed house apparently enjoyed the rents from a number of private houses in Paris.

The revenues of the two residences at Pontoise and Guéret consisted of annual rentes drawn on capital invested in securities. It is not clear who held the title to this capital and therefore not certain whether the revenue was technically alms or not. It also appears that the residences received support from the colleges they served. In the first case, this meant Louis-le-Grand of Paris and in the second, the College of Limoges. The two noviciates of Paris and Lyon were supported by revenue from capital invested in securities and, in particular, in the aides and gabelles. Both supplemented their revenues by offering retreats to lay people and receiving gifts from them for doing so. The mission at Bapaume also apparently existed on the income from capital invested in securities and on small gifts of money.

The colleges' income on the eve of suppression was also derived from gifts. This was because the major activities of the colleges did not earn money. Tuition in the Jesuit colleges being free, there were no fees to be collected from students. Nor were the pensionnats attached to some of the colleges a source of income. They were intended for poor students and were supposed to be self-supporting
but not profit-making institutions.  

Hence, in the case of the colleges, as in the case of other kinds of Jesuit institutions, a major source of revenue was capital endowments. They were the gifts of benefactors of all kinds: kings, princes, bishops, canons, wealthy lay people, and very commonly, town councils. Most dated from the sixteenth or from the first half of the seventeenth century. The first kind of capital endowment was lump sums of money varying from 50 livres to 24,000 livres invested in such traditionally lucrative and safe government enterprises as the aides and gabelles or the taille, or in that branch of the aides known as the Inspecteurs des vins. Such investment yielded an annual dividend of from two to four percent, and sometimes as much as five percent. Some colleges also drew rentes on the Ancien Clergé, the Hôtel de ville, or the various Generalities or Estates. Once again, the rate at which these rentes were paid appears to have varied between two and five percent. Usually, the Jesuits themselves held the titles to their rentes, but in the case of the revenue given to the colleges by the municipal councils, the donor retained the title and made the payment or an annual allowance or subsidy at will. 

The other kind of capital endowment consisted of real estate other than ecclesiastical benefices. The most common form of property in this category was houses in towns, often adjacent to the college buildings, which the Jesuits rented to private people for an annual rent which was usually less than 100 livres a year. Almost as common as the houses were the domaines, borderies, métairies, woodlots, vineyards, seigniories, mills, and prébendes préceptorales from which the Jesuits drew various kinds of agricultural rents. Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to tell how profitable these forms of real property were. The fact that they were subject to
charges and taxes, and that the buildings on them had to be kept in
good repair meant that they invariably yielded a net revenue very
much inferior to their gross revenue. 19

It is not apparent just how great a proportion of most colleges'
revenue came from investment in securities and how much came from
real estate. In one case, that of Louis-le-Grand in Paris, it is
certain that rentes from state-sponsored investments, and particularly
those drawn on the aides and gabelles, made up between one-third and
one-half of the global or gross revenue of the college, and probably,
since they were apparently not subject to further charges in the way
that revenue from real estate was, as much as three-quarters of the
net revenue. 20 The cases of the other colleges are not so clear. 21

Some colleges, besides enjoying revenue from the two kinds of
capital endowment described above, also received revenue from eccles-
iasiical benefices. Twenty-four of the colleges with which we are
concerned had attached to them sixty-nine, or one-third, of the one
hundred and ninety-six benefices attached to the Jesuit colleges of
France. 22 Most of the benefices thus attached in the jurisdiction
of the Parlement of Paris were priories depending on abbeys. But
besides these fifty-three priories, there were also nine chapels, five
abbeys, one cure of souls, and one dependency. All benefices were
apparently made up of at least one building and land, and all, with
the probable exception of the cure and the dependency, included
productive agricultural property not unlike that which formed part of
a college's capital endowment. Such property carried with it the
traditional feudal rights of the seigneur: cens et rentes, the right
to dispense justice and obtain a fee, and the right to collect dues
at his oven or mill. 23
Most ecclesiastical benefices had previously been held by Augustinians or by Benedictines, and the latter sometimes retained an imprecise and limited authority over the priories and chapels, if only because they continued to hold the abbeys on which the benefices depended. So far as we know, most of the benefices had become college property within a century of the establishment of the first Jesuit college in France. Some, in fact, had been attached to the Latin schools which the Jesuits took over and became Jesuit property along with the college buildings. The benefices acquired after the establishment of Jesuit colleges were connected to them because the crown or the Augustinians or Benedictines who were holders of the right of nomination wanted to assure a Jesuit college of more revenue. The ceding of a benefice to a Jesuit college was normally not without compensation for the previous title holders.

It is doubtful whether benefices were united to colleges for any reason other than to produce revenue. This they did in a most unequal fashion. The amount of revenue any benefice was capable of producing appears to have depended not on the kind of benefice it was but on its size. Thus, abbeys did not inherently produce more than priories, or priories more than chapels. Moreover, because benefices consisted primarily of agricultural property, the amount and quality of the harvest tended to determine the amount of the Jesuits' income from the benefices. Although the Jesuits leased their benefices to individual farmers, the income of the Jesuits was quite unreliable. Décimes charged on the benefices and the rights paid to farmers remained constant and appear to have been paid regularly. The Jesuits, on the other hand, had to be content with what was left over after the décimes, the rights of the farmers, the rights of the previous benefice holders, and the costs of maintaining buildings on the property had been
paid. Often the net revenue derived from a benefice by the Jesuits was less than half its gross revenue.\textsuperscript{31} The net revenue from benefices did not normally equal as much as one-half of the total net revenue of the college.\textsuperscript{32}

With these revenues, the Jesuits carried out the obligations which, over two centuries, France came to expect them to meet. They educated the young, maintained their colleges and property attached to the colleges, and supported themselves. Throughout their history under the old régime, their success in fulfilling these tasks depended on the amount of their income.
Many of the Jesuits' critics of the 1750's and 1760's believed the Jesuits to be very rich. It was apparently their possession of so many colleges and of so many ecclesiastical benefices that encouraged people to believe that the Jesuits' houses were valuable and wealthy and that the men who lived in them had a lot of money at their disposal. And yet the available evidence does not support this general conclusion.

Crétineau-Joly, who apparently had access to Jesuit records which have since ceased to be available, considered the value of the hundred and seven colleges, sixteen pensionnats, nine noviciates, twenty-two residences and missions, three professed houses, and all their attached real and movable property as well as all their investments in France. He reckoned the fortune of the Jesuits in France, excluding their property in the colonies, at fifty-eight million livres in 1760. We may reasonably consider the fortune of the Jesuits in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris to have been about one-third of this amount. It would appear that the value of the thirty-nine colleges, nine pensionnats, two noviciates, one professed house, two residences, one mission and all their attached property was about twenty million livres.

As it turned out, however, what was important was not the value of the various institutions as real estate but the amount of their incomes. A review of the known incomes of Jesuit institutions on the eve of the confiscation reveals that very few institutions enjoyed large net incomes. In the 1740's and 1750's, only the Colleges of La Fleche, La Trinité in Lyon, Paris, and probably Reims; the noviciate of Lyon; the foreign missions; and the pensionnat of La Flèche had annual net incomes which exceeded 25,000 livres. Of these, only the foreign missions enjoyed more than 100,000 livres a year. On a level below
the four major colleges just listed, the Colleges of Amiens, Arras, Billom, Bourges, Orléans, and Poitiers, and the noviciate of Paris received net incomes of between 10,000 and 25,000 livres a year. All other Jesuit institutions of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, with the exception of eight or nine institutions about which there is insufficient evidence to justify any observation, received net incomes of less than 10,000 livres each per year. According to the official records, only the foreign missions or perhaps the professed house in Paris could be said to have had an excessively large income in 1760.

If we consider the relationship between the assets and the long-term debts of the Jesuit institutions of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, the situation is even less satisfying for the Jesuits than might have been supposed. If we consider the Jesuits' own records for the 1740's and 1750's, we find that there were seventeen colleges, including the major Colleges of La Flèche, La Trinité in Lyon, Paris, and Reims, whose assets exceeded their debts and whose net incomes were probably adequate for their needs. But there were also fifteen colleges whose assets were not equal to their debts and whose net incomes were probably not adequate. About the other six colleges there is insufficient evidence to justify either conclusion.

The reports of the Parlement's commissioners given in 1762 to 1764, though different in detail from those the Jesuits prepared more than a decade earlier, convey much the same impression. About twenty-six colleges, including those of La Flèche, La Trinité in Lyon, Reims, and probably Paris, appear to be financially sound according to the usual criteria. Their assets exceeded their long-term debts. And when their net annual incomes are compared with the number of Jesuits they
normally supported, their incomes appear sufficient for the colleges' daily needs. According to the same set of reports, at least six colleges and possibly as many as ten or twelve colleges were probably not financially capable of carrying on.

Nor was the general prognosis for Jesuit institutions very promising. The position of French Jesuits in 1761 to 1762 was not what it had been. Men had begun to withdraw their sons from Jesuit colleges. Voltaire, Diderot, and events in Portugal were doing their work. The pensionnats were no longer full. Colleges whose enrolments had reached six or seven hundred a century before, now had only a hundred students. The decline of the Jesuits' rôle in French education was accompanied by a failure of endowments to keep pace with the financial needs of the colleges. Just as all but one of the colleges with which we are concerned had been founded more than a century before the confiscation and the benefices had been attached to Jesuit colleges more than a century before the confiscation, so virtually all the endowments had been made more than a hundred years before. At the same time, prices increased and it cost more to run even a truncated Jesuit college than it had ever done before. It no longer cost 200 livres a year to support a Jesuit; it cost 300 livres and would soon cost 400 livres. All but the six large colleges of La Flèche, Paris, Lyon, Reims, Amiens, and Orléans were finding it difficult to survive. Even if the parlementaires had not taken the final step in 1762 and decided to confiscate the Jesuits' property, it is doubtful whether, in their existing form, many of the Jesuit colleges could have remained open much longer. Without them, the other Jesuit institutions would also have collapsed.

It is not clear what the Jesuits knew or the Parlement's
commissioners discovered about the wealth of the other kinds of Jesuit institutions. We have seen that one Parisian establishment received an annual net income of more than 100,000 livres, and the Parlement's commissioners seem to have regarded this wealth with particular suspicion.

Otherwise, the Jesuits' enemies found little to prove that the Jesuits were wealthy. The Jansenists alleged, just as critics or enemies of the Jesuits allege today, that it was impossible to know the extent of the wealth of the Jesuits at any given time because the Jesuits did their utmost to disguise the extent of their personal property, or the property reserved for the private use of individual Jesuits. The opponents argued that the Jesuits did this by putting the property in the name of a non-Jesuit, holding it under a fictitious name, or literally hiding it.

It is probably true that the Jesuits did all these things to some extent. Anyone with any experience of a religious community in the twentieth century knows that the statements made in the account books about the wealth of religious houses omit, often despite the good intentions of the keeper of the accounts, reference to the personal property held by individual members of the community. It would be foolish to maintain that the Jesuits did not own more property than they declared or than the Parlement's commissioners were to list in the comptes rendus of 1762 to 1764. But it would be equally foolish to contend that the property unaccounted for in 1762 to 1764 was necessarily extensive. Rolland d'Erceville was to spend 60,000 livres of his own money trying to prove that the Jesuits were wealthy scoundrels. In the end, he admitted that he had discovered very little about any aspect of their affairs, including anything related to the extent of their wealth.
Similarly, a case which we may call the Fijean-Harnepont affair was analysed in the king's council during the 1780's, but no one ever found out whether the property entrusted by one of the last Jesuit officials of Lorraine to a friend in the 1760's was extensive or not. If the Jesuits in the territory of the Parlement of Paris did own hidden treasure, they concealed it so well that even their enemies could neither bring it to light nor show that it had been secretly disposed of before it could be discovered.

If we restrict our attention to that Jesuit property and income which can be proved to have existed, then, we must conclude that the Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris were not wealthy in 1761 to 1762. The colleges remained their most valuable property, but given the Jesuits' declining rôle in French education and the difficulties of financing the education they did still provide, it seems unlikely that the Jesuit institutions which we have studied in this chapter could have survived much longer. The crisis of 1761 to 1762 merely determined that people other than the Jesuits would decide what would happen to Jesuit property, and particularly to the Jesuit colleges, in the years that followed.
Chapter II  The Destruction of the Jesuit order under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris

I  The Legal proceedings against the Jesuit order 1759 to 1762

The legal process against the Jesuits of France has been described many times before, but we must review it in order to understand the subject of this dissertation. Unless we keep in mind the outline of the events which took place in French legal courts in 1759 to 1767 and resulted in the suppression of the order, it is unlikely that we shall understand why or how the French Jesuits' property was confiscated.

It is difficult to explain why the trial or whole series of trials took place, or even when the story really began. For the eighteenth century enemies of the Jesuits, the whole trouble had started when Ignatius Loyola had established his Company in August 1534. Or if that date was too early, then the problem had begun when Monseigneur du Prat founded the first Jesuit college in France in 1556. In either case, for the enemies of the Jesuits, the creation of the order and the rapidity with which it assumed control over much of French education were two developments which led to a third: the acceptance of the doctrine of regicide in France. Clément's murder of Henri III, Châtel's unsuccessful attempt, and Ravaillac's successful one on the life of Henri IV were the foreseeable result of their connection with the Jesuits.

In the seventeenth century, or so the general argument of their enemies continued, the Jesuits had gained control over French education and, by becoming advisers and confessors to the king, had even sought to usurp the power of the monarchy. They had continued to advocate regicide,
and in 1757 Damiens, another former pupil of the French Jesuits, had tried to kill Louis XV. By this time, the Jesuits had proved themselves guilty of every heresy in the history of the church and every capital crime in the history of the state. This argument was advanced by the Jesuits' enemies in pamphlets published in the late 1750's and early 1760's. However naive, deterministic, and exaggerated it may have been, it served its authors' purpose. It contributed to making the Jesuits extremely unpopular in mid-eighteenth century France. By itself, however, it does not explain why the Jesuit order was brought to court in 1759.

It is also possible to date the order's undoing from an event that occurred in 1713, and several eighteenth and nineteenth century writers have done this. It was in this year that the Jesuits had supported the papal bull _Unigenitus_, which had declared Jansenism to be heresy. In response to this action on the part of the Jesuits, the heirs of the early Jansenists declared war on successive generations of French Jesuits. As the century passed, religious Jansenism gave way to political Jansenism, which was akin to Gallicanism, and political Jansenists, by the mid-century, dominated the _Parlement_ of Paris. The Jansenist magistrates would avenge the condemnation of Port-Royal and the more recent exile of the _Parlement_ in 1753 by destroying the Company of Jesus at the first opportunity. Again, the argument was simple and deterministic. And it contained the truth that after 1713, the surviving Jansenists hated the Jesuits and were gaining political power.

The Jesuits' unpopularity and the fact that they had made enemies who were powerful and would not be afraid to destroy them help to explain why the order was put on trial in 1759. But not even these two developments provide the whole explanation. The rest of the reason is to be
found in the history of the Jesuit order in France during the forty or fifty years before the legal proceedings began. We have just remarked that the Jansenists' rôle in French life had changed during the first half of the eighteenth century. The same thing happened to the Jesuits. The Jesuits' colleges, which had attracted thousands of pupils by the first decades of the seventeenth century had begun, by the eighteenth, to lose pupils, and, in particular, to lose them to the Oratorians. As the number of pupils declined, the colleges ceased to be financially self-supporting. Moreover, by the mid-century, the Jesuits, who had introduced a new kind of education in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, found their whole system of teaching, and particularly their insistence on retaining Latin as the medium of instruction and their neglect of the study of science, under severe attack.

Then, ironically, at the moment when the Jesuits were losing their hold on classical education, they contributed to their own undoing at another level. Before the mid-eighteenth century, they had sometimes been accused of casuistry and of moral laxity, and it was these characteristics which, in their critics' judgment, had made them so popular with princes. But in the early decades of the eighteenth century, the Jesuits ceased to present a united front on matters which had previously held them together and made them strong in the face of hostility. They had ceased to subscribe to a uniform dogma and theology. In particular, two of their members, Father Hardouin and his more sophisticated follower, Father Berruyer, had developed a new form of Biblical scholarship. From 1728 to 1758, there appeared the three parts of Berruyer's Histoire du Peuple de Dieu, of which the principal theme was that the Bible should be submitted to the same scrutiny and study as documents concerning profane history. Whatever the general reaction of the French and Universal
Catholic Church to Hardouin's and Berruyer's work, there can be little doubt that its publication intensified the controversy which by mid-century surrounded the Jesuits and made them appear divided and weak.9

Finally, as a result of the events leading to the Seven Years' War, even the court Jesuits ceased to be taken very seriously by the court which they served. Whereas, in the reign of Louis XIV, Père Lachaise had enjoyed unequalled influence and esteem in the eyes of the crown, Louis XV's increasing dependence on Madame de Pompadour and the Duke of Choiseul meant the eclipse of their enemies, the court Jesuits. Thus, by 1759, the whole of the French part of the Jesuit order was in serious disrepute. Whether at the colleges or at the king's court, whether involved in the debate over the future of education or over the use to which the Holy Scriptures should be put, the Jesuits were further discredited by Damiens' attempt on the king's life. The Jesuit order in mid-eighteenth century France was, in every way, weaker than it had ever been before, and weaker than its members realized. It was this general weakness more than any specific development which explains the ease with which the Jesuit order was destroyed after 1758.

The legal proceedings against the Jesuits, which began in 1759, were directly provoked by unprecedented events which occurred outside France and even outside Europe.10 In 1741, a French Jesuit named Antoine Lavalette was sent to the missions in the Windward Islands. No sooner had he taken up residence in the Maison de Saint Pierre in Martinique than he began to display surprising commercial abilities.11 In 1753, he became superior general of the missions in the Islands, and, on the excuse that he was solving their financial problems, he used his status to extend his commercial activities. Between 1753 and 1756, the magnitude of his dealings with the ports of France and Holland and of other islands in the Caribbean increased. He was no longer merely managing the
resources of his missions as well as he could, within the limits imposed by the Jesuit constitutions, which forbade Jesuits to take part in unnecessary commerce. Rather, he was a businessman using the opportunities afforded by his independence and authority in the Caribbean to build up a capitalistic empire.

Perhaps his most notable commercial experiment took place on the island of La Dominique, which he chose because neither the French nor the English had substantiated their claim to it and it was not governed by their laws. Here he developed an ambitious plantation, factory, and trade depot. To do this, and to finance his numerous other undertakings, Lavalette used the instrument of credit known as the lettre de change.

He used it in several ways. In some cases, he issued lettres de change to colonial associates to whom he had incurred a debt. These people, for their own reasons, did not mind waiting the sixteen to thirty-six months until the lettre de change fell due, provided they were repaid in France where the livre was worth more than one-third again as much as colonial currency. In other cases, Lavalette's debts were to négociants, bankers, or individual people in France, and the lettre de change was merely his way of paying a bill. These creditors also had to be willing to wait an average period of two years and could expect to receive a service charge in addition to the principal sum which Lavalette owed them.

Lavalette's creditors were able to redeem in Europe the lettres de change which Lavalette issued in Martinique because he sent colonial goods to correspondents in Amsterdam, Bordeaux, Marseille, Nantes, or Rouen. These correspondents sold the goods and either repaid the holders of the lettres de change directly, or else sent the money to the Jesuit procureur of the missions in the Windward Islands. This official, Dominique de Sacy, lived in the professed house in Paris, although, in fact, the missions
were under the authority of the College of La Flèche. If Lavalette's correspondents in the ports did not redeem his *lettres de change*, it was the responsibility of the Jesuit *procureur* of the missions to deal with them. This official acted according to precedent established before Lavalette took over the financial affairs of the missions, when the *procureur* was merely facilitating the payment of the missions' debts in France by acting as their agent. Hence, the *procureur* would not redeem *lettres de change* issued by Lavalette until Lavalette or one of his agents in the European ports had sent the necessary money to Paris. Lavalette's other correspondents did not always follow such a cautious policy, and some of them in the French ports redeemed his *lettres de change* before receiving goods or money of the same value from him.

How smoothly the system worked in 1753 to 1755, we do not know. But on 19 February 1756, Lavalette's chief correspondents in France, the Lioncy brothers and Gouffre of Marseille, announced their bankruptcy. At that time, they owed over a million *livres* in French money to their own creditors. And they claimed over a million and a half *livres* in the same currency from Lavalette. Lavalette had, in 1755, dispatched colonial products and perhaps gold as well, in two ships bound for Europe. The goods and money were intended to cover the *lettres de change* drawn on the Lioncys, but the two ships had been seized by English privateers. It is possible that even if the ships had arrived, they would not have contained goods or money of sufficient value to save the Lioncy brothers and Gouffre. Lavalette had already begun a policy of unlimited speculation on his own enterprises. After 1755 he borrowed indiscriminately, without regard to the declining value of his crops, slaves, and real property or to the uncertainty of the traffic on seas increasingly dominated by the British, or to the Jesuits' constitutions which forbade them
to engage in unnecessary commercial activities. In fact, the war tempted him to speculate still more daringly in the buying and selling of colonial goods in the Islands. Of all these developments, Lavalette's Jesuit superiors apparently remained ignorant. 19

The Lioncys' bankruptcy made Lavalette's other correspondents suspicious and afraid at a moment when he badly needed their confidence. On learning the news of the Lioncys' failure, the Jesuit provincial and other superiors of the Province of Paris, decided to send a "visitor" to investigate Lavalette's activities and to force him to stop using lettres de change. 20 As it happened, no "visitor" reached Martinique until 1762, and Lavalette, who had always acted independently and apparently secretly as well, ceased to write to his French superiors after the Lioncys' failure. He did not, however, stop using lettres de change. His other creditors appealed to the procureur of the missions in the Windward Islands for the payment of the money Lavalette owed them.

In this apparently unprecedented state of affairs, the Jesuit administrators were unable to develop a consistent policy. De Sacy reversed his earlier practices and, in 1756, with the aid of a specially chosen négociant in Marseille, Rey, repaid about a million livres of capital, interest, or charges to Lavalette's creditors in France. Lavalette had sent him neither the goods nor the money with which to acquit such payments. 21 In 1757, the new Paris provincial, Frey, ordered de Sacy and Rey to cease their activities. 22 Sacy had used the resources of the missions, loans from the Province of Paris, money from the sale of some of Lavalette's goods seized in Holland, and perhaps even money borrowed outside France to try to satisfy Lavalette's creditors. 23

Sacy and Rey had by no means satisfied all Lavalette's creditors, and there continued to be more of them each week. The legal proceedings against the Jesuits began on 19 November 1759, when the Veuve Grou, on her
own and her son's behalf, went before the Consuls of Paris. She held a lettre de change worth 30,000 livres, and could easily have afforded to write off the loss, while many of Lavalette's other creditors could not. It was nevertheless her lawyer, Benoît, who, before the Consuls of Paris, demanded the redemption of her claim not by Lavalette but by the Jesuit order within the domains of the king of France.

On 30 January 1760, this Parisian commercial court heard de Sacy testify that he was indeed responsible to a superior, the general of the order in Rome, for the administration of the order's property. Drawing the conclusion from this evidence that Lavalette must also be responsible to a superior, who in this case resided in France, the court on the same day decided in favour of the Veuve Grou and against the Jesuits of France. Shortly thereafter, the commercial court in Marseille, which had already ordered Lavalette and de Sacy to pay the money Lavalette owed the Lioncys, made a similar judgment against the whole order and in favour of the Lioncy brothers. This time, it was the "General and the Body and Society of the Jesuits" who were condemned to repay the Lioncys about a million and a half livres.

It was thus the Veuve Grou's case which set the precedent for dealing with Lavalette's creditors, and, in February and March 1760, they flocked to the commercial court in Paris. By April they had demanded more than three million livres from the Jesuits. The most important new claimants of this period were the Demoiselle Fouque who held a lettre de change worth 30,000 livres and Cazotte who had one worth 130,000 livres. Some of the creditors also addressed their requests to de Sacy, who, claiming to have had his hands tied by Frey, now told individual creditors to send their lettres de change back to the Jesuit house in Martinique to be redeemed there. Creditors also wrote to General Ricci, the head of the Society of Jesus in Rome. He replied sympathetically but sent no money.
The attitude of the Jesuits of France towards Lavalette's creditors is at times difficult to determine, but in the spring of 1760 it was clear. The order refused to accept responsibility for Lavalette's debts and disputed the authority of both the commercial courts to decide a matter of such consequence. To re-establish the order's reputation and because they believed they had an indisputable case in canon and civil law against the "solidarity" of religious orders, or against holding a whole religious order responsible for the debts of one of its members, the French superiors asked and got permission to appeal the commercial courts' decision in the Parlement of Paris. They did not expect a sympathetic hearing in this, the highest court in France. But they did think they would win the case. In choosing this course of action, the Jesuits apparently remained unaware of their increasing unpopularity, the strength of their enemies, or the weakness of their whole position in the kingdom. Rochemonteix's observations on this matter is not exaggerated:

The Jesuits thus, by an inconceivable blindness, threw themselves into the hands of their most determined adversaries and went before those men who most ardently desired their complete ruin.32

The appeal reached the Grand'Chambre of the Parlement of Paris on 17 August 1760. By now there were six parties involved in the case. They were the Lioncy brothers, their creditors, Cazotte, the Demoiselle Fouque, the Jesuits of the Province of Paris, and the Jesuits of the other four provinces.33 The first four parties were all regarded as creditors of Lavalette and they argued accordingly; the last two parties assumed two somewhat different positions.

The argument that was the least crucial to the outcome of the case was of the Jesuits of the other four provinces of France. Their lawyer, Laget, admitted that all the Jesuits of the kingdom would deplore the condemnation of the Jesuit order to pay all Lavalette's debts. But the matter, he
pointed out, could only concern the Jesuits of the Province of Paris. The court must appreciate that the five Jesuit provinces were quite separate and independent, and the five provincials in France were the highest Jesuit authorities in the kingdom, and that they were individually responsible to the general in Rome. Lavalette had been in Martinique, one of the missions for which the College of La Flèche was responsible, and his superior, de Sacy, who lived in Paris, had been appointed by the head of the missions who lived at La Flèche. For these reasons, the whole affair fell under the jurisdiction of the Province of Paris and could concern no other province. In short, the superiors of the Province of Lyon were worried by the judgment of the commercial court in Marseille in the Lioncys' favour. The Lioncys lived in Marseille, Marseille was within the Jesuit Province of Lyon, and the Province of Lyon wished to avoid paying Lavalette's debt. This argument was rapidly brushed aside as the other two sides took issue with each other.

Although a great deal was written about the Jesuit affair in 1760 to 1761, the debate between the representatives of the Jesuits of the Province of Paris and the representatives of the various creditors dealt with only one obvious and simple question. Could the French Jesuits as a body be held responsible for Lavalette's debts? The Jesuits' lawyer, Thevenot d'Essaule, presented the case against the "solidarity" of religious orders. It was based on the Institute of Saint Ignatius, and on canon law which had been recognized in the statutes of the kingdom. Individual members of the Jesuit order, from the meanest novice to the Jesuit general himself, according to such laws, owned nothing and could own nothing. The general appointed administrators but could not dispose of property. His appointees were charged with the administration of property given to them, and, as administrators, they could enter into only those contracts which were advantageous to the order. If an individual Jesuit incurred a debt,
he did so in his own name or in the name of the particular Jesuit house whose fortune he administered. If he acquired property, he did so with the order's permission in the name of the order. Moreover, most of the Jesuits' property or revenue had been the gift of founders who gave property to the order to enable Jesuits to carry out functions which the founders designated and the order approved. Jesuits administered property according to the founders' wishes; as individuals the Jesuits did not own it.

Similarly, all Jesuit houses were independent foundations with their own means of support. A poor house could not beg from a rich one. If a house were poor, it could be given additional sources of revenue. In this case, it was the foundation, not the Jesuits living in it, that acquired property, and no Jesuit could alienate it. It was thus that colleges, for example, had acquired benefices. But above all, each Jesuit house was separate from the rest, and no Jesuit, not even the general, could spend the money or legally commit the property of a foundation other than his own. From this it followed that Lavalette and the Jesuit house of Saint-Pierre in Martinique were alone responsible for Lavalette's debts. The property of Saint-Pierre could be seized for the creditors, but none of the other property belonging to the order could be touched.

The creditors' lawyers, Gerbier, Gouvé, Lalourcé, and Rouhette, denied the validity of the Jesuits' argument and set forth two of their own. First they argued that the Jesuit order was an exceptional order because its members travelled more than other religious and lived in many different foundations, because the Jesuits' took a fourth vow of absolute obedience to the general, and because the general was a despot. Whatever the Jesuit constitutions and canon law said, the Jesuit order was not the same as other religious orders and could not be governed by the same rules. The Jesuits were not administrators but owners of their
property which they, and particularly their general, had acquired and used illegally.

Furthermore, and this was the second argument, even if the constitutions and canon law did govern the Jesuit order, Lavalette had placed himself outside their protection by engaging in commerce, which they forbade. Since he had done so with the complicity of the general as well as of his more immediate superiors, the whole order had placed itself outside the protection of its own Institute and canon and civil law. The Jesuit order in France, over which the French crown and Parlement had jurisdiction, must be held responsible for Lavalette's debts. And because the Jesuits owned the property they held, it could and should be applied to the payment of Lavalette's debts. 39

By the beginning of April 1761, the Grand'Chambre had heard most of these arguments expounded at considerable length. So had a large number of people in the public galleries, who gave noisy expression to their dislike of the Jesuits. 40 It was in the knowledge that the anti-Jesuit cause was popular that the magistrates took the next step in the legal proceedings. On 17 April 1761, a counsellor of the Grand'Chambre and ardent Jansenist, Chauvelin, acting, he said, within his rights as a Christian, a citizen, and a magistrate, denounced the statutes and constitutions of the Jesuits and demanded that the court examine them. 41

The court complied with Chauvelin's wishes and gave the Jesuit superiors of Paris three days in which to hand over a recent copy of their constitutions. 42 In the same week, twelve lawyers of the Parlement of Paris signed a memorandum which purported to prove that Lavalette had always acted under the order of the general in Rome and that the Jesuits had existed in France provisionally since 1603. 43 Then on 8 May 1761, the Avocat Général le Pelletier de Saint-Fargeau issued his conclusion in
which he supported the position taken by the creditors of Lavalette and held the General of the Society of Jesus to be the owner of that order's property and Lavalette to be his agent. The court then issued an arrêt in which it condemned the Jesuit general and the body of Jesuits in France to pay the Lioncy brothers and their creditors 1,502,276 livres 2 sols and 1 denier and 50,000 livres in interest and damaged owed by Lavalette. It ordered the Jesuits to acquit the entire debt within one year. If they failed to pay it, the creditors could reimburse themselves with Jesuit property in the kingdom.

Once made, the decision of 8 May 1761 was rapidly forgotten and the creditors of Lavalette, whatever their fate, were brushed aside. By its earlier action of 17 April 1761, the court had publicly acknowledged that its main concern was broader than just seeing that Lavalette's debts were repaid. After 17 April, the issue which really concerned it was whether the Jesuit order should be allowed to exist in France at all. In taking up this matter, it encountered the opposition of the king.

The Jesuits had responded almost immediately to the Parlement's order of 17 April. On the following day, Montigny, the procureur of the Province of Paris, handed over copies of the Jesuits' constitutions to the court. He complied with the arrêt so rapidly in the hope of convincing the Parlement of the Jesuits' willingness to see justice done and the matter cleared up as soon as possible. He also did so without consulting the provincial of Paris or notifying the chancellor Lamoignon, a known and respected friend of the Jesuits who was at Versailles that day. On 18 or 19 April, the king heard about the arrêt of 17 April and sent for the Premier Président and the Procureur Général of the Parlement. He ordered them to retract their demand for the constitutions and they replied that it was too late; the Jesuits had already obeyed the arrêt. The king did
nothing for the moment, but on 30 May, the Jesuits' legal case against the Lioncys having ended, he ordered the Parlement to hand the constitutions over to his Royal Council, which would now examine them instead of the Parlement. The Parlement, having taken the precaution of acquiring a second copy for itself, conformed. At Versailles, the king appointed a commission of seven men including Gilbert de Voisins and Feydeau de Brou.\(^47\) He apparently instructed his commission to discover the means by which the Jesuit order in France might be reformed and saved from its enemies. The Jesuits later argued that the king's commission had worked against them and there is some evidence that it had.\(^48\)

The king's commission worked slowly and, in the meantime, the Parlement, still impelled by Chauvelin's and other Jansenists' enthusiasm for the anti-Jesuit cause, instructed the Gens du Roi\(^49\) to examine and report on the contents of the Jesuits' constitutions. Between 3 and 7 July 1761, Omer Joly de Fleury, an Avocat Général, delivered a compte rendu prepared by the Gens du Roi on this subject.\(^50\) As Jean Egret has observed, the conclusions expressed by Omer Joly de Fleury were "relatively moderate".\(^51\) The Avocat Général proposed that the king should issue lettres patentes which would make the Jesuit order in France independent of the general in Rome and more subject to the will of the French bishops and civil authorities than before. He also recommended that the crown should compel the Jesuits to teach doctrine which conformed to the Four Gallican Propositions of 1682.

In the same report, Omer Joly de Fleury explained the nature of the Jesuits' property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement and in the rest of France. He demonstrated how scattered but also how important the Jesuit property was. By doing this, he expected to convince the court of the need to send its findings and decisions on the Jesuits' existence and
property to the other parlements and sovereign courts of the kingdom. In their turn, they should be persuaded to treat the Jesuits of their jurisdictions as the Parlement of Paris was treating its Jesuits. He concluded his report by warning the Parlement of Paris that its task now was not to reform the Jesuits but to make "stable and immutable laws" by which to control a society which possessed so many establishments of such importance in the kingdom. 52

Joly de Fleury's report was followed by another on 8 July, in which Chauvelin denounced the pernicious doctrine and moral teachings of the Jesuits and revealed something that had probably been clear since 17 April. He was not interested in Joly de Fleury's suggestions but was determined to destroy the Jesuit order in France. 53 After Chauvelin made his speech of 8 July, a commission of members of the Parlement again studied the constitutions. This time it was de l'Averdy and Terray, probably assisted by Chauvelin, who undertook the task. 54 All were Jansenists and very hard workers, and it is likely that Chauvelin's speech of 8 July had been the work of all three. 55

It was probably Chauvelin's report of 8 July which provoked the king's next action. While his own commission continued to seek a satisfactory means of reforming the Jesuit order, the king, on 2 August 1761, issued a declaration in which he ordered the Parlement to stop considering the Jesuits' constitutions and statutes and to refrain from debating the fate of the Jesuits for a full year. 56 At the same time, the king stated that he was ordering all Jesuit superiors to hand over their titles to their establishments to his Royal Council within the next six months. It seems to have been his intention to ask his advisers to determine whether the Jesuits were owners or administrators of their property. As it happened, however, it was the Parlement which considered the titles in February 1762.
and in the months that followed. 57

The Parlement registered the declaration and promptly ignored it. On 6 August 1761, it issued two arrêts which had been prepared by de l'Averdy 58 and which severely attacked the Jesuit order. In the first, the Parlement judged that all the papal legislation relating to the establishment of the Jesuit order in France was illegal and that the Jesuit order probably therefore existed illegally in France. 59 In the second, it condemned twenty-four books written by Jesuit authors and ordered them to be destroyed for the pernicious doctrine which they contained. By the same arrêt it ordered that no one should enter the Jesuit order, take any kind of vow within the order, or join a Jesuit congrégation 61 until the matter raised by the first arrêt had been decided. More important still, it ordered the Jesuits to stop teaching in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris on 1 October 1761 if there were another college in the town in question and on 1 April 1762 if there were not. It told parents and other legal guardians to withdraw students from Jesuit colleges before these deadlines and it instructed municipal officers, officers of the bailliages and sénéchaussées, and the universities to send to the Parlement reports on what should be done with Jesuit colleges after they were closed. 62 A third arrêt of the same day ordered Jesuit superiors to prepare états, or lists of all the members of the Society of Jesus who lived in their houses and of all the property that they held. The Jesuits were to send these statements to the Abbé Terray, conseiller rapporteur of the court. 63 On 7 August, at the foot of the Great Staircase in the courtyard of the Palais de Justice, the court burned the twenty-four books listed in the second arrêt of the previous day. 64

The king's response, apparently prompted by the queen, the dauphin, other members of the royal family, and the chancellor Lamoignon, came on
29 August 1761 in the form of *lettres patentes*. The king ordered the Parlement to refrain from executing the *arrêt* of 6 August for one year. The Parlement registered the royal legislation, which had the support of Terray and was opposed by several other men who were subsequently to play important parts in the confiscation of Jesuit property. The opponents were Chauvelin; the president from the Chamber of Requêtes, Rolland; and two counsellors from the Chamber of Enquêtes, Lambert and Roussel de la Tour. On 7 September, the Parlement again acted on l'Averdy's advice and decided that no Jesuit college should be closed until 1 April 1762, and that it would respect the king's wishes, expressed in the *lettres patentes*, for six months. It was as good as its word, and until the following March it hardly raised the Jesuit question at all, except to ask local officials to suggest what should be done with Jesuit property after the expected suppression. The six months' interim had included the normal summer recess of about three months.

In the meantime, various royal agencies sought to come to some understanding with the Jesuits, the general of the order, and the pope over the means by which the order might be reformed and saved from the Parlement. By the end of September 1761, de Flesselles sent the Paris provincial of the Jesuits, de la Croix, two documents by which, provided the Jesuit superiors in France and the general in Rome could approve them, the commission proposed to save the order from the Parlement's machinations. The first document was entitled the *Decret sur le tyrannicide* and was intended to be the means by which the Jesuits would disassociate themselves from any teaching or belief that regicide was, under any circumstances, just. The second was a declaration of their belief in the Four Gallican Propositions of 1682 and of their willingness to teach them. These were the first of several sets of documents drafted with a view to
saving the Jesuits by making them conform to new laws. Neither the pope, nor the general, nor the French Jesuits could accept the two documents, which were antithetical to the ultramontanism of which the Jesuit order was the greatest symbol. 69

The Jesuits having refused to accept the two documents drafted by the commission, the Paris provincial and his supporters attempted, between October and December 1761, to produce a document which made as great a compromise with the commission as they felt they could make. They and their superiors had balked at holding the Four Propositions of 1682 to be true and at the inclusion of excerpts taken directly from the Four Propositions in the Decret sur le tyrannicide, and they now offered an alternate formula. They declared themselves attached to all the laws of the kingdom and especially to the royal power. They condemned all doctrines opposed to the safety of the king and they agreed to teach the Four Propositions and never to teach anything contrary to them. They recognized the authority of the bishops and laws of the Gallican church over them, and even promised in advance to disobey their general if he should ever order them to act in a manner contrary to the present declaration. 70 Over one hundred Jesuits of the Province of Paris signed the declaration. 71

While de la Croix and his associates had been working on this document, a group of fifty-one bishops and cardinals had begun to meet in Paris to consider Louis XV's request for their opinions on the usefulness, doctrine, conduct, and régime of the Jesuits. 72 It was to this body that, on 19 December 1761, de la Croix presented the declaration just described. The bishops and cardinals were apparently satisfied with it, but the pope and general could not accept the major changes in Ignatius's Institute which it implied. Moreover, the royal commission would only accept it if the
the *Decret sur le tyrannicide* were also included, and the Jesuits had already decided that this would be impossible.\(^{73}\)

The impasse thus reached was not broken by the prelates' conference, though the Jesuits and their supporters were encouraged by the decisions of the conference. On 30 December, forty-five of the fifty-one members voted to accept a statement which defended the integrity of the Jesuits' Institute and demanded its conservation. They also commended the Jesuits' doctrine and morals and the services rendered by members of the Jesuit order. The six who did not sign included the Cardinal of Choiseul, brother of the duke of the same name, and Fitz-James, the patron of the Oratorians. In January 1762, the conference adjourned and the pope wrote to Louis XV to ask him to protect the Jesuit order.\(^{74}\)

The crown had not abandoned the hope that a way might still be found by which the Jesuit order in France might be reformed to satisfy the Parlement and end its persecution of the order. The king therefore, in the meantime, asked the Cardinal of Paris, the Archbishop of Narbonne, the Bishop of Verdun, and the Bishop of Orléans\(^{75}\) to find another formula. By 5 January, they had revised de la Croix's document and had submitted it to Rome.\(^{76}\) Then, on 15 January, the royal commission which had so far failed to provide a solution to the problem met, apparently in the king's presence, to discuss the means of separating the Jesuits of France from the rest of the Company of Jesus. This time it proposed the creation of a special Jesuit vicar, who would be responsible to the king for the Jesuits' affairs in France.\(^{77}\) Choiseul supported the plan and sent Cardinal Rochechouart to Rome to persuade the general and the pope to accept it. Clement XIII replied to the suggestion on 28 January. He said it was not in his power to approve such a change in the Institute of Saint Ignatius which had been sanctioned by so many earlier popes and by the Council of Trent.\(^{78}\)
Still the king did not stop seeking a means to satisfy every party involved. On 9 March 1762, he issued a declaration which he himself may have prepared. It would have allowed the Jesuit order to remain in France on condition that all instructions from the general were approved by the crown before being executed and that the Jesuits would teach the Four Propositions of 1682. The king sent the declaration, which the Jesuits were not prepared to accept, to the Parlement. The Parlement named commissioners to examine it, but, led by de l'Averdy, refused to take up the matter seriously until the questions about the Jesuits' right to exist in France, which had been raised by the Parlement's legislation of 6 August 1761, had been decided. On 28 March, the commissioners, probably inspired by Chauvelin, presented further evidence against the Jesuits in the form of a pamphlet entitled Extraits des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses...[of the Jesuits]. Compiled by the Jansenists Goujet, Minard, and Roussel de la Tour, using money provided by the President Rolland d'Erceville, it explained all the heretical and immoral propositions which had been taught or published by the Jesuits.

Then, on 1 April, the Jesuits, who, for the most part, cannot have been aware of the parlementaires' vindictive action of four days before, closed their own colleges. We do not know whether the Jesuits' decision to obey the Parlement's commands was prompted by fear or by the hope that they might still save their order by proving their willingness to be governed by the laws of the kingdom. Their pupils gone, the Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris either left their houses, too, or closed their doors and waited inside to see what would happen.

While the debate on doctrine and morals had been taking place, other Jesuits had been involved in an attempt to save the order by meeting the
requirements of the arrêt of 8 May 1761. That legislation had ordered the Jesuits to repay a million and a half livres to the Lioncy brothers and also served as the legal precedent by which all other creditors of Lavalette could expect to be repaid by the Jesuits in France. After 8 May 1761, many creditors presented themselves to the Jesuits of the professed house in Paris and asked to be paid. Their claims rapidly amounted to over three million livres and before the year was up it was apparent that Lavalette still owed about four and one-half million livres to his creditors, despite the work of de Sacy. In the circumstances, the Jesuit general in Rome, Ricci, decided to appoint a papal commissioner to satisfy as many creditors as possible.

He named the French court Jesuit Griffet to the post, and on 10 September 1761, Griffet substituted Gatin, the procureur of the mission of Martinique, who lived in the professed house in Paris, for himself. The problem was to raise enough money even to begin to appease the claimants. By 12 January 1762, the Assistancy of France had provided 352,000 livres from the missions, colleges, and residences of the kingdom, and even to do this much had doubtless required sacrifices. The king of Poland gave 150,000 livres. For the rest, Gatin had to ask permission to borrow. The Duke of Choiseul gave this permission, on the condition that Gatin raise the money outside the kingdom. As things turned out, although Choiseul had authorized Gatin to raise up to three million livres abroad, Gatin managed to raise only 860,000 livres, most of which came from England. Thus, his total resources were only slightly more than one million livres. It was with this money that Gatin and Lamarche, the only "visitor" who ever reached Martinique, repaid Lavalette's creditors in 1761 to 1762. Gatin apparently continued to make payments to creditors until 1764 at least, but the work of both men was thwarted by
the events of April 1762.

When the Jesuits closed their colleges on 1 April, the debate over whether the constitutions and statutes of the order could or could not be changed came to an end. Despite the apparent flexibility of the king and some of the French Jesuits, neither the pope nor the general, on the one hand, nor the Parlement of Paris, on the other, could accept any of the proposed formulae in place of the existing laws governing the society. The intransigence of both these parties suggests that no compromise ever could have been achieved. And the speed with which the Parlement acted after 1 April suggests that the coalition of anti-Jesuit forces had been planning the destruction of the Jesuit order for some time before.

On 23 April 1762, two weeks before the deadline set by the arrêt of 8 May 1761 for the repayment of Lavalette's creditors, the Parlement passed an arrêt by which it created a network of administrators who, with the municipal officers and members of the bailliages and sénéchausées, would immediately seize all Jesuit property in the Parlement's jurisdiction. The new administrators, or économes séquestres, would assume control over all the property. At the same time, the Parlement ordered the Jesuits, who remained in their houses for the time being, to prepare lists of the members of the order who lived in specific houses, and statements regarding the nature and extent of the property which each foundation owned. Between April and August 1762, the Parlement, and even the crown, had little to do with the Jesuits, who after 23 April were officially despoiled of their property though not yet officially disbanded. If the Jesuits needed money with which to buy food or other necessities, the Parlement sent what they needed from the revenue which the Jesuits had once administered and which was now in the hands of the Parlement's officials.
Although we know that the Jesuits did prepare the statements about themselves and their property which the Parlement demanded, we do not know whether they had, after 23 April, given up the hope that their order might still survive. On 11 May, an extraordinary assembly of the French clergy meeting in Paris voted a subsidy to support the war and asked the king to retain the Jesuits. But by 19 May 1762, the Jesuit general in Rome had apparently accepted the French Jesuits' loss of their property and expulsion from their houses. On that day, he wrote to the Jesuits of the Assistancy of France, dispensing them from their obligation to wear the Jesuit religious habit and from their duty to obey those rules of their constitutions which could not be applied to men who no longer lived as members of a religious order in a religious community. At the same time he asked them, after their dispersal, to obey their bishops and to continue, for the glory of God, to carry out as many of their priestly and spiritual functions as possible.

On 6 August 1762, the one year's delay demanded by the king having expired, the Parlement of Paris again considered the fate of the Jesuit order in France. This time it did carry out its threats of one year earlier, and it again embodied its decisions in three arrêts. It judged the existence of the Jesuit order in France to be incompatible with the existence of a disciplined state. The Jesuits were guilty of all the heresies, and all subjects of the king were henceforth forbidden to have anything further to do with the Jesuit order. The Jesuits were to leave their colleges, seminaries, professed houses, noviciates, residences, and missions. This time the king did not overrule the Parlement's decision, and as a result of the legislation of 6 August 1762, the Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris were disbanded.

But that was not all. Like all the other anti-Jesuit legislation
approved by the Parlement during the preceding eighteen months, the arrêts of 6 August 1762 were intended not just for the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris but for the whole kingdom. Nor were the magistrates of the capital disappointed. Within a year, legislation inspired by the Parlement of Paris or modelled on its decisions had been adopted by all parts of the kingdom except the border regions of Pau, Flanders, parts of Artois, Franche-Comté, and Alsace. By 1762, the Parlement of Paris, although not always the first to introduce legislation against the Jesuits, had become the Parlement of France in matters that concerned them. It would lead the campaign against the Jesuits until its own brief suppression a decade later. After 6 August 1762, it no longer dealt with the Jesuit order in France, however, but with the individual Frenchmen who had once been members of that order. In the second phase of the struggle, the Parlement would again encounter the opposition of the king, but he would be less resolute than before.
II The Dispersal of the Jesuits 1762 to 1789

When the arrêts of 6 August 1762 were promulgated, there were about 3,250 Jesuits in France and the French missions, of whom about 1,200 lived in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. We shall understand some aspects of the administration of Jesuit property better if we now consider what became of these men after their property was taken away and their order was suppressed.

The arrêts of 6 August allowed the former Jesuits living in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris to withdraw to any part of the kingdom they wished. If an individual Jesuit wanted to continue to teach or preach, he had to take an oath of allegiance to the king and to the Four Articles of 1682, and to swear to have nothing further to do with the Jesuit Institute. It was thus possible for a former Jesuit with a flexible conscience or a dislike to his order to take the oath of 6 August 1762, and to continue to be part of French ecclesiastical life. By 1767, about 150 Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris had taken this oath and apparently become indistinguishable from other ecclesiastics of the kingdom.

Jesuits who did not take the oath prescribed by the arrêt of 6 August 1762 might not live in colleges or seminaries or associate with or write to other Jesuits or former Jesuits. They were to renounce their Jesuit habit and to live "in obedience to the king and under the authority of the ordinary". This legislation applied to the other approximately 1,050 Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the Parlement, who apparently chose not to perjure themselves in the eyes of God or their fellows, or at least did take the oath. They were allowed, for the time being, to live privately and separately in any part of the kingdom they chose.
Although it is impossible to discover what happened to all the Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris who had not taken the oath, we can trace the movements of a small number of them in the years 1762 to 1767. The official catalogues of the former Jesuit Province of Champagne for 1761 to 1765 inclusive and for 1767 have been published. That province had included the Colleges of Charleville, Reims, Châlons-sur-Marne, Sens, Chaumont-en-Bassigny, Laon, Auxerre, Langres, and Bar-le-Duc, which were in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. Its catalogues explain what happened to many of the 137 Jesuits who had lived in those colleges. The catalogue of 1762, and that of 1763, describe approximately fifty-five Jesuits as "dispersed", but say nothing about where they went. In the other cases, the catalogue of 1762 is more precise. It shows that after 6 August 1762, most of the other eighty-two Jesuits moved to the border regions of Alsace and Lorraine, which were outside the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris and under the general protection of the king of Poland. In about fifty cases, they took up teaching in the Colleges of Pont-à-Mousson, Nancy, Ensisheim, or Epinal, or else went to live in the Jesuit residence at Saint Mihiel. In more than twenty of these fifty cases, former Jesuits spent the next five years in the college or residence in Lorraine to which they had moved in 1762. In two or three other cases, former Jesuits actually moved to Poland, and in a handful of cases they went to Strasbourg or to that part of the old duchy of Burgundy which we describe as Franche-Comté. Jesuits from other parts of the territory of the Parlement of Paris seem also to have been attracted to the border regions of the kingdom. Some went to Franche-Comté, Flanders; or even Avignon, in 1762.

Besides expelling the Jesuits from their houses, the Parlement also made provision for their needs during the first year after the suppression.
On 6 August 1762, it accorded 600 livres to Jesuit priests who were over thirty-three and whose names appeared in the list made after 23 April 1762, and 300 livres to Jesuit brothers and scholastics on the same conditions. The money was to be paid in three instalments in August, December, and March. To all other Jesuits of its jurisdiction who were under thirty-three, the court granted travel allowances of 200 livres if they were priests and 100 livres if they were not. Both kinds of payments were to be made by the économes séquestres named after 23 April 1762.  

A week later, the Parlement changed these arrangements slightly. Now the Jesuits over thirty-three were to receive the full allowance of 600 or 300 livres immediately, and those not yet thirty-three were to receive an additional 100 livres if they were priests and 50 livres if they were brothers. At the same time, the Parlement decided how much personal property the Jesuits might take with them when they left their houses. The allowance seems to have been generous. Each Jesuit could take his own table, chair, desk, and books, twelve shirts, eighteen sets of undergarments, twelve towels, three pairs of sheets, his bed, and its covers.  

The Parlement also took account, by an arrêt of 11 August, of the Jesuits who were too old or too sick to leave their houses. They might remain in them until they were well enough to leave, and in the meantime they were to be treated by doctors employed by the court and paid by the économes séquestres appointed to administer Jesuit property after 23 April 1762. All the measures just described were temporary ones intended to speed the dispersal of the Jesuits or to take care of them until they could be dispersed.  

But the Parlement had also considered what would become of the Jesuits after they had spent the money which the court had given them for the first year. On 6 August 1762, it had stated that all former Jesuits
over thirty-three and included in the lists made after 23 April 1762 should be entitled to annual pensions. These pensions would be drawn on the property which had belonged to the Jesuit order, and specifically on the ecclesiastical benefices which had been attached to Jesuit colleges. The court had instructed the Jesuits of its jurisdiction who met the requirement and wanted a pension to submit their requests with proof of their age and profession in the Jesuit order to the Parlement by 3 February. By that day, the Parlement had received and accepted applications for pensions from 439 Jesuits in its jurisdiction. They included 307 priests and 132 brothers. The Parlement had also recognized the claims of another thirty-three former Jesuits but had sent them directly to the crown to ask for a pension. At least 639 Jesuits, including 481 priests and 158 brothers and scholastics had not submitted their claims by 4 February 1763. We do not know whether the lists of Jesuits in the two categories were ever used to determine who would or would not get a pension because the whole matter was very soon taken out of the Parlement's hands.

The Parlement had designated the ecclesiastical benefices attached to Jesuit colleges to be the eventual source of annual pensions for former Jesuits, but it is unlikely it expected that its économes séquestres in the bailliages and sénéchaussées would pay Jesuit pensions. As other parlements in other parts of the kingdom also suppressed the Jesuit order, the payment of Jesuit pensions became more and more a matter which concerned the crown. On 2 February 1763, the king issued lettres patentes which charged the royal official known as the Econome Général du Clergé with the responsibility for administering the benefices attached to former Jesuit colleges. One obvious reason why the crown selected this official was because his régie was already responsible for administering
vacant benefices in the king's nomination and for paying pensions to ecclesiastics whom the king wished to support.¹⁶ He now simply broadened his functions to include administering additional ecclesiastical property and paying additional ecclesiastical pensions.

The Econome Général's administration of the benefices began retroactively on 1 January 1763, and he apparently paid his first pensions to Jesuits during the last six months of that year.¹⁷ From the beginning, the crown seems to have authorized the payment of pensions to any French Jesuits except those of Lorraine and Franche-Comté¹⁸ who were thirty-three or more in August 1762, and who had been members of the Jesuit order for a number of years, regardless of where they lived. Initially, the Econome Général paid pensions of 400 livres a year to former Jesuit priests and 200 to 300 livres a year to other members of the order, and he made such payments in advance, in two instalments a year. We do not know precisely how many former Jesuits received pensions from the Econome Général in any given year, but he probably paid annual pensions to about 1,470 former Jesuits of the whole of France during the first six years of his administration. After 1768, he seems to have paid them to a smaller and smaller number of Jesuits each year.²⁰ We do not know how many of the Jesuits in question had lived in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

Although the parlementaires were apparently relieved to see a royal official assume responsibility for paying annual allowances to the Jesuits,²¹ they had not yet washed their hands of the former Jesuits. In 1763 to 1764, a new wave of pro-Jesuit literature was published. The best example was the Réponse aux Extraits et Assertions,²² or rejoinder on behalf of the Jesuits against the anti-Jesuit polemic read in the Parlement of Paris in March 1762.²³ The anonymous author of the Réponse pointed out 758 falsifications, alterations of text, and faults in translation in the
parlementaires' pamphlet. As a result of the publication of the Réponse and other similar works, the parlementaires responsible for suppressing the order in the territory of the Parlement of Paris became uneasy about the possibility of the restoration of the Jesuit order, which the king had obviously not yet abandoned. Their uneasiness was expressed in a number of ways.

By July 1763, the Parlement had decided to investigate all those Jesuits of its jurisdiction who had not applied to the Parlement for a pension and who were thus not under the surveillance of the local courts which reported to the Parlement. In the same year, the Parlement's inquiry into the state of former Jesuit colleges had been accompanied by the re-opening of the discussion on public education which had been going on for some time before and which, in Paris, was led by the enemy of the Jesuits, Président Rolland d'Erceville. People like Rolland wanted public education to serve the needs of a unified state and to be scrutinized very closely by public authorities. To this desired development, the continued existence of the Jesuits, whether they received pensions or not, seemed antithetical. Even the nomination, in December 1763, of one of the most active enemies of the Jesuits, de l'Averdy, to be Controller General of Finances did not calm the parlementaires' fears of the restoration of the Jesuit order in France. It may, however, have given them the courage to do what they did next.

On February 1764, the Parlement of Paris decided to require an oath from all Jesuits of its jurisdiction who had not taken the one of 6 August 1762, and to threaten them with expulsion from the kingdom if they failed to take it. It gave them until 9 March to take the "oath of 22 February 1764", which was in substance the same as that of 6 August 1762. Apparently very few Jesuits took the oath. Then, on 9 March, the Parlement ordered all the other Jesuits who had not taken the
oath of 6 August 1762 or of 22 February 1764 to leave the kingdom, and not merely the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, within one month. 29

For the Parlement, banishment entailed some of the same problems as suppression. Once again, it decided to except from the provisions of the arrêt of 9 March 1764, those former Jesuits who were too old or too sick to leave their present residences. In this case, we do know how the court carried out these special provisions. Its papers contain records of over two hundred requests from former Jesuits stating that they were unable to move within the allotted month. In April and May 1764, it considered these requests and the medical certificates that accompanied them. In almost all cases, it rendered judgments which either ordered the Jesuit in question to leave France immediately or else gave him a maximum period of two months in which to leave. In only a handful of cases did the court grant unrestricted rights to former Jesuits to stay in France. 30 Other parlements, and notably those of Toulouse and Rouen, also banished their Jesuits at about the same time. 31

One immediate result of the Parlement's actions of February and March was the king's Declaration of 2 April 1764. In this document, the crown officially assumed responsibility for supplying any money that the benefices failed to produce for Jesuit pensions. Even before this time, the crown had apparently been providing any additional money that was necessary, but the emphasis was henceforth to be first on paying Jesuit pensions from the Royal Treasury and then on making sure that the Econome Général was administering the benefices well. 32 Moreover, the principle was rapidly established that the pensions, now largely paid by the crown, were to be given to those former Jesuits who had no economic resources of their own. The pensions were not intended for Jesuits who had taken the oaths of 6 August 1762 or 22 February 1764 and gained ecclesiastical
benefices or other sources of money with which to support themselves.\(^{33}\)

The crown attached no strings to the pensions it paid; it would even pay them to Jesuits who left the kingdom.\(^{34}\) By assuming the responsibility for paying Jesuit pensions, the crown had not regained the initiative in the Jesuit affair, but it had tried to ensure that the Jesuits would not die of poverty or neglect.

It is not clear how many Jesuits left the kingdom after the \textit{Parlement} issued its legislation of 9 March, though a number of former Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the \textit{Parlement} of Paris seem to have gone to Lorraine or Franche-Comté or Flanders, where they were safe for the time being.\(^{35}\) But the exodus from the kingdom was not great, either because many of the \textit{bailliages} and \textit{sénéchausées} lacked the will to enforce the \textit{Parlement}'s orders or because the former Jesuits did not take them seriously.\(^{36}\)

Nevertheless, the king was sufficiently displeased with the \textit{Parlement}'s legislation to take steps to undo it. In November 1764, he issued an edict in which he stated that the Jesuit order was now to be suppressed throughout the entire kingdom, and he thereby put an end to the anomalies that had existed in the border regions since 1762. He granted all former Jesuits the right, which the \textit{Parlement} of Paris had granted two years before but taken away in 1764, to live privately anywhere in the kingdom, under the authority of the ordinaries. Any Jesuit who had taken the oaths prescribed by the various \textit{parlements}, which in the territory of the \textit{Parlement} of Paris meant the oaths of 6 August 1762 or 22 February 1764, might continue to teach, preach, or hold an ecclesiastical benefice. Everyone was now ordered to drop any legal proceedings he had initiated against former Jesuits and to stop writing on the Jesuit affair. The edict was to apply to all France.\(^{37}\)

While the \textit{Parlements} of Franche-Comté and Flanders tried to avoid
accepting the edict, which obliged them to suppress the Jesuit order for the first time, the Parlements of Toulouse, Rouen, Aix, and Paris registered the edict immediately and then drafted some harsher legislation to ensure that the Jesuit order would never grow strong again. After 1 December, former Jesuits might again live in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, but they had to remain at least ten leagues away from the capital. Otherwise, they were to live in the diocese of their birth and report to local officials of the court every six months.

While it is not possible to determine what happened to the Jesuits of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in the weeks after the publication of the arrêts of March to May 1764, it is possible to consider the effects of all the legislation of 1764 on the movement of Jesuits who had formerly lived in the Jesuit province of Champagne. The official catalogues of that province show that while, in 1762, the Jesuits had moved to the generally safe border regions in the east, in 1764, they reacted to new legislation with no obvious consistency. In 1764, at least three former Jesuits of this province did leave France to go to other countries, but in the same year at least two former Jesuits seem to have returned from two years' exile in foreign lands. Otherwise, the former Jesuits who moved, followed no particular pattern. In short, the legislation of 1764 had no general effect on the Jesuits who had lived in those colleges of Champagne which were in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. It appears unlikely that Jesuits from elsewhere under the jurisdiction of the Parlement changed their behaviour or their places of residence because of it, either.

In mid-December 1764, the moderate parlementaire of Rouen, Miromesnil, wrote to the Controller General about the Parlement's arrêt of 1 December 1764. He advised de l'Averdy that the men who feared the re-establishment of the Jesuit order should avoid persecuting the former Jesuits because
persecution would undoubtedly create many Jesuit sympathizers and achieve no other useful result. For more than two years, the Parlement of Paris seems to have followed this advice and to have avoided discussing any but the economic and administrative aspects of the Jesuit question.

The parlementaires' enmity for the Jesuits had merely gone underground, however. On 2 April 1767, the Jesuits were forcibly expelled from Spain in the midst of a propaganda campaign which was even harsher than that waged by the Parlement of Paris in 1761 to 1762. In France, this was the event which recalled all the old Jesuit fighters to the colours. It was the Abbé Chauvelin who led the last charge against the remnants of the Jesuit order in the territory of the Parlement of Paris. The other magistrates followed him.

By the end of April 1767, the Parlement had decided to revoke the permission which, in 1762 and 1764, it had given to former Jesuits to remain in the kingdom. By 8 May, Omer Joly de Fleury, acting under Chauvelin's influence, had prepared and read to the court a lengthy summation of the vices of the Jesuits and a resolution that they should be banished. On 9 May 1767, the Parlement embodied the conclusions of the Avocat Général in an arrêt. It ordered the exile of all Jesuits who had not taken the oath of 6 August 1762 or 22 February 1764, from the kingdom. Those who had taken the first oath were still permitted to fulfil their public functions, and those who had taken only the second oath were obliged to live in the diocese of their birth under the authority of their bishop. Anyone else who had been a member of the Jesuit order in France in August 1761 was given two weeks in which to leave the kingdom. The king was asked to use his influence in Rome to ensure the total destruction of the Society of Jesus throughout the world. In the next three months, the Parlements of Aix, Metz, and Toulouse followed the
example of the Parlement of Paris and banished those former Jesuits who would not take an oath against their order. The Parlements of Rouen and Rennes adopted a slightly more moderate, but nonetheless anti-Jesuit, stance in the same period. The legislation passed by the Parlement of Paris was applied in Lorraine within the next year.

Once again, although it had decided to punish the Jesuits, the Parlement did not ignore their daily needs. It assumed responsibility, on the crown's behalf, for the welfare of the Jesuits who were expelled. The arrêt of 9 May asked the king to continue to pay pensions to those Jesuits who were forced to leave the kingdom and to those Jesuits who were too ill or too old to move. An arrêt of 4 August 1767 named Paris notaries and bankers who were authorized to receive the pensions accorded to exiled Jesuits and to send the money out of the kingdom to those former Jesuits who entrusted them with this responsibility. In the meantime, on 15 May, the court had instructed officers in each bailliage and sénéchaussée to list the Jesuits who had remained in the kingdom and to submit this list to the Parlement as soon as possible. It instructed the local officers to make suggestions about how to place old or sick Jesuits in religious institutions where they could be looked after. All former Jesuits permitted to remain in the kingdom were to be placed in such institutions, unless, of course, they had taken the oath. The religious superiors of these establishments were charged to "treat [former Jesuits] with humanity, to oversee their conduct, and to prevent them from engaging in any kind of communication [with other Jesuits or former Jesuits] which could be dangerous".

As it had done in the spring of 1764, the court permitted former Jesuits to ask to remain in the kingdom and it judged each case on the evidence submitted by the supplicant and by the local officials. Again, we
have considerable information about the court's treatment of those Jesuits who wanted to stay. In 1767, thirty-eight Jesuits asked to be allowed to stay, and in May 1768, the court granted such permission to twenty of them, while ordering the other eighteen to leave the kingdom. A week after making this decision, the court issued another arrêt in which it ordered that no more Jesuits, whatever their condition, should be allowed to take the oaths of 1762 or 1764.

The results of the legislation of 1767 to 1768 in the territory of the Parlement of Paris are difficult to assess. Most of the extant reports state that while there had been some former Jesuits in the bailliage or sénéchaussée in question until quite recently, by 1768 all but three or four had either departed or died. Those who had not left the kingdom were in at least half the cases unable to take care of themselves. In several instances, it was clear that the persecution of the Jesuits in the previous five years had had harmful effects. A handful of former Jesuits had become insane or unbalanced, apparently because of the uncertainty of their life since their expulsion from their religious houses in 1762.

The Jesuits who left the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in 1767 or 1768, and it is impossible to tell just how many did, had fewer places to which to retreat than ever before. Neither Flanders nor Lorraine was so secure a refuge after 1768 as before. Those former French Jesuits who sought peace and quiet found it either in eastern Lorraine, or in the remaining refuges in the region south of Lyon which remained a kind of no man's land not directly policed by the most anti-Jesuit parlements. Many "lived privately" in the countryside of the former Province of Lyon. Others went to Carpentras. But the most important retreat of all was the papal territory of Avignon. Even as late as the
Revolution as many as thirty or forty former Jesuits lived in Avignon and continued to receive pensions from the king of France there. More daring men, and there seem to have been several of them, had struck out for the Catholic domains of Catherine of Russia or Frederick of Prussia.

The king did not interfere with the Parlement's legislation of 1767 to 1768 as he had done in 1764. There is no obvious explanation for his restraint, unless it was that there were so few Jesuits left to be affected by the Parlement's actions that it was not worthwhile to draw attention to the remaining Jesuits who were living in cognito in the kingdom by making special provisions for them. Since the Parlement did not administer the payment of pensions, it also did not necessarily know whether all the former Jesuits had actually left its jurisdiction. In any case, the Parlement's power in this and other matters came abruptly to a temporary end in 1771. In that year, the rise of Maupéou and Terray, a former enemy of the Jesuits and now an advocate of strengthened royal government, resulted in the most serious exile which was imposed on the Parlement of Paris in the eighteenth century. That exile was followed in 1773 by the achievement of a goal which the parlementaires had long desired. On 21 July, the new pope, Clement XIV, issued the papal bull Dominus Ac Redemptor, which disbanded the Jesuit order throughout the world.

Some loyal Jesuits, including a handful of former French Jesuits, refused to accept the papal decision, which they rightly thought had been dictated by powerful men in the Spanish and French governments. They re-established the headquarters of the loyal few in White Russia, under the protection of Catherine the Great. Almost everywhere else, however, the papal decision of 1773 was enforced.

In France, the result of the papal condemnation of the order was an
end to the harrassment of those men who had once been Jesuits. The re-established Parlement of Paris finally decided to admit that the Jesuits were no longer a threat to it or to the monarchy. For the next fifteen or sixteen years, the lot of the former French Jesuits, wherever they lived, improved. Their pensions continued to be paid and were increased. On 18 August 1773, Louis XV granted an additional fifty livres a year to all Jesuits over sixty, an additional 100 livres a year to Jesuits between seventy and eighty years old, and an additional 200 livres to Jesuits over eighty. In most though not all cases, this meant increasing pensions to 450, 500, or 600 livres for each of the three age groups. In the 1770's the General Assembly of the Clergy began to subsidize a few Jesuits whose pension from the crown were insufficient, and in 1786, it decided to remove any anomalies in the payment of pensions to former Jesuits by granting a subsidy of over 40,000 livres a year to be used to make sure all former Jesuits over sixty got at least 600 livres a year. Former Jesuits over seventy were in many cases supposed, with the clergy's subsidy, to get up to 800 livres each year. The records kept by the clergy show that even as late as 1788, more than 220 French Jesuits continued to receive pensions on the Economats and supplements from the clergy.

In February 1777, a counsellor of the Parlement of Paris alluded to the threat of a Jesuit revival, and the events of 1764 or 1767 might have been repeated except for the action of the new king. In the beginning of May, Louis XVI issued an edict which reaffirmed the one promulgated by his predecessor in November 1764. The edict promulgated in 1777 guaranteed that all former Jesuits had the right to live privately in the kingdom under the authority of their bishops. They were not to engage in foreign correspondence, not to live together, not to be charged with the cure of souls in French cities, and not to act as superiors in colleges or seminaries.
They might hold benefices in the country, provided they had signed a submission, of which the oaths of 1762 and 1764 were apparently an acceptable example. All writing and legal proceedings on the subject were to come to an end. Finally, the edict guaranteed that all former Jesuits originally eligible for pensions would continue to receive them unless they had an annual income of more than 1,000 *livres* from another source. 64

The *Parlement* of Paris registered the edict on 13 May and ordered any former Jesuit still living in its jurisdiction to reside in the diocese of his birth. 65 We do not know how many Jesuits were affected by the edict or by the *Parlement*'s legislation. As late as 1788 there were still about 300 Jesuits in France, and presumably there would have been several hundred more a decade earlier. 66 Despite the momentary revival of the Jesuit question in 1777, the French Jesuits as a group were financially more secure and personally less likely to be harrassed in 1773 to 1789 than they had been at any time between 1759 and 1773. 67 After 1773, both the *Parlement* and the crown were convinced that the disbanded order constituted no threat to their authority. Neither realized that the Society of Jesus would again exist after they had both been destroyed.

Legal proceedings against the French Jesuits had taken place in the *Parlement* of Paris between 1759 and 1767, and had resulted in the suppression of the Jesuit order in France and the dispersal of its members. At the same time as the *Parlement* carried out its campaign against the Jesuits, it also established the administration which would confiscate their property. We may now consider how it created that administration.
Part II

The Administration
Chapter III The Creation of the administration

I Appointing the officials

In the arrêts of 8 May and 6 August 1761, the Parlement of Paris had threatened to seize the property of the Jesuit order in its jurisdiction if the Jesuits failed to repay the creditors. In the months that followed, it made preparations to carry out this threat. To confiscate, administer, and eventually to dispose of the property would require the services of special officials or appointees. We may begin our study of the confiscation of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris by considering how the Parlement, with the crown's help, named men to perform these tasks.

Anyone who reads the legislation which appointed the officials and explained how they would function is likely to be impressed by the administration's lack of coherent purpose and by the piecemeal way in which it developed. It did, however, have three characteristics which gave it unity and determined the tasks which the officials would carry out. In the first place, although royal legislation created or regulated important aspects of the administration, it was principally the work of the magistrates of the Parlement, and they retained control over it. Some of these magistrates were people we have already encountered.

Before August 1762, much of the legislation creating new officials was drafted by the Abbé Chauvelin, who had already distinguished himself as an enemy of the Jesuits and was eventually to be remembered as the destroyer of the order in 1767. He was helped by the Abbé Terray, who acted as the Parlement's rapporteur during the initial phases of the
legal process against the Jesuits and who went on playing the same role in subsequent years in many other aspects of the Jesuit affair. De l'Averdy, who was to become Controller General of Finances at the end of 1763, was partly responsible for the early legislation which named the administrators.

On 6 August 1762, the Parlement appointed three of its members to be commissioners of the Parlement and to determine the fate of the Jesuits and Jesuit property. Thereafter, it was these men, de l'Averdy, Rolland d'Erceville, and Roussel de la Tour, who prepared most of the legislation determining the nature of the administration. The Abbé Terray remained their rapporteur and six months later became a fourth commissioner. All the legislation concerning the administration which these men drafted apparently had the approval and support of the Avocat Général Omer Joly de Fleury, of the Procureur Général Guillaume Joly de Fleury, and of the three successive Premiers Présidents of the Parlement during the 1760's, Molé, Maupéou, and d'Aligre. It also often passed under the eyes of Chauvelin.

After September 1762, these parlementaires not only prepared legislation to be approved by the Parlement, but also increasingly sought royal legislation to give the administration the authority it needed. The three commissioners and Terray worked with the two bishops of the Royal Council: the Archbishop of Narbonne (and subsequently of Reims), de la Roche-Aymon; and the Bishop of Orléans, Jarente. Together these six men drafted the royal legislation which created those officials and those parts of the administration that the Parlement either would not or could not create. It was the magistrates of the Parlement of Paris who created the administration and would maintain control over most aspects of it.
The nature of the administration was determined, in the second place, by the fact that the Jesuits had performed certain functions in French society, and that after 1761, both the Parlement of Paris and the crown continued to expect Jesuit property to provide the means to acquit these obligations. Until 1762, the Jesuits had educated young men in the colleges and had used the revenues from their other property to pay for educating youth, to pay all debts which they contracted while carrying out their educational and pastoral functions, and to provide for the members of their order. From 1762 until the end of the old régime, the authorities would expect most of the Jesuit colleges to be used as colleges and the revenues produced by the Jesuits’ other property to pay for the education provided in the colleges, to repay all the creditors of the Jesuits, and to provide pensions for former Jesuits. As the Parlement created the administration and divided the property between the officials it appointed, it seemed to satisfy the claims of the people who wanted to maintain the former Jesuit colleges under new administrators, of the creditors of the Jesuits who still sought to be repaid, and of the Jesuits, who needed subsistence allowances. Each of the groups of claimants expected to be satisfied with Jesuit property, and neither the claimants nor the Parlement thought of using revenue coming from any other source to satisfy the claimants. Jesuit property would be used to perform Jesuit obligations, even after the Jesuit order was suppressed.

In the third place, although the administration was created to serve the needs of the three claimants just described, the parlementaires who drafted most of the legislation creating the administration wished, above all, to maintain the Jesuit colleges. Because the parlementaires were among those men who wanted to keep the Jesuit colleges open, the
parts of the administration which they created to ensure that the colleges would continue to function and remain financially solvent were potentially stronger and better able to fulfil their tasks than the parts representing the interests of the creditors or the Jesuits. The administration would develop in such a way as to subordinate the needs of the creditors and Jesuits to the financial needs of the colleges, when the Parlement deemed this to be necessary. But this is to look too far ahead.

Once it had found the Jesuit order responsible for Lavalette's debts and guilty of heresy, the Parlement had ordered the Jesuits to close all their colleges in its territory by 1 April 1762. The Jesuits obeyed, and thereby opened the way for the creation of the first part of the administration. Early in April, local authorities throughout the jurisdiction of the Parlement began to seize some of the Jesuits' property, and after that had happened, the Parlement created a new group of public officials. On 23 April 1762, the Parlement told the local officials in the provinces to name économes séquestres to administer all the Jesuit property which had been seized. For Paris, the court decided to name its own économme séquestre, soon to be known as the Econome Séquestre, to perform the same functions under the direct control of the court. On 30 April 1762, it named Edme-Louis Bronod the younger, a notary from the Châtelet, to be the Econome Séquestre for the Vicomté and Prévôté of Paris and to oversee the entire system of économes séquestres presently being developed in the provinces. He would be represented in the Parlement by the attorney, Brousse.

On 23 April 1762, the Parlement also authorized the creation of the Union of Creditors of the Jesuits. The Union was to have its own
officials selected by the creditors. It, too, would have an attorney
in the Parlement, and the parlementaire named to this job was Lambert. In May, the Parlement told the officials or syndics of the Union to
identify and to include within its ranks all the creditors of the
Jesuits and to list their claims. The Abbé Terray was to receive the
creditors' requests to become members of the Union. At the same time,
the Parlement restricted the activities of the syndics of the Union by
telling them to ask the court's permission before disposing of any Jesuit
property or repaying any of the members of the Union.

The next part of the administration came into existence in August
1762. As we have seen, an arrêt of the Parlement of 6 August gave
Rolland d'Erceville, Roussel de la Tour, and de l'Averdy the rank of
commissioners of the Parlement and made them responsible for the
Parlement's policy about all Jesuit property. To some extent, since
the commissioners had either prepared or supported much of the legis­
lation already issued by the court on the subject of the Jesuit order
or its property, this legislation of August 1762 merely confirmed a
state of affairs which already existed. At the same time, on 6 August,
a new set of circumstances did come into being: the court expelled the
remaining Jesuits from their houses. The official appointment of the
commissioners was a counterpart to this action.

The three commissioners of the Parlement immediately began to
consider the financial situation of the thirty-nine colleges and other
Jesuit institutions of the Parlement's jurisdiction. Their investiga­
tions, led them to prepare the legislation creating the last parts
of the administration. Although signed by the king, the Edict of
February 1763 was a result of their deliberations. By this edict,
registered in the Parlement on 5 February, the crown imposed a uniform
system of administration on the colleges of the kingdom which were not united to universities and not governed by religious congregations. The future administration of almost all the colleges formerly held by the Jesuits was supposed to be determined by this legislation. They were supposed in future to be governed by bureaux of administration to be composed of local people of rank. Such bureaux would be indirectly responsible to the Parlement.24

On 2 February 1763, in two lettres patentes, the crown established the last part of the administration and set the Parlement's seal on the administration as a whole. The first lettres patentes were the work of the commissioners and of the two prelates of the Royal Council, Jarente and Roche-Aymon. They temporarily exempted one kind of college property from the immediate control of the new bureaux of administration and charged the Econome Général du Clergé, also known as the Econome Séquestre of benefices in the king's nomination, with the administration of all the benefices which had been attached to the Jesuit colleges.25 This development was hardly a surprising one, since Jarente was the superior of the Econome Général, Marchal de Sainscy. Moreover, Jarente, Molé, and the Jolys de Fleury apparently approved the nomination.26

The second lettres patentes of 2 February, which were drafted by the commissioners, explained the means by which the officials of the Union of Creditors should sell the property to which they were entitled.27 The syndics of the Union of Creditors seem to have been authorized, with the Parlement's permission, to carry out the sales themselves. The autonomy of these officials was reduced in the following month, however, when the Parlement, again apparently acting on the commissioners' recommendation, appointed a curator from its own ranks to carry out the
the sale of such property at the bar of the court. Thereafter, although the commissioners would not control sales made by the Union, the Parlement could. It would retain its authority over the Union as long as it and the Union existed.

The second lettres patentes of 2 February 1763 also confirmed the authority of the Grand Chambre of the Parlement of Paris over disputed Jesuit property in the colonies. Then lettres patentes of 3 June gave the Superior Councils in the colonies some power over local sales but told colonial officials to send the revenue produced by such sales to the Econome Séquestre of Paris, who had been appointed in April 1762. He was expected to turn it over to the officials of the Union of Creditors. Still the authority of the Parlement of Paris over various parts of the administration remained intact.

By February 1763, then, the main parts of the administration had been created. The économes séquestres in the provinces and the Econome Séquestre in Paris had been charged to hold all Jesuit property temporarily, and they were responsible for paying the first subsistence and travel allowances to the Jesuits. A union of creditors had been created and its officials had been charged to decide on its members and to list the extent of their claims. And the three commissioners of the Parlement had undertaken to analyse the condition and extent of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris with a view to deciding its permanent fate. In February 1763, some of the commissioners' recommendations were embodied in royal legislation ordering the creation of bureaux of administration to govern former Jesuit colleges and giving the Econome Général du Clergé temporary responsibility for administering Jesuit benefices and paying Jesuit pensions.

Naming the officials and fashioning the administration had been so
much the work of the Parlement that it is hardly surprising that all but one of the officials or appointees who administered Jesuit property were ultimately responsible to the Grand'Chambre of the Parlement of Paris. Even the exception, the case of the Econome Général, was more apparent than real. The commissioners of the Parlement had been in the habit of collaborating with the Royal Council, which included his superior, and had discussed the administration of Jesuit property with at least one member of a commission of the Royal Council to which he was responsible. The Parlement's commissioners appear to have been satisfied with the Econome Général's freedom from their surveillance, and this may have been because they wanted to avoid responsibility for that aspect of the administration with which he was entrusted. The nature of the administration which confiscated and held Jesuit property was thus determined almost entirely by members of the Parlement of Paris. It seems to have been as centralized as they wanted it to be.

In the process of creating the officials and their general responsibilities, the Parlement had not only fashioned a new, centralized administration. It had also decided which parts of the new administration, or which officials, would hold and dispose of the Jesuit property. To understand what the Parlement, working within the new administration, did with the specific institutions, real and movable property, and capital endowments in its jurisdiction, we must retrace our steps a little.
II Deciding the fate of the property

To decide what to do with all the property which had belonged to the Jesuit order in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris would, under any circumstances, have taken a long time. There was, by any standard, so much of it. The parlementaires' task was further complicated by their realization that they were dealing not just with real and movable property in the strictly material sense, but with about two score institutions, the Jesuit colleges, and a great deal of real and movable property attached to the colleges. It is hardly surprising that even to decide the theoretical future of specific institutions and other property took several years. And to try to carry out such decisions took decades.

As early as 6 August 1761, the court had ordered the universities, bailliages and sénéchaussées, and municipal councils to consider the ultimate fate of the Jesuit property and it had told the Jesuits to prepare the statements about themselves and their property required by the Declaration of the king of 2 August 1761. In the six months that followed, it had collected as many titles to Jesuit property, lists of members of the Jesuit order, and lists of their real and movable property as it could.¹ By February and March 1762, the Parlement had used the information thus gained to make its first major decision about Jesuit property. In those months, it made known its intention to ensure that Jesuit colleges in towns of its jurisdiction where there were no other colleges should remain open even after the departure of the Jesuits.²

The importance of this action cannot be overestimated. If one thread connects all the court's decisions about Jesuit property taken in the subsequent thirty years, it is the thread of unaltering allegiance
to this principle. All the court's other decisions about the future of the Jesuits' property followed logically from this one. Thus, from the beginning, to ensure that almost all of the thirty-nine colleges of its jurisdiction remained open and financially solvent, the parlementaires disposed of Jesuit property in a way that favoured the colleges and often seems, despite what the legislation stated about the other two claimants, to have ignored all but the most pressing needs of the creditors and the Jesuits.

In February and March 1762, the Parlement charged the municipal councils with temporary authority over the colleges after the Jesuits had left, but it did not stop investigating the nature of Jesuit property then. By the end of April, the Jesuits had closed their colleges and the local économos séquestres had assumed responsibility for administering all the Jesuit property not actually in the control of municipal councils. While this was happening, the Jesuit officials remaining in their houses were busy. They had to finish preparing the statements demanded in the previous year or compile new and more complete statements about themselves or their property before they could legally leave their houses. The information they assembled would be added to the records, and principally the titles to real property, which the Jesuit superiors had handed over to the crown or Parlement in the spring of 1761, when they still hoped to save their order in France by cooperating with the court.

In May 1762, the Parlement sought to forestall clashes over Jesuit property which threatened to break out between the newly created network of économos séquestres and Union of Creditors. It gave the creditors the eventual theoretical rights over all movable property not required for education and over any real property acquired by the Jesuits with their own money or for their own use and not for public education.
And it gave the économes séquestres the immediate responsibility for administering all the rest of the property which had belonged to the Jesuits. For several weeks more, at least a handful of Jesuits remained in the major institutions and continued to prepare the statements required by the court, however.  

Then, on 6 August 1762, when Rolland d'Erceville, de l'Averdy, and Roussel de la Tour became commissioners, the Parlement gave them far more extensive responsibilities than any of the other officials had yet received. It told them "to consider the results of the deliberations and agreements made by the various towns of the jurisdiction on the fate of the Jesuit schools and colleges", and "to determine the uses which may be made of the lands, buildings, houses, and establishments of the former society". Besides deciding the fate of the property, the commissioners were also to determine the charges to which the property of the order should be subject, the amount of the pensions which should be paid to former Jesuits, and the extent of the debts owed by the order.  

Through its commissioners, the Parlement retained almost complete control over the Jesuit property in its jurisdiction and over the other economic aspects of the Jesuit affair. By telling them to assess the extent of the Jesuits' debts, it apparently even usurped some of the functions which it had already delegated to the officials of the Union of Creditors. At the same time, the Parlement authorized its other protégés, the provincial économes séquestres, to help the municipal officials and the officials of the bailliages and sénéchaussées to place seals on the Jesuit colleges and take full possession of them. The économes séquestres were also to continue, for the time being, to administer all college property, including the attached benefices.
They were to use the revenue from the benefices to pay the subsistence and travel allowances of the Jesuits. If the local économes séquestres became insolvent, they were to ask the court to authorize the Econome Séquestre of Paris to send whatever money was needed, although in future the benefices were expected to produce what was necessary for Jesuit pensions. On the other hand, the Parlement did recognize that its power over the property was not limitless and on 6 August and again on 7 September 1762 it asked the king for the royal legislation necessary to reconfirm both the union of benefices attached to former Jesuit colleges and the endowments formerly paid to the colleges.

Still, it fell to the three commissioners of the Parlement to carry out the responsibilities they had been given on 6 August and to enable the Parlement to decide the permanent fate of its Jesuit property. To perform these tasks, the commissioners judged that they needed more information about Jesuit institutions and other property than the court had accumulated in 1761 to 1762. For this reason, one of the first things they did was to ask the six universities of the jurisdiction, the Universities of Paris, Poitiers, Bourges, Orléans, Reims, and Angers, to submit memoranda containing recommendations about the future of Jesuit colleges. The arrêt of 3 September 1762 instructed the universities specifically to suggest what kinds of studies should be undertaken in the colleges in the future.

The commissioners also undertook to study all the Jesuit institutions in the jurisdiction of the court. To this end, they divided the various towns in which there was Jesuit property between them. De l'Averdy would consider the financial situation of the Jesuit institutions in six towns, including Paris; Rolland would study the institutions of nineteen provincial towns, including Bourges and Poitiers; and Roussel
de la Tour would consider the institutions of fifteen provincial towns, including the whole of Artois. Eventually, in order to acquaint the court with the state of Jesuit property and to help it to decide what to do with the property, the commissioners would present detailed descriptions or *comptes rendus* on each of the former Jesuit institutions.

To make this task easier, the commissioners drafted a set of questions about Jesuit property and membership in the Jesuit order to send to all the *bailliages*, *sénéchaussées*, and municipal councils under the *Parlement*. They dispatched their questions with a letter on 27 September 1762. In the letter they instructed the municipal officials and those of the *bailliages* and *sénéchaussées* to investigate the Jesuit property in their jurisdiction. These officials were expected to discover which of the college property, including the buildings themselves, belonged to the town and could be claimed by the town because the town had originally provided it, and which property was not in this category.

If the college buildings did not belong to the town, the officials were to recommend which of them were really essential for education, and which, by implication, could be claimed by the town for this purpose. The officials were also to consider the Jesuit property, such as noviciates, the professed house, retreat houses, and residences, which was obviously not essential for public education. They were to tell the court whether the town wished to buy this property or whether another religious community wanted to acquire it. If such property were to be sold, the officials should state whether it should be sold as it now stood or whether it should be demolished and sold for building materials and land. They were to report on the state of all buildings, including those of the Jesuit benefices, and to recommend whether or not the
buildings needed repairs.

Although this policy had not yet been sanctioned by the crown, the letter stated explicitly that the property not used for education would be applied to the repayment of the creditors and to the payment of Jesuit pensions. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that by presenting possible uses for Jesuit property in the way that they did, the commissioners encouraged the local officials to claim as much property as possible for education, and hence for themselves, and discouraged the towns from designating very much property for the payment or repayment of the other claimants.

In a second part of the letter, all the officials to whom it was addressed were instructed to make recommendations about the ways in which the colleges should be administered, youth should be taught and disciplined, and teachers, principals, prefects, and regents should be chosen. The letter asked the local officials whether they wanted their colleges to be administered by bureaux of local dignitaries, "as several towns [had] already suggested". Besides these opinions on these subjects, the commissioners also sought a good deal of very precise information both about Jesuits who had lived in the towns and about Jesuit property. They wanted to know how many Jesuits had lived in specific houses, when they had entered the order, what kinds of vows they had made, and where they were now. They wanted to know when the Jesuits had acquired their property and its titles, what concessions or additional acquisitions they held, and the amount of revenue they received from ecclesiastical benefices and rentes. Finally, they wanted to know all about the Jesuits' assets and debts, including the names of all their debtors and creditors and the conditions under which the various obligations had been contracted.
In the process of discovering answers to these questions and finding out what all the local officials thought about the matters raised in the letter, the men in charge of carrying out the inquiry were instructed to avoid incurring more expenses than were absolutely necessary. They were forbidden to ask for money from local économés séquestres, who were still to send their reports and excess revenue to the Econome Séquestre. The reports which the local officials sent in and the forms they filled out were, like those prepared after 6 August 1761, to be sent to the Greffe of the court. In Paris, similar investigations were to be carried out by the commissioners, a specially appointed architect and several clerks and ushers from the Parlement itself. But for the time being, the commissioners were involved in another matter.

A week after dispatching their memoranda and questionnaires to the provinces, the commissioners of the Parlement took part in an event which must have been a happy distraction from the clerical work in which they were by now so deeply engaged. In August and September, the Parlement had completed the arrangements for a transfer of some of the former Jesuit property to the Religieux de Sainte Geneviève, who held one of the small colleges attached to the University of Paris, the College of Lisieux. The crown had approved the demolition of the old college in 1757, and since then the principal and other administrators of the college had been trying to find suitable buildings for their students. The closing of the College of Louis-le-Grand in the spring of 1762 and the suppression of the Jesuit order in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in August made it possible for them to obtain the Parlement's approval for their plan to install their college in some of the buildings formerly comprising the Jesuit College of Louis-le-Grand
or, as some contemporaries still called it, the College of Clermont, in Paris.

The ceremony marking the installation of the College of Lisieux in its new buildings took place in the college chapel on 4 October 1762 in the presence of a crowd of laymen and ecclesiastics which included some rather important people. Rolland d'Erceville, Roussel de la Tour, and de l'Averdy were all there, and so were the rector of the University, the University Tribunal, its masters, and the principals and procureurs of most, if not all, the other colleges attached to the University of Paris. The clergy of the community of Lisieux led the ceremony which began when the commissioners of the Parlement took their seats near the altar and the rector of the University, accompanied by one of his own syndics, led Monsieur Leseigneur, the principal of the College of Lisieux, to the foot of the altar, which the latter kissed. Thereupon, the rector led Leseigneur to the two doors of the chapel and in this way Leseigneur took possession of the buildings to which his college was entitled. Leseigneur then led the singing of a Te Deum and when that was finished, the procureur of the College of Lisieux, Bergeron, began to celebrate a Mass in honour of the occasion.

As was deemed appropriate in such circumstances, Bergeron sang the Mass, and it is not clear how soon the assembly realized that he had, either by chance or design, chosen the wrong one. Instead of the votive Mass of the Holy Spirit intended for the day, he had begun the Mass for Pentecost. The enemies of the Jesuits in the audience, and they included the anonymous contributor to the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, were delighted with the opening words: "May God rise up, may His enemies be dispersed, and may those who hate Him flee before His face". The psalm which followed the introit was Psalm LVII, and the reporter judged it,
if anything, even more appropriate. It is that psalm which includes the lines: "[God's enemies] laid a net as I was walking when I was bowed with care; / They dug a pitfall for me, but fell into it themselves". Clearly, implied the narrator, these lines were a reference to the struggle between the parlementaires and the Jesuits and to the ultimate destruction of the Jesuit order. After that part of the Mass, the crowd as a whole was convinced that it was God alone who had contrived to substitute one Mass for another and He alone who had worked the happy transfer of the Jesuit buildings to the College of Lisieux. People scarcely believed the wonder that was going on before their eyes, and the most edifying spectacle of all was the part played, presumably only as closely observed spectators of the event, by the three commissioners of the Parlement.

After the Mass, everyone made speeches, and a representative of the University expressed gratitude to the parlementaires for overseeing the restitution of property which had been usurped from the University. Everyone entered into the spirit of the occasion and, at the end, the scholars of the college were given a few days' holiday in which to celebrate the triumph of justice over evil. Twenty years later, men still discussed the substitution of one Mass for another which had occurred that day, and no one ever knew who had been the human agent in this providential mistake. The commissioners prepared a compte rendu of the event to read to the Parlement. Needless to say, the College of Lisieux did not remain in its new location for long.

The commissioners spent the rest of the autumn and following winter trying to discover how much Jesuit property there was so that they could decide how to dispose of it. It is not clear how long it took for them to receive the answers to the questions they had sent to the provincial officials in September 1762. None of the completed états which the
officials returned or any other documents obviously produced in response to the letter of 27 September has survived. It seems likely that most of the officials did reply, but equally likely that their replies failed to provide all the detailed information that the commissioners had sought. By the beginning of 1763, the commissioners had begun to prepare *comptes rendus* on the colleges and other institutions formerly held by the Jesuits in the jurisdiction of the Parlement, and to present them to that court. Once the commissioners had begun to do this, the crown would follow their advice and, to ensure the continued existence of the colleges, grant *lettres patentes* confirming their existence and their revenues.

By the end of January 1763, Rolland reported to the court that all three commissioners were hard at work on several *comptes rendus*. They were piecing together all the information which, since August 1761, had been sent to the court by the universities, the Jesuits, and the provincial officials. The experience of analysing and classifying all this information in a systematic way and the knowledge that the crown did not wish to own any Jesuit property probably was the incentive for what the commissioners did next. With the help of the Bishops of Orléans and Reims, they drafted three important pieces of legislation, the Edict of February and the two sets of *lettres patentes* of 2 February.

One set of *lettres patentes* confirmed what had been stated in an *arrêt* of 23 April 1762 and gave the creditors of the Jesuits unlimited rights to any Jesuit property, real or movable, which was not necessary for education. The Union of Creditors thereby gained full rights to the noviciates, retreat houses, country houses, professed houses, residences, and missions, and to any securities attached to these institutions throughout France. Although the means by which the Union
might dispose of such property were subsequently modified, it was by this legislation that its enduring claim to these forms of property was established.

The rest of the royal legislation prepared by the commissioners in February 1763 dealt with college property. The Edict of February ordered the creation of bureaux of administration to govern all those colleges in the kingdom which were neither in the hands of religious congregations nor attached to universities. In theory the legislation would apply to all the former Jesuit colleges in the Parlement's jurisdiction except the colleges of Bourges and Poitiers which were attached to their local universities.

It appears that in deciding to establish bureaux of administration the commissioners had taken the advice of the provincial officials to whom they referred in their letter of 27 September, and that other provincial officials whose opinions had been asked in that letter had made the same recommendations. In view of the fruit which the recommendation to create bureaux of administration bore, it is unfortunate that we do not know why the commissioners had included this reference in their letter, or whether, by mentioning it, they had indirectly caused other officials to endorse it. But regardless of who first decided to make this recommendation, which was based on historical precedent, the commissioners were sufficiently pleased with the idea of establishing bureaux of administration for the colleges to make this matter the main subject of the edict.

Each bureau was to be made up of the local archbishop or bishop, who would act as president; the Premier Président of the Parlement in a major city or the Procureur Général of the local bailliages or sénéchaussées in the provinces; the first two municipal officers; two
notables of the town, chosen by the rest of the bureau; and the principal of the college. Each bureau would enjoy considerable autonomy, including the almost immediate right to name its own économie, or treasurer, who would be responsible to it.

The new bureaux would have authority over all but one kind of college property. The other lettres patentes of 2 February entrusted the Econome Général with temporary responsibility for the college benefices, which would be returned to the bureau of a college only when, on the commissioners' recommendation, the crown issued the necessary legislation confirming the continued existence of the college and its right to its attached property. Although it is impossible to tell precisely why the commissioners were willing to take this step and give the Econome Général this responsibility, the explanation offered in the legislation may have been the correct one, and they may have done this to ensure that the benefices should be as well administered as possible. On the other hand, it seems even more likely that they wanted to avoid charging the bureaux, whose affairs they would oversee indirectly for the next few years, with any immediate responsibility for paying the Jesuits' pensions which, since 6 August 1762, had been derived from the benefices.

Otherwise, the bureaux would manage their own financial affairs and eventually regain the benefices for the colleges. But above them remained the Parlement which, for the moment, would approve the payment of masters' salaries and most extraordinary expenses. Thus, while the appointment of the bishops to head the new bureaux implied a degree of clerical control over the colleges which we might have expected the commissioners to have found intolerable, in fact, the parlementaires maintained some control over the colleges' purse strings. The commissioners insisted on setting standards of discipline in the colleges and on
enforcing those standards. They also would have the right, since Paris was the seat of the Parlement, to take part in the meetings of the bureau of the College of Louis-le-Grand and to make recommendations about the "policing" of that college.

In another way the commissioners tried to maintain a watch over the colleges' affairs. The first article of the Edict of February had ordered all the new administrators to send a full report of the colleges' economic and administrative affairs and problems to the court within the first six months of the new régime. An arrêt of 25 February 1763 ordered much the same thing, and on 27 April 1763, Terray, Rolland, Roussel de la Tour, and de l'Averdy signed a letter addressed to the bailliages and sénéchaussées ordering them to see to it that the bureaux carried out these instructions. Considered altogether, the royal legislation and the legislation emanating from the Parlement suggest that the commissioners appointed to decide the fate of Jesuit property were not so much interested in controlling the financial affairs of the colleges or in taking over college property per se as they were in keeping abreast of all aspects of the life of the colleges and in thereby maintaining their own moral and administrative authority over the colleges as institutions dedicated to the intellectual and moral formation of French youth. Their power was further increased in March.

On 24 March 1763, Roussel de la Tour presented the commissioners' second report of their activities to the court. By this time, the commissioners had not only gained the support of the Premier Président Molé and entered into the lengthy correspondence with the provinces which Rolland and Roussel described, but Rolland had already presented one, and de l'Averdy six comptes rendus on former Jesuit property to the court. The Parlement was apparently satisfied with the direction
which the commissioners' collection of evidence and analysis of detail were taking and after Roussel had given his report, it charged them all with new and broader functions. From now on, the three commissioners and the Abbé Terray were to be responsible for deciding the future of all the colleges under the jurisdiction of the court not connected to universities, including many non-Jesuit colleges. It was with this additional responsibility and authority that Rolland, Roussel, and de l' Averdy presented the remaining comptes rendus on Jesuit property. Between 24 March and November 1763, the three of them read accounts on the Jesuit institutions of a further twenty-five towns, and in 1764 to 1765 on a further eleven, bringing to forty-three the total number of separate reports completed by the commissioners.

Considered together the comptes rendus had a number of things in common. All began with a history of the college of the town in question. This history included a detailed description of the way in which the Jesuits had gained responsibility for the college and how and when they had obtained the titles to the real property constituting the college and to the various endowments and other sources of revenue which were its support. The intention behind this elaborate opening section was very clear. It always demonstrated that the Jesuits had gained control over property and revenues which rightfully belonged to the town in which the college was established. The comptes rendus never actually referred to the argument of 1761, but the sections dealing with the colleges were obviously based on the assumption that if the Jesuits could be shown to be only the administrators and not the owners of the colleges and attached property, the town councils could gain or regain the ownership of the colleges.

This description of the methods by which the college and its attached property had found its way into the Jesuits' hands was followed
by a description of the college's revenues and debts, which, like the earlier sections, probably came directly from the local authorities' reports of 1761 to 1762. It included lists of revenue coming from any attached benefices, which were only temporarily in the hands of the Econome Général; from leases on other attached real property; from rentes or other investments; from the crown or the corps de ville, or from a rich patron. Often a compte rendu contained several sets of figures emanating from various local authorities and even from the Jesuits themselves, before their departure in 1762. Frequently there were discrepancies between supposedly comparable or identical revenues or debts, but the discrepancies in the comptes rendus of 1763 were inconsequential. In all cases, the comptes rendus of that year demonstrated the ability of the college revenues described to pay the salaries of secular masters and the costs of running the colleges. And, in all cases, the colleges which had been the subject of comptes rendus in 1763 were permitted to remain open, on the apparent assumption that they could support themselves in the traditional ways described by the commissioners of the court.

Other parts of the comptes rendus of 1763 which were devoted to the colleges described any unusual furnishings, murals, scientific instruments, books, medals, or coins which the colleges possessed. They also listed the movable property and the attached real property which, not being essential for the support of education, might be "abandoned" to the creditors. Such lists were usually brief and not particularly generous, especially considering that much of the property included in the lists had probably belonged to the congrégations which until 1760 to 1761 had been allowed to meet and hold property in the colleges. These later sections on the colleges often also included a list of the local people to whom the Jesuits owed money and who owed
money to the college.

After the description of the college came descriptions of other Jesuit property found in the same town. The comptes rendus devoted to Paris described not only the college but also the noviciate and professed house and the attached country property at Gentilly, Montlouis, and Montrouge. That of Lyon described the two colleges and the noviciate and those of Nevers and La Rochelle, the seminaries held by the Jesuits. The comptes rendus of Clermont-Ferrand, La Flèche, Lyon, Poitiers, La Rochelle, and Paris also described the pensionnats attached to the colleges. Those for Guéret and Pontoise described the residences in those towns; there was no compte rendu for Bapaume. The accounts of institutions other than colleges included descriptions of their endowments and their other sources of revenue, including rentes. The descriptions of the noviciates, the professed house, the residences, the country property, the seminaries, and any other property not needed for public education were brief, and we may assume that the reason for the brevity was the obvious one: their fate had been determined. The seminaries would be returned to the control of the dioceses, and other property would be disposed of in the interests of the creditors.

In 1764 and early 1765, the commissioners presented their comptes rendus on the last eleven towns whose Jesuit property had not already been described. These accounts included descriptions of six establishments in Artois, the college, seminary, and pensionnat in Reims, the colleges and pensionnats in Bourges and Poitiers, and the Colleges of Eu and Charleville. The colleges of all these towns except Charleville were in one way or another exceptional cases. Reims had another college and the hospital was in need of new buildings which the Jesuit college could provide. The Colleges of Bourges and Poitiers were attached to
local universities. The College of Eu was the special creation of the Count of Eu and the present Count of Eu, Charles de Bourbon, had made some special demands pertaining to it.\textsuperscript{55} It is possible that a descendant of Gonzaga made the case of Charleville equally difficult, but there is no evidence of this.\textsuperscript{56} The five colleges of Artois were in territory over which a reluctant Council of Artois had a degree of authority, and in which the Jesuits were still loved. It would appear to be no accident that the comptes rendus of these places, presented in 1764 and 1765, remained basically the same as those of 1763. Only royal legislation could determine irrevocably whether the colleges would survive or not.\textsuperscript{57}

The royal legislation which confirmed or suppressed the former Jesuit colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement was the work of a number of men, including the three original commissioners of the Parlement, probably Terray, and a commission of the Royal Council which consisted of the by now familiar Bishops of Orléans and Reims, Aguesseau, and Gilbert,\textsuperscript{58} and the rapporteur Taboureau.\textsuperscript{59} When legislation was to be prepared, the three commissioners drafted it and submitted it to the rapporteur of the commission. He took it to his commission, which then sent him back to the parlementaires if the commission thought any corrections were necessary. In that unlikely case, the Parlement's commissioners considered the suggestions of the royal commission and normally accepted them.\textsuperscript{60} Then the legislation received royal sanction.\textsuperscript{61}

The lettres patentes of the king were the outcome of this procedure, followed the reading of the compte rendu on the college in question within anything from two months to more than two years.\textsuperscript{62} In those cases in which colleges were suppressed, the decision to suppress them seems to have been taken for granted rather than determined by a special
decision of the Parlement or crown. The case of Reims was a clearcut one since there was already another college in the town. The suppression of the former Jesuit college there caused no local hardship and was in conformity with the Parlement's policy enunciated in February and March 1762. Lettres patentes suppressing it appeared in January 1764. The only other case in which colleges were suppressed was the more complicated one of the three Colleges of Aire, Hesdin, and Béthune in Artois. In that instance, the decision may not have been made until just before the Edicts of September ordering the suppression of those colleges, were drafted. Otherwise, all the royal legislation pertaining to colleges was concerned with keeping them open and may thus be regarded as a triumph of the Parlement's and the commissioners' policy. Of the thirty-nine colleges which the Parlement had ordered to be confiscated in 1762, thirty-five, then, were to remain open.

The royal legislation confirming the existence of the colleges, like the comptes rendus describing them, followed a distinct pattern. It was always in the form of lettres patentes and it always affirmed the permanent value of the college in question. In all but one case, it always affirmed a principle adhered to by the Parlement's commissioners, but not alluded to in the laws published at this time: that the new teachers in former Jesuit colleges should be secular teachers. They did not have to be laymen, but they did have to be at least secular clergy rather than regulars. They were supposed also to hold a Master of Arts degree from the University of Paris. Each lettres patentes stated the salary that secular masters were to receive.

Otherwise, the original lettres patentes issued to confirm a college might or might not refer to any attached benefices whose revenues the college had previously enjoyed. If they did not, then other lettres patentes would be issued later to explain the fate of the
benefice or benefices in question. Except in the case of the College of Reims, which was suppressed, the union of all benefices previously attached to colleges was confirmed.

The matter of the benefices was complicated. The lettres patentes of 2 February 1763 had given the Econome Général the temporary responsibility for administering all Jesuit benefices of the kingdom and had implied, as was later confirmed, that he had a permanent responsibility for administering the payment of Jesuit pensions from this time on. On the other hand, those lettres patentes dealing with specific colleges and specific benefices answered obvious questions: when would the colleges regain ownership or control over their benefices and would they have to do anything in return for getting the benefices back?

The answer for individual colleges varied. Most often, the lettres patentes instructed the new bureaux that the Econome Général would continue to administer the benefices for a further two or three years and that after 1 January 1765, 1766, or 1767, as the case might be, the bureau in question would regain control over the college benefices. In return for this right, each college bureau which had benefices was to make a series of annual payments to the Econome Général for the next thirty years. The amount of the payment was graduated according to the supposed richness or poverty of the benefices and would decrease from one decade to the next. The average annual payment which each college bureau was expected to make to the Econome Général in the next thirty years was 2,000 livres. In the case of some of the richer colleges, the bureaux were also supposed to make annual payments, again to be derived from the revenues of the benefices, to other less fortunate colleges.

All the decisions embodied in the lettres patentes were based on facts explained in the comptes rendus, and the lettres patentes, more
than any other legislation, expressed attempts by the Parlement and particularly the commissioners to settle the permanent fate of the colleges. Almost all the colleges were to be kept open and their revenues assured. Except in the two cases of Bourges and Poitiers, they would be governed by bureaux of administration. Except in the case of the Colleges of Lyon, the students in them would be taught by men having no affiliation with religious orders. The colleges would make payments to the Econome Général to help offset the cost of Jesuit pensions. But, so far, disputes between the colleges and the creditors over property had not been fully settled and the creditors' rights to dispose of property not needed for public education had been imperfectly defined.

These relations were settled by more royal legislation drafted by the commissioners, approved by the commission of the Royal Council and published by the king. By lettres patentes of 2 February 1763, the creditors had been granted general rights to Jesuit property not reserved for public education. Other lettres patentes of 3 June and 14 June 1763 recognized their rights to the Jesuits' property in the colonies if it were not reserved for publication, and ordered them not to touch property belonging to the colleges in France. This law would apply to the movable property of the chapels and libraries, which until then had been considered to be property which the creditors could claim.

Then on 21 November 1763, the crown gave even more specific instructions differentiating between educational and non-educational property and prohibiting the creditors from seizing property which in any way belonged to the colleges. In return for this right to enjoy all college property unconditionally, the crown placed heavy, though somewhat theoretical, responsibilities on the college bureaux. In the future, if all their other sources of revenue were exhausted, the creditors might
claim from the college bureaux specific money payments which, if they ever did fall due, would be made over a six-year period, with the Parlement's approval. These hypothetical payments varied from college to college according to each one's reckoned ability to pay. Thus, the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris might have to pay up to 300,000 livres, the two colleges of Lyon up to 250,000 livres, the College of La Flèche up to 100,000 livres, the surviving college of Reims up to 40,000 livres, and all the others up to the equivalent of one year's revenue before deduction and including revenue from benefices. On paper at least, the obligations of the college bureaux to the creditors had been clarified.  

On 30 March 1764, yet more lettres patentes explained that the legislation of 21 November 1763 was not retroactive. Any sales or seizures not in accordance with the provisions of the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 made before that date would be permanent; any sales or seizures made after it and disputed by one side or the other were to be judged by the Parlement of Paris.  

With the publication of the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763, the Parlement, with the crown's help, had decided the legal fate of all categories of Jesuit property. The decisions implied by the several lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 were reinforced by the specific arrêts confirming the colleges' possessions of their attached property, which the Parlement issued in 1764 to 1765. Thus as we have seen, the towns gained and kept the official ownership of all the colleges, even of the four which were suppressed. Of the remaining thirty-five colleges, two continued indefinitely to be administered by the universities to which they were attached. The rest, after February 1763, were to be governed by bureaux of administration, which, in all cases but one, were charged to employ secular priests or laymen as teachers, and to pay them
specific salaries. Otherwise, the bureaux of administration could control the fortunes of the colleges as they saw fit.

By means of the économes séquestres which they had appointed, the bailliages and sénéchaussées in the provinces, and the Parlement for Paris, enjoyed direct control over the benefices attached to former Jesuit colleges until February 1763. At that time, the Econome Général du Clergé assumed official control, effective on 1 January 1763, of all the benefices, and the responsibility for paying Jesuit pensions. His direct administration was to be brief, too, and by 1 January 1765, 1766, 1767, or 1768, he was expected to hand over the administration of the benefices to the bureaux of administration of the colleges to which the benefices were attached. After that had happened, the bureaux were supposed to make annual payments to him to help to pay Jesuit pensions. All other movable or real property in any way attached to or connected with the colleges not sold before 21 November 1763 became college property and was to be administered by the bureaux of administration after that date, whether it had been administered by them before or not. In return for the right to hold all college property, the bureaux might have to help repay the creditors through payments to the Union of Creditors at some time in the future.

Property not attached to the colleges or intended to be used for public education, and including the novicirates, professed houses, residences, country houses, and the rentes and other annuities belonging to such institutions, became officially the property of the Union of Creditors in February 1763 and was theirs to sell. Seminaries were returned to the control of the dioceses, and the money allotted for missions was to be returned to the founders or to their heirs, but in neither case did this property prove to be of much value. However, it
was supposed that the sale of the other Jesuit property not intended for public education would provide enough money to reimburse the creditors. By June 1763, the Union of Creditors had gained the right to Jesuit property outside continental France, provided it was not reserved for public education. In the colonies, the colonial councils apparently gained authority over any institutions that might be devoted to public education, but there is no record that there were any.

Thus, by the end of 1763, the Jesuit property of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris had been divided between the various claimants by the Parlement or by its commissioners working with the crown. At the head of all parts of the administration stood the Parlement, which had demonstrated a great desire to oversee the fate of all the property and, particularly, to maintain a watchful eye and as much control as possible over the former Jesuit colleges.

But the story of how the commissioners determined the fate of former Jesuit colleges is not quite over. It did not end with the publication of the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 or of the last lettres patentes confirming the colleges' existence and eventual possession of their benefices. At the same time as the commissioners had been trying to settle relations between the college bureaux and the creditors and deciding when the bureaux should resume responsibility for the college benefices, they had also begun to take up some of the responsibilities given to them in March. And these, too, affected the former Jesuit colleges.

The Edict of February 1763 had been intended for all colleges not attached to universities, and, as a result, in March, the Parlement had made Rolland, Roussel, de l'Averdy and the new commissioner, the Abbé Terray, responsible for the future of education in the jurisdiction of the Parlement. It had been a nebulous sort of charge, but it meant
that by the end of March the commissioners had begun to think that the
future of the former Jesuit colleges was linked to that of many other
colleges. Thus, in August, the Abbé Terray read a report on the dozens
of colleges of the jurisdiction which had not been served by the Jesuits,
but which should now be governed by bureaux of administration. And in
November, de l'Averdy read one on the "dependent colleges" of the capital,
or colleges which, in the time of the Jesuits, had been only loosely
connected with the University and the College of Louis-le-Grand. As the
commissioners settled the future administration of these colleges and
took up questions about colleges in general, they began to theorize
publicly about the kind of education the Parlement should promote in
its jurisdiction. De l'Averdy's report of 12 November 1763, which was
based on a Plan d'Etudes developed in the 1730's under Joly de Fleury
and Aguesseau, advocated the creation of a centralized system of secular
education in which the administration of lay people would replace that
of ecclesiastics. It seems doubtful that he was thereby lamenting
the appointment of bishops to a prominent place in the new bureaux of
administration and more likely that he was reminding the court of the
merits and potentialities of the bureaux in which there should also be
a preponderance of laymen.

This was de l'Averdy's last significant act as a Commissioner. In
December he went to the Contrôle Général and Henry Cochin replaced him
as one of the four commissioners. Thereafter, Rolland took over some
of de l'Averdy's functions and played the main part in preparing the
Parlement's legislation concerning Jesuit property. The fate of the
dependent colleges of Paris was decided in January 1765 when the Parlement
issued an arrêt placing them under the authority of the bureau of
administration of the College of Louis-le-Grand and thereby uniting them
administratively to that college. The fate of the non-Jesuit colleges
was apparently decided by *lettres patentes* of the king, presumably prepared by Terray, which confirmed at least fifty of them. No one tried to implement new programmes of study in the French colleges during this or the next three years. Nor did anyone attempt to revise their administration.

In May 1768, Rolland read *Plan d'Education* to the Parlement. In it he expressed many of the opinions de l'Averdy had voiced in his report of November 1763. This time, the report was based on more recent information. Its argument came from the memoranda which the six universities of the jurisdiction of the Parlement had sent to the court in response to its request of September 1762, and, in particular, from the two memoranda submitted by the University of Paris. The Plan of 1768 advocated imposing stricter discipline on all colleges not dependent on universities and forcing a closer affiliation of such colleges with universities, which would decide on a uniform curriculum and uniform methods of teaching. These were themes taken up by the commissioners in the Parlement and in the meetings of the bureau of Louis-le-Grand from 1763 to 1789. Despite the crown's willingness in 1767 to approve the work of all four commissioners and to make the bureau of the College of Louis-le-Grand, which was dominated by the commissioners, the center of administration for the colleges of the provinces, the commissioners ideas were not embodied in any serious, far-reaching legislation or put into general practice. But they are not without interest in the history of French education.

Thus, the fate of the property which had belonged to the Jesuits was determined in the years 1762 to 1769 principally by the commissioners appointed to decide it. In the matter of all the property except the colleges, the commissioners prepared and the Parlement or Royal Council issued legislation which explained what should become of specific property.
And the legislation was, for the most part, obeyed initially. In the case of the colleges, royal legislation and the Parlement's arrêts decided what form of government each should have. But although the commissioners pronounced on the system of education which should be developed in the jurisdiction of the court, neither they nor the Parlement at large carried out their ideas. Most of the bureaux of administration or other authorities running the colleges went their own way in the years after 1763 or 1764 and there never was a unified system of education or even a unified administration of colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to trace the history of the former Jesuit colleges after the commissioners and the crown tried to settle their fate in 1763 to 1766 or after the Parlement took up the question again in 1768. The important thing is that keeping the colleges open was the criterion on which the Parlement made all its decisions about other forms of Jesuit property. It had done what it could to ensure that the thirty-five surviving colleges should remain financially solvent. It had turned all but two of them over to bureaux of administration, leaving the other two as they always had been, under the control of the local universities. After that, although the legislation had made the bureaux responsible to the Parlement in several ways, the Parlement withdrew from the affairs of the provincial colleges. Its withdrawal from their affairs coincided with its own suspension during the years 1771 to 1774, and thereafter it did not reassert its authority over the provincial colleges or even, indeed, over the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris. Hence, while there is a history of the administration of former Jesuit colleges in the period 1763 to 1789 to be written, it is not part of the history of the confiscation, engineered by the Parlement with the cooperation of the
crown, which we are studying. There were no connections between the capital and the provinces, in the form of policy made either by the Parlement or by the parlementaires in the bureau of Louis-le-Grand and executed by the provincial bureaux, in the period after the lettres patentes confirming individual colleges were issued.\textsuperscript{91a}

The Parlement of Paris was reminded of this situation in April 1783, when Lamoignon, then a Président à Mortier, asked the commissioners named twenty years before to give a report on their work. Lamoignon excused his request by explaining that both the clergy and the municipal authorities were dissatisfied with the current state of the colleges, and that the Parlement still wanted to implement a general plan of education. The plan to which he alluded resembled earlier ones. Its object was to entrust the Parlement with the responsibility for and authority over a system of public education. The citizens of the jurisdiction of the Parlement had a right to know that the commissioners were indeed working for this end, Lamoignon argued.\textsuperscript{92}

Of the commissioners nominated in 1762 and 1763, only Rolland d'Erceville remained. The others were replaced by Lefebvre d'Amécourt,\textsuperscript{93} Tandeau,\textsuperscript{94} and le Rebours,\textsuperscript{95} at some time between 1767 and 1783. It is doubtful that they ever prepared the statement Lamoignon had asked for. Papers in the Collection Joly de Fleury dating from the period of Lamoignon's request do indicate the general fate of college administrations by that time, however.\textsuperscript{96} According to the records of about 1783, twenty of the thirty-five colleges whose existence had originally been confirmed were still in the hands of secular teachers and governed by bureaux of administration.\textsuperscript{97} Three more were in the hands of regulars under the control of bureaux of administration.\textsuperscript{98} One had been turned over to regulars in about 1771 and seven had since been turned over
to regulars. All eight of these colleges and two more, which had been suppressed at an earlier time and were now re-established, had ceased by 1783 to be governed by bureaux of administration. And two other colleges remained, as they long had been, under the control of local universities. The list did not account for the other four of the original thirty-nine Jesuit colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

Most of the colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement had been neglected by local authorities and by the authorities in the capital after 1771, and probably even before then. The general histories of colleges in the period 1771 to 1789 reveal that they all experienced the same fate. Those held by religious orders and those not held by religious orders, those governed by bureaux of administration, and those not governed by bureaux of administration were indistinguishable. They lacked the money necessary to remain open. And they lacked students. The Parlement did nothing about this general problem, and it may not even have been fully aware of it. The history of the administration of the former Jesuit colleges in 1765 to 1789, like that of other French colleges, was one of neglect and slow but fatal decline. Daniel Mornet has described this situation in French education in the following manner:

It was necessary to find money and it was necessary to find teachers; often people were satisfied with what they found, which is to say with the mediocre. In the place of the atmosphere of discipline produced by the Jesuits were often substituted the meanest and most ferocious rivalries and wrangling. The soul of the vain and fractious small town penetrated the colleges.

The complete suppression of municipal colleges by the Revolutionaries less than a decade after Lamoignon had tried to initiate an investigation into the work of the Parlement's commissioners was a result of the Parlement's failure to create a workable system of public education.
The Parlement had conducted its campaign against the Jesuits and established the machinery to confiscate Jesuit property with considerable success. It had also divided the property between the various parts of the administration in a way which reflected its paramount interest in the Jesuit colleges. Although it failed to fill the vacuum in French education which the departure of the Jesuits from their colleges caused, it had initially created a state of affairs in which the colleges should have been able to survive financially.

In the next three chapters, we shall consider the work of the administration created to confiscate and administer Jesuit property. We shall first study the Parlement's own men, the économes séquestres. They were appointed to carry out the Parlement's early policies and, because they had no independent purpose of their own, they may be regarded as the main instrument by which the Parlement sought to carry out its most cherished policy: to guarantee the survival of the colleges. Then we shall analyse the work of the syndics of the Union of Creditors, who, though directly responsible in all matters to the Parlement, were primarily concerned with satisfying members of the Union. They thus served both the Parlement and the creditors. Finally, we shall examine the work of the Économe Général du Clergé, who administered the benefices from which the Jesuits' pensions were supposed to be paid. Although he was responsible for bringing most kinds of disputes to the Parlement, he owed his first duty to the crown, which helped him when he was in difficulty. It remains to be seen whether these officials, whose work was supervised in lesser and lesser degree by the Parlement, performed the tasks which their creators intended for them.
Chapter IV  The Parlement's men

I  The Duties of the économes séquestres

Our study of the confiscation of Jesuit property under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris has begun with an examination of how a group of parlementaires fashioned an administration to seize and hold the property, and how they allotted it to the various parts of the administration. We have seen that their work had a certain form and logic. The laws which these men made or asked the crown to make demonstrated that they wanted, more than anything else, to maintain the existence of the former Jesuit colleges. This achievement assured, the parlementaires tried to satisfy the creditors of the Jesuits and to see that the former Jesuits received pensions. By 1765, the parlementaires had disposed in law or in theory of all the property and the responsibilities which went with it. After 1765, the parlementaires tended to view the Jesuit property not as a separate quantity but as part of all the educational property under the jurisdiction of the Parlement. In the meantime, the future of specific Jesuit property was settled at quite another level.

It is one thing to decide what should happen, another to make laws about what should happen, and yet another to see such laws implemented. The last step is especially difficult when the lawmakers have to depend on large numbers of men, scattered over much territory, to carry out their wishes, and when the reception of such wishes varies from one region to another. These were the problems which the commissioners in Paris faced as they tried to apply their policies and laws to the whole of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.
To trace the concrete effects of the parlementaires' decisions and legislation about all the Jesuit property under their jurisdiction would require years of research in municipal and departmental archives, which it has not been possible to undertake. But it is possible to trace the reception of the legislation in the provinces, as this is recorded in the minutes and arrêts of the Parlement. Because the Parlement of Paris was the highest authority in most disputes arising out of the confiscation, the records of that court contain innumerable references to disagreements or misunderstandings about the application of various laws. Furthermore, because most of the officials appointed or created by the parlementaires to take part in the administration were in some ways also responsible to the Grand'Chambre, the Parlement's papers contain references to their execution of their duties. Hence, even without making use of the local records, we may still discover a good deal about how the local officials performed their tasks.

The local officials who first assumed responsibility for the administration of Jesuit property were the économés séquestres created on 23 and 30 April 1762. They had one function to perform, and that was to hold Jesuit property until the Parlement or local authorities decided its permanent fate. Unlike the officials of the Union of Creditors or the Econome Général du Clergé, the économés séquestres made no claim to the property or its revenues for themselves or for the people they served. In fact, although appointed by the bailliages, sénéchaussées, or municipal officials, the économés séquestres were more truly the servants of the Parlement's interests than any of the other functionaries involved in the administration. To understand how the économés séquestres functioned, we must consider the circumstances of their creation.
Arrêts approved by the Parlement in February and March 1762 had ordered local authorities and local universities to prepare memoranda on the future of Jesuit property and had instructed the former to place seals on the property in accordance with the Parlement's initial legislation ordering the confiscation on 6 August 1761. The municipal officers and the officials of the bailliages and sénéchaussées performed these preliminary functions as the Jesuits voluntarily closed their colleges and other religious houses on 1 April 1762. But after that date, as the Jesuits remained in their houses and the local officials had other duties to perform, the Jesuits continued to conduct their business affairs as usual. There were rumours that ingenious Jesuits took the opportunity afforded by the lull after 1 April to sell some of the order's more valuable movable property for cash. In some places, municipal officers appointed guardians to hold the property until further decisions about it came from Paris, and some undertook to have inventories of movable property made. In a few cases municipal officers paid subsistence allowances to those Jesuits isolated in their houses and afraid to come out because of public feelings against them.

The period in which local officials, already burdened with other tasks pertaining to local affairs, took the initiative in holding the Jesuit property came to an end on 23 April 1762. On that day, the Parlement decided that the local judges in the provinces should name économes séquestres to administer all the Jesuit property which had been seized. They were to receive all the money due to be paid to the Jesuits, either by their debtors or by the fermiers, locataires, or régisseurs of Jesuit property. The Jesuits themselves were no longer to receive any money or other form of payment at all; it was to go instead to the relevant économie séquestre. In the provinces, these
new officials were to be responsible to the officers of the bailliages and sénéchaussées and, on the authority of these superiors, were to pay the salaries of the new masters of Jesuit colleges and the subsistence allowances of the Jesuits. They were to give account of their administration to the local substitute of the Procureur Général of the Parlement of Paris, and thus the lines of responsibility to that court were maintained. The lieutenants généraux of police were to oversee the whole operation.8

In Paris, the court would name its own économie sequestre, shortly to be known and always referred to as the Econome Séquestre, who would act under the direct control of the court. On 30 April 1762, the Parlement named Edme-Louis Bronod, the younger, a notary from the Châtelet, to be the Economie Séquestre for the Prévôté and Vicomté of Paris.9 The occasion of his nomination provided an opportunity for the court to list in detail both his functions and those of the économes séquestres of the provinces. Henceforth, the provincial officials were to be named by the officers of the bailliages and sénéchaussées in which a controlling Jesuit institution was found.10 The provincial économes séquestres were now charged with sending the accounts of their financial administration to the Economie Séquestre of Paris every three months and with sending him the money which remained in their hands after they had paid the salaries of the new masters of the colleges, the allowances of the Jesuits, and the cost of urgent repairs to the Jesuit property. This surplus, the legislation said, would be used to repay the creditors of the Jesuits.

In this legislation, the administration of the économes séquestres emerges as something much more than a stop-gap measure. The Parisian and provincial économes were encouraged to do more than the minimum tasks
of receiving the money owed to the Jesuits or of making authorized payments. They were also encouraged to administer all the property in their hands—and for the time being this meant all the Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris—as well as they could. They were to take whatever legal steps were necessary to regain money owed to the Jesuits or to lease or create régies of Jesuit property as profitably as possible. At their own discretion, they could undertake urgent repairs to the property.

Yet, at the same time, both the Parisian and the provincial économies, and the officials of the bailliages and sénéchaussées who had appointed them, were completely under the thumb of the Parlement of Paris. To make other than urgent repairs or to make significant changes in the local administration of specific Jesuit property, they had to apply to the court for permission. Bronod even had to apply to the court for the right to accept the repayment of capital belonging to the Jesuits. Moreover, both the Econome Séquestre of Paris and the provincial économies had to name attorneys in the relevant courts. In the provinces, the économies séquestres were to name attorneys in the bailliages or sénéchaussées which had appointed them, but even such an attorney could act only on the request of the local substitut of the Procureur Général du Roi of the Parlement. In Paris, on 5 May, Bronod chose Brousse to be his attorney in the Parlement. Although even Brousse could act only on the request of the Procureur Général, it was he who, after January 1763, judged the accounts of the provincial économies séquestres. Thus, the system of économies séquestres was centralized under the Econome Séquestre of Paris, whose caisse extended throughout the territory of the Parlement. And the activities of all the économies séquestres, including the Econome Séquestre of Paris, were to be closely watched and controlled by the Parlement.
The records of the Parlement reveal that there was only one critic of this system. He was Claude Bînet, the Controlleur Général aux Saisies Réelles. In a memorandum presented on 7 May 1762, he drew the court's attention to the fact that the creation of the system of économes séquestres under the jurisdiction of the Parlement was an infringement on his rights. The économes had been given the right to administer both the landed and the movable property of the Jesuit order, but it was really he who should have had charge of the real property. The seizure of the property, Bînet maintained, was a seizure made at the request of the Procureur Général du Roi, which placed the property "under the hand of the king and of justice". It thus had all the characteristics of a normal saisie réelle, and he should have been responsible for it. Moreover, as Controlleur aux Saisies Réelles, he already had the machinery necessary to enable him to take over the Jesuit property. He had officers in every bailliage and sénéchaussée, an office open to the public, and a long-standing and honourable position in the public eye. The Parlement rejected this claim, probably on the grounds that the system it had created was less expensive. We may also conclude that the parlementaires knew they could exert a greater degree of control over their own men than over the Controlleur.
II The Provincial économies séquestres

It is impossible to consider the work of the économies séquestres of the provinces, or even the Econome Séquestre of Paris, in isolation. These officials had been created on 23 and 30 April 1762 to administer all Jesuit property in the territory of the Parlement of Paris until the permanent fate of that property could be decided. But there were many other functions connected with the seizure of the property which the économies séquestres either could not or would not perform. In many cases, other officials had begun to perform these tasks before the économies séquestres had been nominated and continued to carry them out, even after the économies séquestres had been named.

The Parlement had been preparing for the confiscation since August 1761. Even to communicate its desire for memoranda from the provincial officials and universities on the future of the property, required the services not only of the Parlement's own secretaries and clerks but also of their provincial counterparts. By February and March 1762, then, the court had already given additional work to the clerks and secretaries of the bailliages and sénéchaussées and of the municipal councils. This was only the beginning. Between February and September 1762, the Parlement sent three official requests for information about the nature and extent of Jesuit property under its jurisdiction to the provinces. And even after 23 April 1762, the men who answered these requests were not the économies séquestres but existing provincial officials.

The records of the Parlement authorizing payment of the officials who made the inventories of Jesuit property, reveal that the preparation of these documents, variously known as procès-verbaux, mémoires, and even (though not to be confused with the work of the Parlement's
commissioners) *comptes rendus*, was a mammoth undertaking. For most of the Parlement's territory, it involved all the important men of the *bailliages* and *sénéchaussées*: the *Lieutenant Général*, the *Lieutenant Particulier*, the *Lieutenant de Police*, the *Procureur Général du Roi* and his *substitut*, and a small army of attorneys, regular counsellors, king's counsellors, assessors, secretaries, clerks and ushers. In Artois, just as the municipal council was to dominate the bureaux of administration of surviving colleges, so the municipal officials and functionaries apparently played an important part in making the inventories.

The biggest single expense, and therefore probably the most important aspect of the making of the inventories, was the part played by the high-ranking officials of the *bailliages* and *sénéchaussées*, such as the *Lieutenant Général*, or the *Lieutenant Particulier*, or the *Procureur du Roi*. These men drew daily salaries, often averaging sixteen *livres*, and they sometimes devoted as many as fifteen to twenty-five days to their tasks. But the services of other officials, including those of the clerks who recorded everyone else's findings, were not cheap or easily done without. Although most of the lesser officials worked in three-hour shifts, they were paid daily salaries of anything from two to six or even eight *livres*, and some of them worked for as many as forty or fifty days. When any of the officials had to travel to look at property, the cost of their services was increased. And again, when the services of experts were needed, as in the case of the jewellers who appraised the sacred vessels, silver, or other ornaments in Jesuit chapels; book salesmen who evaluated the books in libraries; or architects who estimated the value and possible use of Jesuit buildings, the fees paid even for short work shifts were high. The cost of making the three sets of descriptive
inventories ordered by the Parlement in 1762 and the one ordered by the Edict of February 1763 was probably as much as 120,000 to 125,000 livres in salaries paid to provincial officials and functionaries other than économes séquestres. Costs varied enormously from one bailliage or sénéchaussée to another but were, as we would expect, generally high in the forty towns where there were Jesuit colleges and other institutions and highest where the most substantial Jesuit property was found.  

A few of the functions performed by men who took part in the confiscation of Jesuit property in the provinces but who were not économes séquestres were obviously not connected with the preparation of the various inventories. There were, for example, numerous men named to be guardians of Jesuit buildings and paid from two to four livres a day just to make sure that no movable property was removed from the buildings and no damage done to the structures themselves. Some of the guardians continued to be employed until 1764 or 1765.  

There were numerous provincial printers involved in all aspects of the confiscation and administration of the property, too. Their function consisted mainly in reproducing legislation sent from Paris to the provinces. Their other task was to prepare notices announcing the public auction of Jesuit property in the early days when it was the Parlement's policy to dispose of it in this way.  

There were even officials, known as afficheurs, whose job it was to put up the legislation or announcements about the property in public places. The printers and afficheurs were paid for shifts, too. Finally, for some reason, in at least one case, some of the doctors appointed by the bailliages and sénéchaussées to attend to sick Jesuits were regarded by the court as functionaries just like the other provincial officials taking part in the seizure and disposal of the property. The payment
of all the men just described was authorized by the Parlement in four separate arrêts of January, May, and July 1764 and of April 1766. It was Bronod, Econome Séquestre of Paris, who was ordered to make the necessary payments from funds in his extensive caisse. The total cost of the services of provincial officials other than économès séquestres in the period up to 1766 was 128,049 livres.12

The économès séquestres did not duplicate the work done by these existing provincial officials and in most cases apparently worked with them.13 Thus, while many of the tasks described above were already being performed by other provincial officials, after 23 April 1762 there came into existence a network of at least forty-three économès séquestres in the provinces of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.14 There was originally one économème séquestre for each bailliage or sénéchaussée in which there was a controlling Jesuit house such as a college, professed house, noviciate, or residence. After June 1763, authorization was given for the creation of similar officials in the colonies in which there was Jesuit property controlled by Jesuit houses under the Parlement's jurisdiction.15

We know almost nothing about the forty-three men who were économès séquestres in the provinces of the jurisdiction of the Parlement except their names. They were the appointees of the bailliages and sénéchaussées and they were expected to work only in the interests of their immediate superiors there and of the Parlement of Paris.16 According to the legislation which had created these officials, they had almost unlimited powers to receive money originally owed to local Jesuits, and to constitute rentes, régies, or leases on Jesuit property as profitably and imaginatively as possible. They continued to enjoy these extensive powers at least until February 1763, when the crown issued the Edict of February and the lettres patentes of 2 February which determined the
permanent fate of most of the colleges and their attached benefices.¹⁷

Perhaps because their powers and responsibilities were so great in the first months after their creation, many of the provincial économes séquestres very soon found themselves involved in legal problems of determining just what were the limits of their authority. While municipal officials began to replace Jesuit teachers in the colleges, and various men from the bailliages and sénéchaussées prepared inventories, the économes séquestres apparently assumed that they were, nevertheless, the administrators of the college property and all other Jesuit property. Other local officials made the same assumption, with the result that the Parlement of Paris intervened within less than a month of the original creation of the économes séquestres, and issued legislation further defining their functions.

Thus, when the local officers of Amiens sought to give Gille Thomas the possession of a benefice attached to the Jesuit college at Amiens, the Parlement reacted with an arrêt officially forbidding anyone to interfere with the ownership of a benefice attached to Jesuit property.¹⁸ And when Jean-Baptiste Roger, also of Amiens, sought to become an économe séquestre, the Parlement ruled that a clerk of a bailliage or sénéchaussée who was also the son of a greffier en titre was ineligible to be an économe séquestre unless he took an oath to abstain from the performing function of clerk in matters pertaining to the Jesuits. Roger apparently did this.¹⁹ In Nevers, the économe séquestre appointed by the bailliage seized papers belonging to the seminary as well as those belonging to the college of that town. On the request of the diocesan séquestre of Nevers, the Parlement ordered the local économe séquestre to give up the papers. But at the same time, it also told the diocesan séquestre to name a special official to administer the affairs of the seminary once held by the Jesuits and
made that new official responsible to the *Procureur Général* of the *Parlement* of Paris. There were doubtless many other specific problems of this type to be dealt with as the system of *économes séquestres* was established.

But one jurisdictional problem which developed within the first month of the new administration's existence concerned virtually all *économes séquestres*. This was the matter of Jesuit property located in a specific *bailliage* or *sénéchaussée* of the *Parlement* of Paris but originally belonging to a controlling house of another *bailliage* or *sénéchaussée* of that *Parlement*, or even of another *parlement* of the kingdom. Local *économes séquestres* sought to take possession of all Jesuit property within the jurisdiction of their *bailliages* or *sénéchaussées*. At the same time, other *économes séquestres* having charge of other controlling houses, sought to rationalize or complete their administrations by taking possession of all the property belonging to these colleges or houses, regardless of where it was found, even if it were found outside the jurisdiction of the *Parlement* of Paris. The *Parlement* of Paris dealt with this problem in a consistent manner and repeatedly ruled that the seizure of property found within its territory but belonging to a controlling house (and, as it happened, it always meant to a college) outside its own territory should be carried out "as though ordered" by the other *parlement* or *parlements*. It enforced the same principle with regard to property located in one of its own *bailliages* or *sénéchaussées* but belonging to a college or other kind of religious house of another. In such a case, the seizure and administration took place "as though ordered" by the *économe séquestre* of the controlling house which had owned the contested property under the Jesuits. Eventually, the *Parlement* was to insist that each former Jesuit college of its jurisdiction should have its own *économe séquestre*,
charged with the administration of all its landed property, no matter where that property was. This is why even the list of payments or allowances to économes séquestres for the early years is almost entirely limited to the men who had been charged with Jesuit houses such as the colleges, noviciates, professed house, residences, or independent mission, and includes very few whose administration was limited to provincial terreins metayers, forests, mills, or ecclesiastical benefices.

As a result of the policy of entrusting one économ sequestre with the administration of all the landed property of a single institution, the Parlement had to receive requests from provincial économes séquestres for special privileges when they had to undertake legal proceedings or administer property in more than one bailliage or sénéchaussée. Eventually, in the cases of La Flèche, Bourges, and Poitiers, the Parlement granted specific lettres garde-gardiennes, or rights of committimus to enable each local économ sequestre to make his claim before a single special court instead of having to take it to all the bailliages and sénéchaussées involved.

In only one case did the Parlement of Paris allow a departure from the principle which we may describe as that of "one college: one économ sequestre". That was the case of Paris itself. On Bronod's request, the court decided on 13 July 1762 that the seven priories which he deemed to be too far away from Paris for him to administer should be placed under the économes séquestres named by the bailliages in whose jurisdiction the benefices were found.

Another problem for provincial économes séquestres arose in the summer of 1762 when the Parlement decided to make provisions for disposing of movable property of Jesuit buildings which was not required for public education. On 6 August 1762, then, the court
authorized the Procureur Général in Paris or his substituts in provincial courts to request the sale by public auction of most of the movable property. Clerks of the bailliages or sénéchaussées were to supervise the sales in the provinces, and the local économes séquestrés were to receive the money coming from the sales and to send the profits to Bronod in Paris immediately.\(^{25}\) There were still some questionable categories of movable property, and later in August the Parlement made special arrangements to dispose of it. It ordered the substituts of the Procureur Général to seize the sacred vessels, linens, and ornaments in Jesuit chapels or churches and to entrust this property to the local vicar until its fate could be decided.\(^{26}\) Then, at the end of the month, the court ordered the économes séquestrés to bring all the silver plate, including that which had belonged to the congrégations suppressed in 1760, to the nearest mint. In the towns in which the Jesuit college was the only college and its church thus the only college church, the local officials were to consult the local curés and vicars to decide which silver plate should be left in the chapel or church for the sake of the "decency" of religious services held there. The silver plate which the économes séquestrés brought to the mints was to be converted into money which was to be sent to Bronod.\(^{27}\) Nearly a year later, the Parlement authorized some of the clerks guarding the silver plate to sell it to jewellers if the jewellers paid a higher price for it. They, like the provincial économes séquestrés, were charged to send the proceeds from the sale of the silver plate to Bronod in Paris. And he, it was stated, in this case and in others, was to use it to repay the creditors of the Jesuits.\(^{28}\)

Thus, in general, until February 1763, the économes séquestrés named ten months before, were involved in administering all kinds of Jesuit property as imaginatively as they could and in implementing the
Parlement's decisions about the various problems described above. In February, bureaux for administering colleges, with the right eventually to appoint their own treasurers, came into existence and began to take over the running of all material aspects of the colleges. And the Econome Général du Clergé or his appointees began to take over the benefices. The roles of the existing provincial économés séquestres thus began to be greatly curtailed, as the permanent fate of the Jesuits' property was decided and the new policy regarding college administration and the payment of Jesuit pensions began to be implemented.

The changing conditions caused new problems for the provincial économés séquestres. One problem became apparent in March 1763. The décimes had not been paid on Jesuit property in Tours for the three years 1760 to 1763, although, according to the terms of an arrêt of the Parlement of 13 August 1762, décimes due on former Jesuit property were to be paid before all other debts. Thus, it was the responsibility of either the local économé séquestre of Tours or the Econome Séquestre of Paris to pay this ecclesiastical tax. According to the lettres patentès of 2 February, however, much of the revenue for 1762 from the ecclesiastical benefices of the College of Tours was to go to Marchal de Sainscy, the Econome Général du Clergé. The court therefore concluded that Marchal should be held responsible for a share of the unpaid balance commensurate with the revenue he was to receive from the property.

Between February 1763 and 3 June or 21 November 1763, there still existed considerable confusion about the ownership of all that property not specifically singled out in the royal legislation of February. Thus, for this period, the économés séquestres' rights and duties over property such as movable college property which might not be deemed
necessary for education, or even over the noviciates, professed house, residences, and independent mission were in question. The *lettres patentes* of June decided that all the institutions not necessary for public education should belong to and be sold for the Union of Creditors.\(^{31}\) It was thus removed from the official control of any of the *économes séquestres* who had been administering it.\(^{32}\) Perhaps more important, because it touched property which the *économes séquestres* had been handling directly, the *lettres patentes* of 21 November removed from administrative limbo those questionable pieces of movable property or ill-defined real property always connected to the colleges but not clearly serving a useful purpose in the education of French youth. After 21 November 1763, such property belonged outright to the colleges. It would be the rôle of members of the new *bureaux* of administration to treat with representatives of the Union of Creditors concerning the large payments which the colleges might one day make to the creditors for the rights the former received on 21 November. But the arrangement would not involve any provincial *économe séquestre*. Indeed, the *lettres patentes* of 21 November, by deciding the permanent fate of the last undefined category of Jesuit property, were, in a sense, the death warrant of the *économes séquestres*. In those cases in which former Jesuit colleges now had *bureaux* of administration, the provincial *économes séquestres* no longer had any reason to exist.\(^{33}\)

These, then, were the conditions in which the provincial *économes séquestres* temporarily administered all Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the *Parlement* of Paris. But what was the result of this brief administration? It must be remembered that these officials had had many responsibilities. They had been charged to use the money raised in the course of their administration to pay subsistence and travel allowances to Jesuits, to finance necessary and urgent repairs
to Jesuit property, and to pay new masters of Jesuit colleges. If they had money left over, they had been expected to send it to Bronod, the Econome Séquestre of Paris.

How well did they perform these functions? This is very difficult indeed to judge. The Parlement's records contain few suggestions that the provincial économies séquestres received enough money to fulfil even the first obligation, let alone the second or the third. On the other hand, they do show that many économies séquestres took the alternative offered to them by the legislation of 23 and 30 April 1762, and appealed to the Econome Séquestre of Paris for supplements when they could not afford to pay the Jesuits' original allowances or the new masters' salaries. 34

Despite this fact, the accounts of the Econome Séquestre of Paris are confusing on this question. On the one hand, they show that in 1762 to 1765, the provincial économies séquestres sent a mere 73,914 livres to Bronod as the surplus revenue left over after a very few of them had paid local expenses. But the accounts fail to explain whether Bronod received any of the remaining more than one million livres which came into his caisse in these years from the provincial économies séquestres. It is possible that some of this revenue came not only from the provinces, but also indirectly from the économies séquestres. 35 Thus, we have no way of knowing whether even contemporaries regarded the 73,914 livres officially sent by the provincial économies séquestres from their surplus revenue as pitifully little. Nor do we know whether contemporaries balanced that sum against the more than 100,000 livres which the Parlement ordered Bronod to send to the provinces 36 or the amount as high as 800,000 livres which he may have sent to the provinces in this period 37 to enable the économies séquestres to pay the Jesuits' allowances or the masters' salaries, or any other expenses
which provincial officials were unable to pay.

Perhaps a more useful way of judging the success or failure of the work of the provincial économies séquestres is to consider what the Parlement itself thought of it. By authorizing the payment of provincial économies séquestres for their loyal services in the early years of the confiscation, the Parlement implied that it was well satisfied with its servants. The Parlement first granted such payments in June 1764. By that time, bureaux of administration had been established in all the former Jesuit colleges which, according to the Edict of February 1763, were expected to have them, and the principle that the surviving Jesuit colleges should own all the real and movable property previously connected to them, laid down in the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763, had been generally recognized. In these circumstances, then, the Parlement decided to carry out the provisions of the Edict of February pertaining to the économies séquestres. It would authorize the Econome Séquestre of Paris to pay the économies séquestres' salaries now that most of their services were no longer needed.

Since January 1763, the quarterly accounts of the provincial économies, which had been sent to Bronod, had been closely scrutinized by Brousse, his attorney in the Parlement. It was therefore Brousse who, in June 1764, issued the list of économies séquestres who had given satisfactory service during the preceding two years and recommended that their salaries should be paid. The list was then approved by the commissioners of the Parlement appointed on 6 August 1762. Thus, the responsibility for the execution of the Parlement's policy in confiscating Jesuit property, even in this instance, remained partially in the hands of the men who had determined it in the first place. In the case of the twenty-five économies séquestres of the twenty-three
colleges whose existence had by this time been confirmed by royal legislation, the Parlement now authorized the payment of their full salaries. In the case of the dozen or so others, whose colleges had not yet been confirmed by individual royal lettres patentes, the legislation had a more complicated effect. It authorized the payment of économes séquestres' salaries for the services they had already performed and it also allowed them a fixed salary or commission for services which they might perform in the months or years to come.

In June 1764, the Parlement not only decided that the provincial économes séquestres' salaries for services rendered up to this time should be paid. It also determined who should pay them. The second decision, in view of the complex legislation of 1763, was not an easy one to make. It had originally been intended that the provincial économes séquestres should acquit local obligations and then send their profits to Bronod in Paris so that he might send them to the Union of Creditors. Implicit in this original legislation had been the assumption that the Union would receive appreciable amounts of money from this source and would therefore assume responsibility for rewarding those provincial économes séquestres who had served it well. But there had been few profits to be passed on to the Union and the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 had altered the original arrangements drastically. From that date on, the colleges, or the administrative bureaux of the colleges, owned all college property outright, wherever it was. Thus, once the existence of the various colleges had been confirmed by royal legislation, it turned out that the provincial économes séquestres had been administering the bulk of the property in their charge not for the Union of Creditors at all, but for the college bureaux.
In the circumstances, the Parlement judged that the bureaux should pay the salaries of the économes séquestres, who could now be said to have served the bureaux well. That plan might have worked if the bureaux of administration could have afforded to pay such salaries. But they could not. Hence, on 5 June 1764, when the Parlement approved the list of deserving économes séquestres prepared by Brousse and the commissioners appointed on 6 August 1762, it had to suggest an alternative means of providing the money to pay them.\textsuperscript{43} It resorted to an expedient it had used before\textsuperscript{44} and ordered that in those cases in which the économes séquestres had sufficient profits on hand to pay their own salaries, they should do so. Otherwise, Bronod should dip into that reserve of money which, as the Econome Séquestre of Paris, he had collected before 21 November 1763, and which had legally remained in his hands.

We have no means of determining just how much money the provincial économes séquestres received as a result of this legislation of 5 June 1764. In general, we know only what commission they received on the money they handled, and that it varied a great deal from one place to another. In a few cases, most of them relatively small colleges, we know what salary individual économes séquestres received for the first year. But about large establishments, such as La Flèche, for which the économe séquestre got one sol per livre of all the money he handled; or Lyon, where the commission was eighteen deniers of all receipts, it is difficult to judge how much money the économes séquestres got for their work. On the basis of our knowledge of these institutions' receipts on the eve of the confiscation, we may suppose that these salaries were high.\textsuperscript{45} Finally, we also know that the payment of the provincial économes séquestres for the period 1762 to 1764 was part of more than 500,000 livres described in Bronod's accounts for 1764 to
1766 as "paid on the orders of the commissioners of 6 August 1762".  

In 1766 the issue of paying the salaries of two provincial économies séquestres, those of Eu and Châlons-sur-Marne, was settled by the Parlement, and they were authorized to receive a total of nearly 5,000 livres for the services they had performed. The absence of references in the legislation of this year to other provincial économies séquestres suggests two things. First, it suggests that the legislation of 5 June 1764 had dealt successfully with the problem of continuing to pay those provincial économies séquestres whose services had not yet ended by June 1764. Secondly, it suggests that if the original provincial économies séquestres appointed in 1762 continued to work for the bureaux of administration of the colleges after the period in which individual colleges were confirmed by royal legislation, it was probably the bureaux that paid them.

The legislation of 1766 authorizing the payment of the économies séquestres of Eu and Châlons-sur-Marne apparently ended the Parlement's responsibility for authorizing the payment of économies séquestres of colleges having bureaux of administration. It did not, however, put an end to the Parlement's desire to oversee the work of the économies séquestres of the two colleges of Bourges and Poitiers. These colleges, having been attached to the local universities under the Jesuits, had not been touched by the Edict of February 1763. Their property therefore continued to be administered by the économies séquestres appointed after 23 April 1762, long after bureaux of administration of former Jesuit colleges had assumed such responsibilities elsewhere.

In both Bourges and Poitiers, the early history of the confiscation was basically the same as in the rest of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. The two économies séquestres, Maigreau for Bourges and Coulland for Poitiers, had trouble paying the initial expenses of
their administration and had to apply to the Econome Séquestre of Paris for supplements to enable them to pay the Jesuits' allowances and the salaries of the new masters. In both places, silver vessels and property once belonging to Jesuit congrégations were seized and taken to nearly mints. In Bourges there was a brief conflict between the econome séquestre and the representative of the Econome Général du Clergé over the administration of a secularized benefice attached to the college. This conflict was decided in favour of the econome séquestre. In Poitiers, the econome séquestre's affairs were complicated by the presence of Irish scholars who had attended the college in the time of the Jesuits and were still entitled to scholarships which on the order of the Parlement were eventually provided by Bronod. Otherwise, the affairs of both économes séquestres were made easier by the decision of the Parlement to grant them special rights to administer all the property connected to their colleges without needing to have recourse to innumerable local courts with overlapping jurisdictions. As far as I can determine, the exceptional status of the Colleges of Bourges and Poitiers had no other ramifications in the early work of their respective économes séquestres, Maigreau and Coulland.

On the other hand, as the years passed, the administrations of these two men apparently assumed a more stable form. After 1765, when virtually all the colleges which were going to have bureaux of administration had been confirmed, and the crown was more concerned with reforming the provincial universities than with pronouncing on the future of colleges attached to them, the authorities everywhere apparently ceased to regard Maigreau's or Coulland's functions as temporary. This fact probably explains the survival of detailed accounts of their administrations in the papers of the Parlement of Paris. From these,
we may determine certain characteristics of Coulland's administration for 1762 to 1766 and Maigreau's administration for 1767 to 1768. In both cases, we find that in the period after 1764, when the upheaval caused by the confiscation of the Jesuits' property and the dispersal of the Jesuits was over, the économes séquestres' receipts generally exceeded their expenditures. Moreover, the administrators used the money they received from the property they administered, to fulfil a variety of responsibilities. They repaid some of the money which the Parlement had ordered Bronod to send them in the first two years, they continued to make some payments to Jesuits, to have property repaired, and to pay the salaries of the new masters of the colleges. They appear to have spent an increasing proportion of their income on the upkeep of colleges and attached property.

By 1780, the Parlement had lost track of the conduct and affairs of Coulland in Poitiers, and of Maigreau in Bourges. By 1786 and 1788 respectively, the major Jesuit colleges of both Bourges and Poitiers had been removed from the control of the secular clergy, who had held them after the Jesuits' departure, and placed in the hands of religious congregations. It is not clear whether Maigreau and Coulland, or other économes séquestres with the same duties, continued to serve the new masters. Even if they did not, the administration of the économes séquestres had lasted approximately two decades in these two towns, while it had lasted no more than five years in other provincial towns. To judge from the limited information available to us, it had been as successful in Bourges and Poitiers as anywhere else in the provinces.
The most important of all the économes séquestres was the Econome Séquestre of Paris, Edme-Louis Bronod (or Bronot) the younger. ¹ He was named to the position on 30 April 1762, ² and it seems to have been the most important one he ever held. He had been a notary of the Châtelet since 1753, when he replaced his father there. ³ He was a bachelor who, by all appearances, lived a frugal life and shared an apartment or small house in the Marais with his mother. ⁴ It is not clear who selected him for his new position in 1762 or why they chose him. ⁵ The makers of policy in the Parlement obviously assumed that he was honest and conscientious, but they may also have chosen him, rather than a better-known lawyer, because they wanted a man who they knew could devote all his time to the new tasks of his office. In the Parlement, Bronod's work was supervised and scrutinized by Brousse, his own attorney there, and by the Abbé Terray and Rolland. ⁶

As a public official, Bronod had two separate, though related responsibilities. The first was to perform all those functions implied by his title. He was indeed the Econome Séquestre of the Prévôté and Vicomté of Paris. He did with the Jesuits' property in the capital more or less what the provincial économes séquestres did with it elsewhere. Of course, since the Jesuits had owned more property in the capital or attached to institutions in the capital than in any other part of the jurisdiction of the Parlement, even his first set of responsibilities was considerably more complicated than any of theirs. We may appreciate this fact best by reviewing the nature and extent of the Parisian Jesuits' property. ⁷

The list begins with the largest and most famous of all the Jesuit colleges, the College of Louis-le-Grand, sometimes still called by its
original name, the College of Clermont, and now located on the rue Saint Jacques. Near it and physically almost attached to it were a number of buildings rented to private individuals, sometimes for commercial purposes. Officially attached to it, in a figurative sense, by papal legislation were a number of ecclesiastical benefices including the Abbey of Saint Martin aux Bois, and the Priories of Montalet, Gargenville, and Villeneuve, all of which were located a long way from Paris. The college also owned a good deal of non-ecclesiastical property, some of which, including the Maladerie de Brie Comte Robert, had once been ecclesiastical property but was now secularized. There was a farm at Montabis, also in the country. Otherwise, in Paris the college possessed much movable property and held titles to valuable rentes. And it had a large library.

Elsewhere in Paris, there were two other Jesuit institutions of which the richer was probably the professed house of the rue Saint Antoine. It included a library and chapel. In the professed house were found the titles to annuities and securities actually belonging to other Jesuit institutions or property, including colonial missions and colleges, both outside and inside the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. Most of these rentes should have been administered by the College of La Flèche, where the Jesuit procureur of the relevant missions had traditionally lived. As it happened, however, the official in charge of them had taken up residence at the professed house in Paris in the years of the Lavalette affair, and the titles were found there during the confiscation. Moreover, although such a practice was definitely against canon law, the professed house apparently enjoyed the revenues of the ecclesiastical benefice of Villeneuve, even though, officially, it was attached to the College of Louis-le-Grand.

The third Jesuit institution in Paris was the noviciate of the rue
Pot-de-Fer. Like the professed house, it should have been supported primarily by alms and minor, unofficial endowments. In fact, it owned considerable property, including a retreat house next door. Like the professed house, it had a not insignificant library and a chapel. And with the professed house, it owned country property, including the country houses of Gentilly, Montlouis, Montrouge, Charonne and Belleville. It also enjoyed the revenue of a variety of rentes. Most important of all, it owned perhaps as many as sixty or seventy private houses in Paris, which it had normally rented to private individuals rather than corporations.

It is difficult to tell exactly when Bronod's functions as the Econome Séquestre of Paris began. The arrêt of 30 April 1762 which named him to the position instructed him to give 6,000 livres in subsistence allowances to the Jesuits of Paris immediately, so in one sense his work began at once. Certainly, the fact that the Jesuits in Paris did not abandon all their property until mid-August 1762 made little if any difference to the series of events constituting the seizure of property in that city. Like his counterparts in the provinces, Bronod played an intermittent role in the early stages of the confiscation. He was absent from most of the initial seizures and making of memoranda, états, comptes rendus, and other lists of property required by the Parlement. These tasks seem to have been carried out by a host of clerks, ushers, and commissioners of the Parlement, under the general supervision of the clerk Griveau.

The records of these lesser officials' work, though not of all the rewards they received for their services, have survived. They reveal that the Jesuits of Paris, and particularly the Procureur of the Province of Paris, de Montigny, co-operated wholeheartedly with the Parlement's officials until the autumn of 1762, when the Jesuits were
expelled from Paris. De Montigny was well repaid by the Parlement for his efforts, including considerable secretarial activities and travelling, which he made to ensure that the various documents required by the Parlement were as complete as possible. There was no counterpart to this Jesuit procureur in the provinces.

The Parlement's minor officials and the Jesuits who remained to help them carried out their duties in the summer of 1762, while Bronod was beginning his. Although not involved in the first seizures or making of memoranda, and apparently absent from the ceremony marking the transfer of the College of Lisieux to the College of Louis-le-Grand in October 1762, Bronod took part in the appraisal of some of the property in Paris. In doing this, he worked closely with Nicolas-François Ponchon, the curateur of Jesuit property named by the Parlement in March 1763. Together they discovered most of the information which de l'Averdy used in his compte rendu of Jesuit property in Paris, presented in June 1763. Bronod also employed and worked with the architect Moisy to determine the probable cost of repairs to various buildings formerly owned by the Jesuits of Paris.

Bronod's two major tasks as the Econome Séquestre of Paris consisted of receiving and paying out sums of money. On the one hand, he was to receive all money and other dues supposed to be paid to the Jesuits of the controlling houses under his jurisdiction. Until 2 February 1763, he received money from the ecclesiastical benefices attached to the College of Louis-le-Grand, although he had to rely on provincial appointees to administer them for him. He received rents due for private houses in Paris, and, with the Parlement's permission, the reimbursement of the capital of rentes or the annual revenue from rentes formerly held by the Parisian Jesuits. He received permission to be reimbursed a total of 53,989 livres which the négociant Rey of
Marseille had owed to the Jesuit administrator, Gatin. Moreover, even after it had a bureau of administration, the College of Louis-le-Grand paid him money to give to the Jesuits as pensions. He apparently also received money from the sale of movable property in Paris, which the Parlement's officials organized during the first year of the confiscation. Even as late as 1767 to 1773, he was still receiving rentes originally intended for all the Jesuit institutions of Paris: rentes on the aides and gabelles due to be paid to the noviciate and professed house, and rentes on the provincial estates due to be paid to the College of Louis-le-Grand.

With this money, Bronod paid the expenses resulting from the confiscation of Parisian Jesuit property. He paid allowances to the Parisian Jesuits until the Econome Général took over that responsibility, he paid the cost of minor repairs and sought the right to pay the cost of major ones, and he paid salaries to the new masters of the college. It is not clear how much money Bronod spent in this way in Paris, but it is apparent that he did all these things for the first decade of his administration and perhaps longer.

Bronod's administration of the individual institutions of Paris is hard to trace. It is certain that, in the first year or two, he was responsible for all three. He administered the College of Louis-le-Grand and all its property for over a year. On the order of the Parlement, he even paid scholarships to a student of that college, Hardevilliers. Then on 21 November 1763, lettres patentes of the king confirmed the existence of the College of Louis-le-Grand, and authorized the end of Bronod's administration of that institution. We do not know when he gave up that administration. The records of the bureau of that college, which appear amongst other papers of the Parlement, contain no reference to Bronod's activities although they
reveal that the commissioners of the Parlement named on 6 August 1762 did attend its meetings.\textsuperscript{31} On the other hand, the same papers contain a complete reference to Bronod's accounts of his administration of the College of Louis-le-Grand. Those accounts were considered by the Parlement in 1770, but it is not certain which period they covered.\textsuperscript{32} They were the only extant accounts presented by Bronod which show a deficit, or an excess of expenditures over receipts.\textsuperscript{33}

The permanent fate of the other two major institutions in Paris was decided by other lettres patentes of the king, also dated 21 November 1763.\textsuperscript{34} They repeated and gave royal sanction to a provision of an arrêt of the Parlement issued on 6 August 1762.\textsuperscript{35} After 21 November 1763, the noviciate and professed house, which had not been used for public education under the Jesuits, became the property of the Union of Creditors. The officials of the Union were empowered to dispose of the buildings, although, as we shall see in a later chapter, they were not successful in their attempt to sell either building.\textsuperscript{36} Bronod continued for many years to administer the rentes for which the titles had been found in the professed house. In the case of the titles which had belonged to property not used for education, he was supposed to be administering the rentes for the creditors of the Jesuits. And, in the cases in which various colleges owned the titles found in the professed house, he was supposed to be administering the rentes for the colleges in question. In 1773, when his last extant accounts end, he was administering both kinds of rentes and receiving rents paid for the private houses which the Jesuits had owned in Paris.\textsuperscript{37} At the time of his death in 1781, Bronod was still administering quite a number of rentes whose titles had been found in the professed house in the first stages of the confiscation. There is also some evidence that in the ten years before 1781 he had been gradually turning the
rentes to which they were entitled over to the officials of the Union. 

Bronod was more than the Econome Séquestre of Paris. He was also the Econome Séquestre for the whole jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. That this was his second major responsibility is demonstrated by the fact that he administered rentes whose titles had been found in the professed house but which had belonged to Jesuits living outside the city of Paris. Both in theory and in fact, it was Bronod who made the économes séquestres of the entire jurisdiction of the Parlement not merely a lot of similar officials performing similar actions, but a rational administrative system. Under the Parlement, he was the key to the entire organization. His caisse officially extended not just to Paris itself but also to all corners of the territory of the Parlement.

In his central position in the administrative system, Bronod performed the same functions as he had performed as Econome Séquestre of Paris, but on a wider scale. He received money coming from the sale or administration of Jesuit property all over the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. And he sent money to those parts of the Parlement's territory where it was needed, to pay the costs of the confiscation or of the administration of former Jesuit colleges. Most of his receipts and expenditures were dictated by the Parlement. At first, his receipts from the provinces came from the sale of Jesuit property, and primarily from movable property. They also came from the reimbursement of rentes, and from sums of money left behind by the Jesuits. In the first year, a total of nearly 74,000 livres was described as coming from the provincial économes séquestres' surpluses of receipts over expenditures. Later, Bronod's receipts included small repayments made by bureaux of administration of provincial colleges for money he had once forwarded to them, payments of rents on real property, and the repayment of money owed to Jesuits.
With this money, as well as with any surplus he might have left over from his administration of the Jesuits' possessions in Paris, the Parlement charged Bronod to pay bills which the provincial administrators could not pay. Thus, according to the papers of the Parlement, the most important part which Bronod played in the confiscation was that of an obedient official who, on the request of Brousse and the orders of the Parlement, paid for the inconvenient details of the provincial confiscation with money coming from his extensive caisse.

It was Bronod, then, who was ordered to pay the men who had taken part in the initial seizures and sales or placing of seals on Jesuit property. He paid the Lieutenants Généraux, Lieutenants Particuliers, and the brigades of clerks, secretaries, guardians, and so on the more than 128,000 livres which the first phases of the confiscation had cost. Then it was Bronod who paid bills that provincial économes séquestres could not pay: some of the early local expenses, and, before the Econome Général du Clergé assumed this responsibility, allowances to Jesuits. In the first three years, or between 1762 and 1765, Bronod paid more than 260,000 livres and perhaps as much as 375,000 livres in allowances to former Jesuits. He also paid the costs of repairs to provincial property before either the Econome Général or the bureaux of administration took on this responsibility. And, by 1773, he had paid several thousand livres in scholarships or bursaries to students who had been denied their rights to scholarships because of the confiscation or because of the suppression of the Jesuit order. It was a group of Irish scholars who benefited most from this part of Bronod's work. And, in the first two years of the confiscation, he paid 91,000 livres directly towards the expense of the Union of Creditors.
Perhaps most important of all, because it revealed the provinces' dependence on him, he paid many of the salaries of the new masters of the colleges, in the period before the bureaux of administration were organized to do so themselves. Although we are unable to separate the affairs of Paris from those of the provinces in Bronod's early accounts, it is clear from the Parlement's papers that it authorized him to send more than 100,000 livres to the provincial économies to enable them to pay the new masters' salaries. He may have sent considerably more than this amount for these purposes in the whole period 1762 to 1773. After all the colleges which were to be confirmed had been confirmed, Bronod continued to administer a few of the rentes belonging to some of the confirmed colleges until 1773 and perhaps later. He also made a few small payments to local officials whose services during the first months of the confiscation had so far gone unrewarded. Bronod's accounts for 1767 to 1773 include an entry for the expenditure of about 5,000 livres for his own administrative expenses, including even the cost of certain arrêts passed in the Parlement. It is doubtful whether this amount was the whole cost of the "justice" dispensed by the Parlement of Paris in the course of the Jesuit affair. In all probability the cost of all the arrêts approved in 1761 to 1773 was very much higher.

Bronod paid the costs of the seizure of Jesuit property in the provinces, and he paid bills the provincial économies séquestres could not pay. Then, he undoubtedly paid the salaries of the provincial économies séquestres when their régies did not produce enough money for their own salaries or commissions, and when, as usually happened, the bureaux of administration could not pay them either. Then, on the orders of the Parlement and according to the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 and 30 March 1764, Bronod paid what was necessary to
the colleges and the Union of Creditors, according to the reciprocal arrangements made by that legislation.52

As the years passed, the amounts of money which Bronod had to administer, as well as the amounts of money which the Parlement ordered him to pay, diminished considerably. In the first year of his administration, his receipts were 658,498 livres and his expenditures were 369,654 livres.53 In the second year, he received 352,296 livres and spent 283,769 livres.54 In the third year, he received 244,838 livres, and, using his surplus from the two previous years, spent 343,512 livres, most of which came under the single heading of "paid on the order of the Parlement and of the Commissioners appointed on 6 August 1762".55 In 1767 to 1773, the last six years for which we have a record, his average annual receipts were 35,176 livres and his expenditures 30,476 livres.56 To judge from the state of Bronod's affairs at the time of his death, the annual receipts and expenditures for which he was responsible were even smaller in the remaining eight years of his life.57

Just as it was impossible to judge the success or failure of the régies of the provincial économes by the standards of a later time or place, so it is also impossible to judge Bronod's administration by such standards. Our judgment of his administration must be based on the reception which Bronod's superiors gave to the accounts he presented to them, and the judgment of his administration which his superiors offered in accepting the accounts. Just as the provincial économes séquestres had been required to present very regular accounts, so Bronod, too, was supposed to give regular accounts to the Parlement. His administration lasted far longer than those of most of his provincial counterparts' and subordinates', and it is hardly surprising, in view of what we know of the general history of the Parlement in the late 1760's and 1770's58 that the Parlement seems to have become less exacting about the presentation
of Bronod's accounts as the years passed. Thus, at the beginning, Bronod presented his accounts and had them judged within eight months of the end of the first year of his administration. After that, the time between the transactions described in the accounts and the presentation and judgment of the accounts increased. The second set was judged thirteen months after the end of the second year, and the third set was judged four and a half years after the end of the third year of Bronod's administration. It is not known what became of Bronod's accounts for May 1765 to May 1767, but his accounts for May 1767 to November 1773 were presented all at once, probably some time after the latter date. If they were considered by the Parlement at all, it must have been at some time well after 1773. Nevertheless, in the early years, when Bronod was administering large amounts of money, the Parlement was apparently very satisfied with his work. He received an annual salary and saw the Parlement judge his work within a very short time after he had carried out the transactions listed in his accounts. In contrast, in the same period, the Econome Général du Clergé was still presenting his accounts to his superiors in the Commission of the Economats and they were still judging them at least a decade after the transactions described in the accounts had taken place.

After 1773, Bronod sinks temporarily from view. The standard sources of information about the Parlement's business for this period say nothing about him or his accounts for the whole period 1773 to 1781. But in 1781, he died. The records of the Châtelet contain a complete report of his death at what seems to have been a comparatively young age. The medical reports leave little doubt that he died of what we would describe as a violent stroke. The manner of his death would not matter if we had not come to associate such deaths of
relatively young people with living under extreme pressure or tensions or having to shoulder extreme responsibilities. That Bronod had been living under stress in the months or weeks before his death is by no means certain, but the developments which followed his death suggest that he probably had been.

He died on 30 January 1781, and, according to the practice when a public official of his stature died in the capital, seals were immediately placed on his property by officials of the Châtelet. Officials of both the Châtelet and the Parlement began immediately to investigate his business affairs and within the week, members of the Parlement judged that he had died bankrupt. By 16 March 1781, he was openly referred to as bankrupt, and members of the Parlement were demanding that the price of his office and title in the Châtelet be turned over to his creditors.

By the summer of July 1781, officials in both the Châtelet and Parlement were speculating about the meaning of Bronod's bankruptcy and that of several other public officials, which had occurred at about the same time. One official of the Châtelet went so far as to compare it with all the other alarming bankruptcies, suspected of being fraudulent, "which are breaking out on all sides and in all states [of life]". The same man also admitted that Bronod's papers were in such disorder that it would take a long time to ascertain whether Bronod had been dishonest or just careless, and he asked for the time in which to analyse Bronod's papers to discover the truth. The Parlement gave members of the Châtelet permission to make the necessary inventories and analysis.

In the meantime, other people besides members of the Châtelet and Parlement had become alarmed about Bronod's probable bankruptcy. From the very beginning, the syndics of the Union of Creditors of the
Jesuits, led by Rouhette, and their attorney in the Parlement of Paris, François Lambert, had insisted on making claims to Bronod's remaining property. Their first claim dated from 30 January to 1 February 1781. By 30 April, the creditors of Edme-Louis Bronod had formed a syndicate of creditors and Rouhette had entered a claim for about 166,000 livres on behalf of the Union of Creditors of the Jesuits against Bronod's estate.

The creditors of the Jesuits were not the only people making claims to property which Bronod owned or had administered. While they had been preparing their case against the first Econome Séquestre of Paris, the Parlement, to protect its rights and interests, had named a successor to Bronod. An arrêt of the Parlement of Paris dated 21 February 1781 appointed the second Econome Séquestre of Paris, whose name was Florent-Jacques Le Pot d'Auteuil. That court charged him to go on doing exactly what Bronod had been required to do ever since the original arrêt of 23 April 1762. He was to be present at the lifting of the seals on Bronod's property.

The volume of business which Le Pot d'Auteuil transacted must have been extremely small. It is doubtful whether either his receipts from former Jesuit property or his expenditures on it can have exceeded 20,000 livres each year. When the Revolutionaries investigated the entire system, they made no mention of Le Pot d'Auteuil and it is quite possible that the entire régie of the Econome Séquestre ceased to exist at some time between 1781 and 1789.

The lack of evidence about his successor suggests that our judgment of the success or failure of the administration by the Parlement of Paris of the Jesuit property which was not taken over by other agencies or corporate bodies after 21 November 1763 must be based on what we can
discover about Bronod. Was it true, as men suggested in the spring
and summer of 1781, that the official appointed in 1762 who had
apparently served the Parlement so well until 1773 had been guilty of
wilful neglect of his duties after 1773? Was his bankruptcy, of which
the Parlement's record leaves little doubt, in fact a fraudulent one?
Had Edme-Louis Bronod been dishonest, after all? 75

So far as it can be reconstructed, the situation after the accusa-
tion against Bronod had been made was the following. In the summer of
1781, men called Bronod's bankruptcy "fraudulent". But thereafter, they
failed to bring the charge to the proper authorities and no legal pro-
ceedings against Bronod took place in the Grand Criminel of the Châtelet,
where they should have taken place if initiated by the proper authority
or authorities. 76 Nor did the Parlement take any serious steps after
the summer of 1781 to investigate the details of the latter years of
Bronod's administration. 77 In fact, there was no serious investiga-
tion of Bronod's affairs during the old régime. This is the more
surprising since, only two years after his death, Lamoignon, avowedly
acting in the public interest, attempted to initiate an investigation
into the conduct and work of the commissioners named on 6 August
1762. 78 In view of Bronod's very close association with the commissioners,
particularly at the time when de l'Averdy had been preparing the compte
rendu on Jesuit property in Paris, it is surprising that he escaped
mention in Lamoignon's charge. It seems highly improbable that he
could have done so if either the Parlement or the Châtelet had discovered
any proof that he had been a dishonest administrator. It would seem
that Bronod's contemporaries and his would-be judges accepted the fact
of his bankruptcy but, despite their initial accusations, ceased very
soon to regard it as fraudulent.

A decade later, the Revolutionaries, probably using the papers
pertaining to the Jesuit affair which had come into Lambert's hands at the time of Bronod's death, they investigated Bronod's administration. They found that the amount of money which Bronod actually owed to the Union of Creditors or to anyone else was so small that it hardly mattered. Nearly two hundred years later it seems impossible to know for certain whether Bronod was deceitful or not, or whether he was an incompetent administrator. But it certainly is true that the system under which Bronod had worked successfully in the 1760's and early 1770's ceased to exist in the confusing time 1773 to 1781.

Until 1771, the Parlement oversaw Bronod's affairs with considerable care. After that, the situation changed. The Parlement and the crown ceased to supervise the affairs of the colleges and the Parlement also apparently ceased to give any directions to its Econome Séquestre. If Bronod had not happened to die bankrupt, and if officials from the Châtelet had not placed seals on his property, we might have no knowledge of him or his successor after 1773. As it is, we have almost none. We can only assume that this is because the Parlement neglected them both in order, after its exile of 1771 to 1773, to engage in its last struggle against the crown.

Despite the ingloriousness of the last act of the drama, it would be quite wrong to assume that the Parlement's men had been ineffectual or that the entire system of économies séquestres had been mistakenly conceived or used. It is more accurate to regard the history of the Parlement's servants described in this chapter as a brief one-act play than as a full three-act one. Although there was an Econome Séquestre of Paris until 1781, certainly, and possibly even until the Revolution, the work of the économies séquestres everywhere was virtually over by the end of the first five years of their existence. The whole history, or the whole play, may be encompassed by the first five years,
when the volume of the business Bronod transacted was well over one million livres and perhaps as much as two million livres and there was an économie séquestre in each of forty or forty-five bailiages and sénéchaussées of the jurisdiction of the Parlement. Then the system worked. Even when the Parlement each month ordered Bronod to send from 2,000 to 10,000 livres to the provincial économies séquestres to enable them to pay new masters' salaries or other expenses, Bronod still headed an enterprise which was entirely self-sufficient. After the provincial économies séquestres were abolished, Bronod's work was mainly a holding operation. By the end of the first decade, most of the provincial économies séquestres had long since been dismissed, and the volume of Bronod's business was pitifully small compared with what it had been ten years earlier. The surprising thing may not have been that Bronod was bankrupt in 1781, but that his administration was still self-sufficient as late as 1773.

There was a darker side to this comparative success. The legislation of April and August 1762 laying down the functions of the économies séquestres had suggested that they should serve the interests of the colleges, creditors, and former Jesuits. Yet the Parlement's use of économies séquestres in the provinces and of the Econome Séquestre in Paris had demonstrated its tendency to concentrate its attention on maintaining former Jesuit colleges under the direction of local officials and had not suggested that the Parlement had any comparable intentions of satisfying the creditors or providing for the former Jesuits. Most of the économies séquestres held former Jesuit property until it could be taken over by the new bureaux of administration. Bronod's functions were more complex but not markedly different. He did make some payments to creditors and to Jesuits. But the volume of the business which he transacted in the colleges' interest was always
far greater than any other kind. In the next two chapters we shall study how the claims of the creditors and the Jesuits were met. We shall also consider whether these two parties suffered because of the Parlement's paramount concern for the colleges.
Chapter V  The Union of Creditors

I  The Union

When the Jesuits failed to pay the debts for which the arrêt of 8 May 1761 held them responsible, the Lioncy brothers and Gouffre asked permission from the Parlement of Paris for all the creditors of the Jesuits to form a union. They asked explicitly that all the creditors might become "a single body of united creditors [entitled] to name syndics to whom it would be given the power to act in the name of all the creditors through one and the same procureur on the advice of the counsels of the union, and [who would] carry out all the pursuits, procedures, constraints and seizures necessary for the common advantage of all the creditors". In making this request, the creditors were behaving in a time-honoured way. It was normal in the eighteenth century to form a union when there were many creditors of a single person or society. Such a union was expected to keep legal costs to a minimum and see to it that all legitimate creditors were justly repaid.

Rumours that the religious had been secretly disposing of their movable property had prompted the creditors to make this request and also apparently persuaded the court to grant it. On 23 April 1762, the Parlement therefore ordered all the creditors of the Jesuits to appear before the Abbé Terray to present their claims and form a union. By 8 May 1762, the day on which the original creditors' claims fell due and went unpaid, forty-seven people or firms with forty-six separate claims had done as required, and others joined on 14 and 15 May. By 19 May they had selected the officers of the Union
who would act on everyone's behalf, and the Parlement had approved their actions.\textsuperscript{6}

In this way, some of the men with the largest claims against the Jesuits became syndics and directors. The first and most important was Jacques-François Lioncy, a partner in the commercial house of Marseille which had financed many of Lavalette's exploits and had gone bankrupt in 1756.\textsuperscript{7} The other original syndics were Antoine Lefevre de Givry, a former Intendant of Martinique; Jacques Arnault Trochereau de la Berlière, once an écrivain principal of the Marine; Jacques Cazotte, once controlleur of the Windward Islands in the service of the Marine and for a long time a resident of Martinique; Pierre Famin, a négociant in Paris; and Jacques-Sébastien Prépaud, a fermier du roi.\textsuperscript{8} All but one of these men had either lent money to the Jesuits of Martinique or, in the case of Cazotte, had sold property to the Jesuits of that colony, and never been repaid.\textsuperscript{9} The members of the Union decided to keep Lacourse, Rouhette, and Gerbier, the lawyers who had already acted on the Lioncys' and the Veuve Grou's behalf, as their chief pleaders and legal counsels. Lambert, a lawyer in the Parlement of Paris, became the Procureur empowered to represent the Union in that court, and Morisse of the Châtelet became the Notaire Séquestre charged with handling the money belonging to the Union.\textsuperscript{10}

The membership of the Union grew until it included virtually all the creditors of the French Jesuits except those who claimed money from particular institutions in Flanders, Franche-Comté, and Lorraine. By 1772 there were more than 1,500 members.\textsuperscript{11} But despite the Union's increase in size, the directorate or syndicate changed very little over the years. In March 1763, when it was determining how the syndics should dispose of the property to which the Union was entitled, the Parlement named Nicolas-François Ponchon from its own ranks to be the
Curateur of Jesuit property who would carry out the sales at the bar of the court on behalf of the Union. Then, after the lettres patentes of 14 June 1763 had explained the relationship between the Union of Creditors and creditors in other parts of the kingdom and the colonies, the court instructed the Union to appoint three more syndics to be concerned with colonial affairs.

Claude Levacher, a Paris banker; and Jean-Jacques Tiran, formerly an écrivain of the Marine at Sainte-Lucie, who were both creditors of Lavalette, were added to the list of syndics in 1765 and 1766, perhaps as two of the additional members required by the court. By the 1770's, the syndics included at least three more Paris bankers who had lent money to Lavalette. They were Jean-François Batebedat, Vandenyvert, and Tassin. André Dejean, a counsellier du roi; Jean-Baptiste Chol, a négociant of Paris and creditor of Lavalette; Provost; and Morel were also described as syndics in 1772. We assume that these men replaced some of the earlier syndics or were the additional members required by the Parlement after 1763. By 1790, the only remaining syndics whom we know of were de la Rivière, Theaulon, and Grassin. De la Rivière had been governor of Martinique during Lavalette's last years there and was also his creditor. If the majority of syndics over the years had anything in common, it was that they were creditors of Antoine Lavalette.

There were some changes in other offices. Doillot replaced Morisse at some time between October 1763 and September 1764 and remained Notaire Séquestre until the Revolutionaries deprived him of his functions. Ponchon was replaced by Gabriel Hélo in June 1768 and Hélo by Raymond Bouclier in January 1776. Bouclier remained Curateur until at least 1781 and perhaps until the Revolution.
Rouhette remained the Union's counsel until at least 1790 and was apparently helped by Target and Carré after 1768, though we do not know for how long or if they replaced his earlier associates. He was to be the most frequent spokesman for the syndics until 1790. Lambert remained Procureur of the Union and acted on its behalf in the court until the Revolution put an end to the Parlement of Paris. After that he continued to work for the Union under the Revolutionaries.

All the recognized creditors of the Jesuits were permitted to assemble at a general meeting of the Union whenever the syndics had important business to present. The first meeting was held on 19 May 1762, and we do not know whether any other general meeting was held before the one on 13 August 1772 at which the syndics presented the Ordre Général or list of all the creditors who had presented claims to them. Most of the day-to-day business of the Union was conducted by the directorate which at first met once a week. Soon, however, as a result of the lettres patentes issued in the summer of 1763, the Union's affairs became much more complicated. By this legislation the crown instructed other parlements to establish their own syndics who would carry out confiscations and sales in their own jurisdictions, list the creditors of individual institutions in their domain, send the list to Paris, and, on the order of the syndicate in Paris, repay the creditors whose names they had listed. At the same time, the crown allowed the officials of the Union in Paris to confiscate and sell colonial property and to try to satisfy the creditors in the colonies. In the circumstances, it is not surprising that by the end of August 1763, the Parlement ordered the syndics and directors in Paris to hold a second meeting each week. The first meeting would henceforth deal with the Union's affairs in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris and the second with its affairs in other regions.
of France and the colonies. It is not clear for how long these bi-weekly meetings continued to be held.

All the expenses of the Union were to be paid from its caisse of money gained from confiscated Jesuit property. The officers of the Union were accountable for all aspects of their work to the Parlement of Paris, and sometimes this meant to the commissioners appointed on 6 August 1762. When the Union became involved in colonial affairs, the king intervened to send some of the discussions involving the colonies to the royal council and from there to the Commission of the Economats, which already judged the Econome Général's affairs. But it was the syndics of the Union who carried out the work of the Union and who, indirectly, represented the interests of all the creditors of the French Jesuits everywhere.
II Disposing of the property

According to the normal practice of the eighteenth century and to Lioncy's request for the formation of the Union, the syndics' work consisted of seizing and selling the property of their debtors and repaying the members of the Union. When the Union was formed in May 1762, the syndics' ability to perform the first task was very limited, however. At the same time as the Parlement had authorized the creation of the Union, it had also created a network of économés séquestres throughout its jurisdiction and had charged them with the responsibility for administering all the former Jesuit property. At the head of this network stood Edme-Louis Bronod, the Parlement's own appointee whom it normally referred to and probably regarded as the Séquestre of all Jesuit property. As long as Bronod lived, there was confusion over the limits of his authority and, his caisse in relation to the authority and caisse of the Union of Creditors. It took months for the Parlement and the crown to decide which property would belong to the Union.

In the meantime, since they might not touch the property held by the Parlement's officials, the syndics had to be content with seizing and disposing of only that property which, for one reason or another, the Parlement's men were not administering. Despite the severe constraint in this way placed on their activities, the syndics began their work not in the colonies, where most of the Jesuits' debts had been contracted and the Parlement had little power, but in France where most of the Jesuits' property lay, and where the Parlement of Paris had great authority. It was only later, when most of the property in France had been placed permanently out of their reach that the syndics turned to the colonial property and expected it to provide money with which to
reimburse the creditors. It will be easier to understand how the syndics disposed of Jesuit property and what they gained from it if we consider their French and colonial activities separately.

The syndics' work in France seems to have begun in July 1762, when the Parlement authorized Jacques-François Lioncy to dispose of a rente of 9,000 livres having a capital of 180,000 livres, which had belonged to the Jesuits and was presently held by a bourgeois of Paris. The court instructed Lioncy to use the money he raised to repay the Jesuits' debt to himself and his brothers and Gouffre, which had been recognized by the Jesuits the year before and had fallen due in May 1762. If there were any money left over, Lioncy was to give it to Bronod. 4

This is the only example of self-interested activity on the part of a syndic which is recorded. It may be regarded as an isolated case and the last one in which the chief syndic acted within the system established after 8 May 1761, when the Jesuits were still trying to repay their creditors. 5 After this incident, Lioncy and the other syndics were always at least to give the appearance of being syndics of the Union and of acting in the interests of all the creditors and not just of themselves. In another way, however, this first incident is not unusual. The report of it is accompanied by minutes which show that, at the same time, the syndics of the Union were being consulted about the disposition of rentes belonging to Jesuit houses. 6 The syndics cannot have appreciated this at the time, but a major part of their future activities was to consist of disposing of rentes once belonging to Jesuits. 7

This was very much in the future in 1762 and early 1763. In this period, the authorities had not yet defined the creditors' rights to
Jesuit property and the creditors still apparently hoped to substantiate their claims to college property. It was at Lioncy's suggestion that in July 1762, all the argenterie, or silver plate, in Jesuit cures and other Jesuit houses was ordered to be sent to the mints to be reclaimed. This was only one way in which the syndics were involved in some of the early aspects of the confiscation.

Their work in some of the border provinces was much more extensive. There, the parlements allowed the syndics to oversee most of the seizures of Jesuit property. The Parlement of Paris, by its arrêt of 23 April 1762, had ordered the seizure of all Jesuit property in its domain, and other parlements had followed its example. Between July and December 1762, then, the syndics carried out this order in Artois, Flanders, and Cambrésis in the west, and in Burgundy and Franche-Comté in the east. In the west, the syndics supervised the seizure of furniture, silver plate, books, and paintings, and the sale of furniture, some silver plate, and other small effects. They arranged to have inventories made of the libraries, though not for their sale, which was postponed until the Parlement had analysed the inventories and destroyed the books which it judged to be pernicious. The syndics also arranged to have the paintings appraised and reclaimed money owed to the Jesuits in rentes and debts. Finally, they paid the fees of the clerks and guardians looking after the unsold property and dismissed these officials when their services were no longer needed. In doing all this, they were helped by two appointees of the Parlement of Paris, the clerk Rose and the notary Thomas, who was the économe séquestre for Arras. It was Thomas who actually received the money that was recovered in the west and it was he who sent it to Bronod in Paris. But it was the syndics of the Union who drew on Bronod's funds to pay the costs of the seizures.
In Burgundy and Franche-Comté, the syndics' activities were very similar, though the main task that we know they performed there was to see that the Jesuits' vineyards were maintained in good order. These operations in the border regions must have been extensive and were, by the syndics' admission, time consuming. But the Parlement approved of them and by August 1763, when the seizures of property in these areas was complete, it had authorized Bronod to pay the syndics 91,000 livres of the 101,000 livres which the syndics had asked for in costs for the seizures they had made in the Low Countries, Burgundy, and Franche-Comté. It is not certain how much money these seizures and sales produced or how much the Union of Creditors ever received from them.

While this had been going on, the Parlement and crown had begun to decide the permanent fate of the various categories of Jesuit property which the économes séquestres were still holding. The Parlement's arrêt of 6 August 1762 instructed the municipal officers and officials of the bailliages and sénéchaussées to make recommendations to the court's commissioners about the future administration of the Jesuit colleges and schools, and told these officers to take possession of the colleges as soon as the Jesuits had carried out the order to leave. It declared most of the movable property within the colleges and their chapels to be college property and announced that the revenue from the benefices attached to the colleges was to be used to pay Jesuit pensions. This revenue would for the moment be administered by the Parlement's économes séquestres. They were also supposed to receive all the money coming from the auction of movable property not required by the colleges or benefices and to send it to the Econome Séquestre of Paris, Bronod. All property necessary for education was to be held by the municipalities,
the college benefices were to produce money for Jesuit pensions, and all movable property not required to make education possible was to be sold and the proceeds sent to Bronod, who was instructed to hold the money for the creditors. All this would take place under the general authority of the court and the direct supervision of its appointees. The creditors were to formulate their demands and present them to the court.  

We may assume that they did this, for on 2 February 1763, the king acted on the Union's request and issued lettres patentes authorizing the sale, in the interests of the creditors, of all real and movable Jesuit property not specifically attached to the colleges. The method of sale was to be by public auction to the highest bidder after three prior announcements that the sale was to take place. This time the court ordered that the money raised by such sales was to go to the Notaire Séquestre of the Union of Creditors. The means of sale were slightly modified by the lettres patentes of 5 March and it was this legislation which authorized the nomination of a Curateur of Jesuit property to carry out the final aspects of the sale in the court.

Then, on 14 June 1763, the crown announced in another set of lettres patentes that the creditors might henceforth make no claims at all to property constituting or attached to colleges, schools, seminaries, or other establishments in France formerly run by the Jesuits and dedicated to the education of youth, and presumably including the missions in France. It repeated the provisions of the earlier legislation and reminded the creditors that they had no right to Jesuit benefices or to the movable property such as sacred vessels, linens, church ornaments, and libraries in the colleges. But all
other former Jesuit property in France was now to belong to the creditors. 19

At the same time, the crown made provision for the provincial creditors living outside the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. The other parlements were now encouraged to create syndics who would be responsible for drawing up lists of the creditors in the provinces and for repaying them as much as possible from the sale of the provincial property which had been the obvious security for their loans in the first place. The existence of these provincial syndics would restrict the geographical area of the Paris syndics' activities, though not their authority, because the provincial officials would take their orders from the Paris directorate of the Union of Creditors as well as from their own parlements. The legislation did not apply to Flanders, Franche-Comté, or Lorraine, where local parlements or sovereign councils were to repay recognized creditors. 20

The result of the lettres patentes of 2 February and 14 June 1763, was thus to oblige the syndics of the Union to restrict their activities in continental France to the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. This meant that they began to work in the same small geographical area as Bronod and would have to cooperate with him and the network of clerks and appraisers which the Parlement had already established and which functioned most obviously in the Ile de France. 21 They would also find their activities limited by the rights and activities of the Econome Général du Clergé and the bureaux of administration of the former Jesuit colleges. 22 At the same time, the officers of the Union would have an expanded part to play. Although most of the Union's activities still had to be approved by the Parlement, its Notaire Séquestre was entitled after February to receive money coming from the sale of Jesuit property assigned to the
creditors. And he might use that money to pay the Union's expenses and to repay the creditors.23

After 2 February, the officials of the Union proceeded on the assumption that they might claim for the Union all the former Jesuit property not specifically denied them.24 In Paris their task was made easier by the crown's refusal in January 1763 to lay claim to any of the former Jesuit property in that city.25 It was thus very clear after 2 February that the creditors had every right to the noviciate of the rue Pot-de-Fer with its attached retreat house, and to the professed house of the rue Saint Antoine, as well as to all the real and movable property attached to these institutions.26 But it took several months, even with the aid of the comptes rendus presented by the Parlement's commissioners on 25 February and 15 June,27 to determine precisely what property in addition to the actual buildings and grounds of the noviciate and professed house the creditors might claim and sell. Bronod's men had already sold a lot of the movable property of both houses but it is not certain how much money these sales produced or how much of the money they produced ever reached the Notaire Séquestre of the Union. It is possible that he eventually received a great deal of it.28

In March 1763, the court recognized that the creditors were entitled to the Jesuits' real property at Gentilly, Montrouge, Montlouis, Charonne, and Belleville, all of which was country property held by the Jesuits of Paris. On the syndics' request, it allowed them to advertise the sale of this property.29 Then, at the beginning of August, it granted a request of J.-F. Lioncy and ordered the sale, at the bar of the court, of the private houses in Paris and other country property which had belonged to the Paris Jesuits. The list of property
now offered for sale was long. The noviciate itself headed the list and it was followed by twenty-seven private houses in Paris, of which at least fourteen had been directly dependent on the noviciate and a further seven or more had had some connection with the professed house. After the houses, were listed gardens, courts and places, and fields and other productive land in the country. A few days after this list was published, the Curateur of Jesuit property, Ponchon, and other officials of the court began in earnest to sell the real property at Gentilly, Montrouge, and Montlouis.

The method they used was the prescribed one. Once the court had made the decision to allow the sale of the property and had specified that that sale should take place according to the methods enunciated in the royal legislation of 2 February and 14 June, its officials placed fiches in public places, and especially in church entrances. The fiches announced the date of the auction and the minimum price for which each piece of property could be sold, a price determined by the findings of the commissioners of the court and Bronod's appraisers. The sale itself took place at the bar of the court on the appointed day under the authority of the Curateur of Jesuit property, and in the presence of various substitutes of the Procureur Général and various conseillers rapporteurs appointed by the court. Bidding was done by procureurs of the court who concealed the identity of the real bidder until after the last and highest bid had been placed.

The sale of most, if not all, the country property in question occurred in August and September 1763. The house and lands at Montlouis were sold for 63,000 livres to J.-B. Grastin, a bourgeois of Paris. The house and lands at Montrouge went, for 25,000 livres, to Ducornet,
a member of the royal administration, although Trepagne, who had represented Ducornet in the court, immediately disclosed that he would himself take seventeen pièces of the property and pay 2,988 livres 10 sous of the 25,000 livres. The house and lands at Gentilly and a farm at Bauges which was "dependent on Montlouis" and may have been the property at Belleveille referred to in the legislation of March 1763, went to Duchaffon, a négociant of Paris for 77,000 and 19,000 livres. The total selling price of the four pieces of property was thus 184,000 livres.

It is not clear how much, if any, of the price of the property was paid in August and September 1763, though it is probable that the terms of payment were those laid down by the lettres patentes of 5 March 1763: half payment within a week and half payment after the décret volontaire had been sealed. We know for certain that in October Ducornet and Trepagne paid half of the 25,000 livres they owed and that they paid this money to the Notaire Séquestre of the creditors, Morisse. The full 184,000 livres was probably paid, but we do not know how soon or whether the Union received it all. The property in Paris which was listed for sale at the same time was not all sold until 1769.

In the meantime, it had become apparent that the relations between the creditors and other administrators holding Jesuit property had not been completely settled by the lettres patentes of 14 June. While the creditors' rights to the Jesuits' non-educational property were being recognized by the crown, and the creditors had been proceeding with the sales described above, the new bureaux of administration of the colleges which had been set up since February 1763 had begun to extend their claims to the property legally assigned to the creditors.
The members of the bureaux now argued that the Jesuits had misused the money given to them for education and specifically for the upkeep of the colleges and had often spent it on themselves. It was with money intended for education that the Jesuits had acquired their country property and the movable property not now regarded as essential for education, the bureaux maintained. In return, the creditors argued that the Jesuits had often attached to the colleges property which was really not necessary for education. Not surprisingly, then, legal struggles between the college administrators and the creditors had begun to develop.  

Such disputes did not last long. On 21 November 1763, the crown issued lettres patentes to which the creditors subsequently attached a great deal of importance because from this time on the creditors could make claims against only a tiny portion of the Jesuits' continental holdings and their hope of ever being completely repaid became consequently dimmer. According to the legislation, all property belonging to or connected to the colleges, whether essential for education or not, and whether movable or real property, was henceforth to belong to the colleges and not to the creditors. In return for the clearly established ownership of all college property, the college administrators would be required under certain circumstances and at certain times in the future, to make cash payments to the Union of Creditors. These payments would fall due only if the sale of all other property to which the creditors were now entitled should fail to produce enough money to acquit the Jesuits' debts. The maximum amount each administration could be assessed depended upon the college's supposed ability to pay. Thus, the College of Louis-le-Grand might
be required to pay the creditors up to 300,000 livres, the Colleges of La Trinité and Notre-Dame of Lyon might together have to pay up to 250,000 livres, and those of La Flèche and Reims up to 100,000 livres and 40,000 livres respectively. All the other colleges might be asked to pay up to an amount equivalent to one year's total revenue. In the case of the last group of colleges, the parlements within whose jurisdictions the colleges lay were to determine the precise amounts they should pay. Such payments would fall due only after the Ordre Général of the creditors had been completed and all the money raised from the sale of other Jesuit property had been distributed to the creditors. If there were then still some unpaid creditors, the bureaux of administration would make the assessed payments over a six year period and stop their payments if the creditors were all repaid before this source of money was exhausted.42

On the same day as the crown issued the legislation we have just described, it also issued other lettres patentes which placed the Union of Creditors under new and more immediate obligations to the colleges. Perhaps because of the creditors' success in disposing of the country property attached to the Paris establishments, the crown now ordered the Séquestre of the Union to lend up to 150,000 livres to the Econome Général du Clergé, who was still administering the benefices attached to the colleges, but who was expected to turn them over to the colleges in 1765 or 1766. The Econome Général was supposed to use the money to pay for urgent and costly repairs to those benefices which could not be repaired from the ten percent of the annual revenue allowed for these purposes43 and whose value would be enhanced when the repairs were made. Subsequently, the bureaux of administration were to reimburse the Econome Général from the money
paid to the colleges in higher leases on the benefices, and he was to reimburse the creditors. As a result, between 1763 and 1770, the Union did lend more than half the 150,000 livres for these purposes to Marchal de Sainscy.

Even then, relations between the college administrators and the creditors had not been completely settled. Four months later, the crown issued lettre patentes interpreting those of 21 November 1763. Given at the request of the creditors, who wanted the matter cleared up, the lettres patentes of 30 March 1764 decided the ownership of the feudal obligations or money that would have been paid to the Jesuits if they had remained in their colleges and of the money produced by the sale of movable property once attached to the colleges. The present legislation ordered that all feudal dues and leases—the cens et rentes, lods et ventes, fermages, and rents—owed to the colleges after 21 November 1763 and any payments for movable college property which were still outstanding on that date should belong to the colleges. But the colleges might not take back any of the same kind of payments made to the creditors before 21 November. This meant, in short, that the creditors would continue to control or sell the college property judged to them before this date and that the money raised from the sale of such college property before 21 November 1763, and even before their own Notaire Séquestre had the power to administer the Union's funds, remained the property of the Union of Creditors. It was, Bronod who held the money in question, and he would continue to keep it for the creditors.

The practical implications of the new legislation become clear when we remember that in 1762 to 1763, Bronod had sometimes been required to lend money to the municipal authorities so that they could
pay the new teachers in their colleges. The money he had used for this purpose had apparently been money raised by the sale of non-essential movable college property, or money intended eventually for the creditors. What the legislation of 21 November 1763 and 30 March 1764 now did was to confirm the creditors' rights to this money and make the colleges which had received such loans from Bronod the debtors of the Union of Creditors. We do not know whether any of the colleges ever repaid the Union, but many of them did repay Bronod. Even as late as 1772, he was still receiving such payments from colleges. This was only part of the money which the Union was later to reclaim from him.

The relationship between the colleges and the creditors was further complicated by the last clauses in the lettres patentes of 30 March which stated that the Union of Creditors was entitled to the money due to be paid to the colleges as scholarships or pensions for students but that, in return, the Union was to repay the colleges the money which college administrators had already given the Jesuits as subsistence and travel allowances. The way in which the creditors were to repay the colleges was complicated. The college administrators were to claim reimbursement for such payments from the official described as the Séquestre Général des Biens de la Société, by whom the crown undoubtedly meant Bronod. We know that he did make such payments, and these payments, like the loans he had previously made to the municipalities for the salaries of new teachers seem to have come from the money in his caisse which belonged to the creditors.

In December 1764, the crown or the Parlement decided to except one category of creditor from the provisions of the royal legislation of 1763 and early 1764. After this time, anyone who had financed the
upkeep or improvement of college property ceased to be a liability of the Union of Creditors, though he probably did not cease to be a member. These creditors were henceforth to be repaid not by the Union but by the bureaux of administration of the colleges. The Ordre Général of 1772 would list such creditors separately.52

The legislation of 21 November 1763 and 30 March 1764 had not been intended for the border regions of France, but the principles it contained were extended to them in 1765 to 1769. In those years, the administrators of the colleges of Franche-Comté, Flanders, Lorraine, and Bar, and the Comté of Venaissin received control over all the movable and real property which had belonged to the Jesuits of their jurisdictions. In return they assumed the responsibility for repaying the creditors of their jurisdictions. They also might one day have to pay large sums to the Union if the Union's funds were not enough. The colleges of Flanders might have to pay up to 72,000 livres, the colleges of Franche-Comté up to 40,000 livres, and those of Lorraine and Bar up to 50,000 livres to the Union. But as it turned out, this part of the legislation was less important than the part which gave the parlements of these areas final authority over the repayment of the Jesuits' creditors in their jurisdictions. In Venaissin, the situation was a little different, and the syndics of the Union could expect to receive 100,000 livres when the noviciate of Avignon was sold. The rest of the money from that sale was to be used by the syndics of the Parlement of Aix to repay the Jesuits' creditors in Avignon and Carpentras.53

Thus, in a complicated way, the disputes between the bureaux of administration of the colleges and the Union of Creditors were averted in theory and apparently in practice, too.54 The creditors assumed
relatively small immediate obligations to the colleges, while the
colleges, in return, might one day have to pay large sums of money to
the creditors. The Union of Creditors had absolutely no rights to
college property, and in the exceptional case of Flanders, Franche-
Comté, and Lorraine, would take no part in repaying the Jesuits' creditors in these regions. Elsewhere, the Union's rights were more limited than they had been before 21 November 1763. They were also more clearly defined, a fact which might have simplified the syndics' job of disposing of Jesuit property.

While the Union's relations with the colleges of most of France were being defined in 1763 to 1764, the syndics were finding it difficult to dispose of some of the property to which they clearly were entitled. This property consisted of rentes belonging to or normally paid to former Jesuits living in institutions which the creditors might now take. The matter had first been brought to the Parlement's attention by Bronod, and the Parlement had passed legislation in August 1763 which permitted him to compel Jesuit sympathizers holding Jesuit rentes to hand them over to him, threatened a heavy fine for people who failed to hand over such rentes, and promised a reward to anyone providing information leading to the recovery of such property. 55

The question became more specific when, on 10 March 1764, the crown authorized Lioncy and the other syndics, who had not yet succeeded in selling the small houses attached to the noviciate and professed house, to try to sell the buildings and grounds making up the professed house itself. At the same time, it instructed them to sell all the rentes in any way attached to the noviciate, retreat house, and professed house. 56 The total revenue from these rentes, which were drawn
on money invested for the missions, had been reckoned by the commissioners of the court at 300,000 livres, and, that being so, the capital involved may have been as much as 6,000,000 livres. The syndics found it difficult to dispose of these rentes, and probably of others handed over to them by Bronod, however.

It was for this reason that the crown issued the lettres patentes of 29 May 1764, by which it recognized that the various methods of sale prescribed in the laws of 2 February, 5 March, and 14 June 1763 were inadequate for disposing of the rentes drawn on the aides and gabelles, tailles, clergy, towns, pays d'états, provinces, or individuals, which had belonged to the Jesuits and were now in the creditors' hands. It allowed the syndics of the Union to reconstruct or reconstitute the rentes which they held in the most advantageous way possible, and then to sell them by the simplest means available, according to the custom of the area. The syndics were apparently successful in this work, and by 21 August 1765, the Union had received at least 1,700,000 livres, and perhaps more, from the sale of rentes.

Rentes were not the only property which the syndics succeeded in selling after the long period of legislation in 1763 to 1764. They also proceeded with the sale of the real property, and principally the twenty-seven houses in Paris connected to the noviciate or professed house, which they had been given permission to sell at the same time as the Paris country property. They used the same method of sale as in the case of the property at Gentilly, Montlouis, and Montrouge. Ponchon oversaw the sale at the bar of the court, and the property went to the person for whom the highest bid had been laid. Apparently the buyer paid half of the cost within a week of the sale and the rest later. By 1769, the sale of the small houses in Paris had produced
625,900 livres. By the same year, the creditors had also received 89,876 livres from the sale of movable property in the professed house and novic peace and a further 400,000 livres from unexplained private sales and reimbursements. By 13 August 1772, the creditors had received a further 200,000 livres in arrears paid on rentes or from the sale of rentes held by the Union. Hence, by the end of the first decade of their involvement in the confiscation, the officers of the Union of Creditors had received a total of at least 3,379,776 livres, most of which had come from the sale of property connected to the professed house and noviciate of Paris.

They had not succeeded in selling either of these two buildings or the land on which they were built, however. The syndics' initial attempts to sell these establishments had been so unsuccessful that by September 1764, they had gained permission from the Parlement either to sell both buildings as they stood or to have them demolished and sold for the materials of which they had been built. But even this did not work. After four more years, the city of Paris agreed to buy the noviciate for the seminary of Saint-Sulpice for 400,000 livres and the crown to buy the professed house for a complicated project involving the Augustin canons regular for another 400,000 livres. The crown had also agreed to see that the creditors received a further 25,000 livres for the reliquary containing a cotte of Saint Louis in the church of the professed house. In the end, the only money the Union of Creditors ever got from all these transactions was the 10,000 livres which had been the down payment on the reliquary.

Against the crown, the syndics had no right to compel payment. They could not reclaim the buildings of the professed house because, at some time after 1768, the crown sold them. The creditors did apparently
appeal to the Controller General of Finances, but without any success. As for the noviciate, the city of Paris failed to pay any of the agreed price and, by the *lettres patentes* of November 1779 the syndics gained the right to repossess the building. The opposition of the *curé* of Saint-Sulpice delayed the repossession and any attempt at resale until September 1789. Hence, by the time of the Revolution, the creditors had received no money from the sale of either of the two major Parisian establishments to which they were entitled.

Elsewhere in the jurisdiction of the *Parlement* of Paris, the syndics had similar problems in carrying out the sale of Jesuit property. The other major establishments to which they had substantiated their claim were the noviciate of Lyon and the two residences of Guéret and Pontoise. On 7 September 1764, the court had authorized Lioncy and the other syndics to sell all the movable property belonging to the noviciate, and, on 31 August 1769, it authorized them to take possession of all the real property that made up the noviciate of Lyon. At the same time, it ordered the local *économe séquestre* to hand over to the *Notaire Séquestre* of the creditors all the money he had received from the noviciate.

As we would expect, the list of the property of Lyon now officially in the Union's hands began with the noviciate building, known as Saint Joseph's house, the lands surrounding it, and the retreat house. It also included at least two small houses in Lyon rented to private persons and two *domaines* made up of pasture, arable land, woodlots, vineyards, meadows, gardens, and windmills. But although the legislation of 1769 authorized the creditors to take possession of all this property, it forbade them to interfere with the prisoners of Lyon who, since June 1764, had been quartered in the noviciate itself. The *arrêt* of August
1769 also allowed the syndics to study the titles to various rentes belonging to the two colleges of the city of Lyon to see whether any of them should rightfully have belonged to the creditors. By 1773, the syndics had successfully sold the movable property and some of the attached real property of the noviciate for 102,117 livres. On 22 July 1775, the prisoners having apparently been transferred to another place, the creditors sold the buildings and the grounds of the noviciate for 224,000 livres, which were promptly paid.

The creditors were less fortunate in their attempts to sell the residences. It has been impossible to trace the fate of the residence at Pontoise in the papers of the Parlement, but it is certain that the court considered some of the problems pertaining to the sale of its movable property in March and April 1763. When Rolland gave his compte rendu of the property at Pontoise in May of that year, he presented the views of the municipal officers and argued that the Cardinal de Joyeuse had originally endowed the residence for the public welfare and that the creditors could make no claims against it. In 1783, however, he stated that it had become the property of the creditors by the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 and that the Parlement judged it to be the property of the Duke of Orléans by an arrêt of July 1770. After that, the library of this residence was transferred to the noviciate of Paris where it was apparently sold by auction in September 1772. The buildings and grounds of the residence were then sold by auction in December 1778. We do not know whether the money raised by the sale of the library was included in the 400,000 livres which the creditors received from "private sales and reimbursements" by the end of 1772, or what became of the money raised by the auction of the residence. The syndics were silent about this property
in their own accounts, which probably means that they received payment for it. 76

The officers of the Union were not so silent about the property at Guéret, however. In 1790 they complained about what had happened there. According to Rouhette's report, the residence of Guéret was legally theirs after the publication of the lettres patentes of February and November 1763, and they formally gained possession of all its movable and landed property in May 1772. In 1784, the Parlement gave them permission to have it sold at the bar of the court in the usual way. After that, the syndics were unable to gain the cooperation of the séquestre appointed by the sénéchaussée of Guéret and they never received any money from his sale of movable property or from the repayment of debts to the Jesuits of that town. Even in mid-1790, the municipality of Guéret remained in possession of the residence despite an arrêt of the Parlement passed in July of that year which ordered the former to give it up. 77

In the meantime, the death of Bronod in 1781 had meant that the syndics of the Union had become part of another union of creditors, the Union of the Creditors of Edme-Louis Bronod. As we have already seen, Bronod's affairs had always been inextricably mixed up with the Union of Creditors', and its with his. It is not certain how much money or how many contracts he handed over to them in his lifetime, although at some time after 1773 he had given the Union some of the money rightfully belonging to it. On Bronod's death, Rouhette made a request for the reimbursement of 166,000 livres derived from rentes which Bronod had been administering for the Union. As a result, the Union probably received at least 76,000 livres and some contracts of an undetermined value from Bronod's estate. 78 This was not the end of the story of
Bronod's relations with the creditors: only the Revolution was to put an end to that.

The Union's affairs extended to all parts of France except Lorraine and Bar, Flanders, and Franche-Comté. Outside the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris its business was conducted by the syndicates appointed by the other parlements or sovereign councils to confiscate and administer Jesuit property. In general, the provincial syndicates were responsible to their own parlement or council, to the officials of the Union in Paris, and, as it turned out in the end, even to the commission of the Economats. Their work for the Union consisted of selling the Jesuit property to which the creditors were entitled, submitting their lists of creditors to Paris, gaining the approval of the officials there, and, finally, distributing the proceeds from these sales to the creditors of their regions. If they had any money left over, they were to send it to the Union's officials in Paris.

There was no Jesuit property to be sold for the creditors in the jurisdictions of the Parlements of Grenoble, Pau, Metz, or the Superior Council of Perpignan. The Parlement of Toulouse had used the money coming from its Jesuit property to pay Jesuit pensions and allowances in 1762. It does not appear to have sent any money to the Séquestre in Paris, despite the Commission of the Economats' order of 1783 instructing the syndic of Toulouse, de la Porte, to send his remaining 8,850 livres to Doillot. The local syndic of Aix, Ferrand, was ordered by the same commission in the same year to send 8,013 livres to Doillot, but he apparently used it for other purposes, such as repaying the creditors of Provence. The syndicate of Aix apparently raised between 150,000 and 300,000 livres but did not send any of this money to Paris.
In contrast, the syndics of Brittany turned over 218,942 livres to Doillot and apparently paid between 100,000 and 150,000 livres to their own provincial creditors as well. The syndicate of Dijon received 61,500 livres from the sale of Jesuit property at Ornex and a further 40,000 livres in cash and contracts of rentes on the Etats de Bourgogne. We do not know if they turned this money over to the syndics in Paris or used it to repay the creditors of Burgundy. In 1783 the Commission of the Economats ordered Mathieu, the syndic of Dijon, to turn over 10,239 livres to Doillot, and it is possible that he did so.

In Bordeaux the sale of Jesuit property and the collection of money owed to the Jesuits produced about 400,000 livres. Of this, the Commission ordered Castera, the syndic of that city, to send 64,978 livres to Doillot. It issued that order in 1783, and by 1790 the syndics of Paris had received 66,808 livres from this source. The rest of the money was used to repay creditors in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Bordeaux.

The syndics of Normandy were still disposing of Jesuit property in 1790, but up to that time they had sent 74,000 livres to Paris, and probably repaid most of their creditors as well. The 74,000 livres probably included the 39,577 livres which the Commission had told the séquestre Le Breton to send to Doillot in 1783. To avoid ever having to pay the money assessed them by the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763, the colleges of Alsace had sent 59,268 livres to Doillot in 1774. We do not know if the Union received the 100,000 livres from the sale of the noviciate in Avignon, but it probably did.

Assuming that the money raised in Burgundy remained there and that the syndics in Paris did receive the 100,000 livres from the sale of the property in Avignon, the Union's Séquestre in Paris received
519,018 livres from the provincial syndics. If we add this amount and the other amounts of money produced by the sales and transactions which took place in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, we find that by 1790 the Union's Séquestre in Paris had received a total of at least 4,310,911 livres from transactions in France. If we add to this total the amounts of money raised by the provincial syndicates but spent on repaying creditors in the provinces, we find that the Union received a total of at least 4,995,603 livres in cash and contracts from the sale of Jesuit property in France.

For a variety of reasons this total appears to be too small. We have not accounted for certain payments which, in addition to the ones we have examined, must have reached the Union. Part of the Union's caisse had for so long been controlled by Bronod that it is impossible to know how much money the creditors received from the early confiscations and sales, how many of the contracts of rentes held by Bronod even as late as 1773 reached the Union, or how much of the money which Bronod had lent to the colleges came back to the syndics. It is doubtful that the money Rouhette claimed on Bronod's death in 1781 was all that the Union ever received from that source.

Nor have we considered the interest which must have fallen due and in at least some cases must have been paid by the buyers of real property on the unpaid balances of their accounts. Perhaps most important of all, our list of sales in France is probably incomplete. We do not know how much money the sale of the house at Pontoise produced, or what happened to the rentes administered by the professed house but not accounted for in this description of the sale of Jesuit property.

It is with the realization that this list of sales and receipts
is not complete that we should consider what the officials of the Union said about this subject. Apparently none of them ever made a complete statement. Rouhette’s report of 1790, which has been the source of most of our information about the money and contracts that the Union received, does suggest that our total may be nearly a million livres too little. It is probable that the Union’s Notaire Séquestre in Paris, instead of receiving the minimum of 4,310,911 livres just cited actually received nearly 5,500,000 livres from French sales by 1790.

It would seem that the estimate that a further 700,000 livres was raised and spent on behalf of the Union in the provinces is as complete as possible. The Union of Creditors therefore appears to have had control over six million livres in cash and contracts coming from the seizures and sale of Jesuit property in France by 1790.

So far we have considered how the syndics of the Union disposed of Jesuit property in France. We have witnessed their limited success in raising money from the sale of rentes, furnishings, ornaments, and some of the real property which the Jesuits of France had owned. We have observed that the syndics also received payments from the Econome Séquestre of the Parlement of Paris, syndics in the provinces, and perhaps even indirectly from some of the colleges. We know that the Union was obliged to lend or give money to the Econome Général du Clergé and the colleges. Finally, we know that almost all the syndics' continental affairs took place under the strict surveillance of the Parlement of Paris.

The Jesuit property in France was not, however, the syndics' only concern. The original creditors had lent money to the Jesuits in the West Indies and when the arrêt of 6 August 1762 placed the principal Jesuit property in France, the colleges, beyond their reach, the syndics
naturally turned to the Jesuits' colonial property and expected it to provide the money for their repayment. Some apparently expected to gain more money from the colonies than from France. In making claims to the colonial property, the syndics of the Union remained for the time being under the authority of the Parlement of Paris. The Jesuits in the colonies had had to give account to men living in Paris or La Flèche, so the Parlement naturally regarded the property in the colonies as part of its own jurisdiction.

The Union does not seem to have become seriously involved in colonial affairs until after the crown had defined the creditors' rights to Jesuit property in the colonies. On 3 June 1763, the crown issued lettres patentes drawing a distinction between the kinds of Jesuit property in the colonies which maintained and extended the distinction drawn by the lettres patentes of 2 February 1763 for France. As a result, in the colonies, the creditors had rights to all former Jesuit property except missions, cures, vicarages, seminaries, schools, other establishments founded to provide education for young people, and all the essential movable property attached to such places. This meant that the creditors were entitled to all the Jesuits' commercial property including plantations and the slaves on them, country houses and estates, and a great deal of movable property as well.

The colonial property to which the creditors were entitled was to be auctioned according to the method already laid down for the sale of Jesuit property in France by the lettres patentes of 2 February and 5 March 1763. If the property to be sold were too far away to be auctioned under the authority of the Parlement of Paris, the superior council within whose jurisdiction the property lay was to assume the functions of the Parlement of Paris. The creditors might send delegates
to represent the Union in the colonies and see that its rights were respected there. 106

Two months later the Parlement authorized the Union to name three more syndics and to hold a second meeting each week to discuss, among other matters, the Union's colonial affairs. 107 Later, the crown was to make the syndics responsible to the Commission of the Economats for their conduct of contentious colonial affairs. 108 But for most of the period after 1763, the syndics were freer of direct control in the colonies than they ever were in France. Unhappily for the creditors, their enjoyment of this additional freedom did not permit them to collect larger sums of money in the colonies than in France.

The first colonial matter which the syndics took up was exceptional. It concerned property to which none of the creditors had a direct claim, and property which was not commercial property, although it was administered under the Compagnie des Indes. The death of the former Jesuit superior of Pondichéry in Périgord in 1763 first drew the attention of the Parlement, the crown, and the creditors to the Jesuits' holdings in India and prepared the way for a lengthy legal debate about the creditors' rights to that property. 110 Having survived some of the campaigns of the Seven Years' War, the superior, Lavaur, had returned to France at the beginning of the Jesuit suppression. He took a room in an hôtel in Paris owned by the Compagnie des Indes, and then set off to visit his family. In the course of that visit, he died suddenly, leaving all his official papers in his room in Paris. This matter came to the attention of some of the creditors, who urged the commissioners of the Parlement 111 to gain entrance into Lavaur's room. On 30 April 1763, the commissioners placed seals on all his effects.
The court's commissioners, led by the Abbé Terray, were apparently acting more to satisfy the creditors than in the hope of recovering much property. But when they lifted the seals on 6 June 1763, and began to make the inventory, they discovered to their surprise that Lavaur had had in his possession titles and deed to property and goods worth more than 1,024,790 livres tournois. Most of the property was currently being administered by the Compagnie des Indes. The commissioners handed the titles and deeds over to the clerk of the Parlement and by an arrêt of 11 July 1763, the court handed them and all Lavaur's other effects over to Morisse, the Notaire Séquestre of the Union of Creditors.

In the interests of being repaid, the syndics then presented their titles and deeds to the officials of the Compagnie des Indes only to discover that the Company insisted that the superior council of Pondichéry should verify the titles and deeds before it would pay any money to the creditors. The Company offered to send the creditors' documents to Pondichéry for verification. Not trusting the Company, which would have to give them money if the documents were recognized, the creditors chose to act in accordance with the lettres patentes of 3 June 1763 and to send their own representative or fondé de procuration to Pondichéry instead. For this task they chose a man named Pitois. They charged him to go to Pondichéry, have the documents verified, and discover other Jesuit property in India which he could sell for the Union. They gave him 1,500 livres for his expenses and promised him five percent of the money he was going out to reclaim and twenty percent of the other effects, as yet unknown, that he would sell in India.

Pitois went to India and the superior council recognized the titles he held and dispatched the required verification to the headquarters of the Compagnie des Indes in Paris. But his success ended
there. He could not take the property administered by the Compagnie until he received its permission to do so, and the Procureur Général of the superior council of Pondichéry refused to let him seize any of the other Jesuit property, although he did make a detailed inventory of it. The Procureur Général and, indeed, the whole council, argued that all the property once belonging to the Jesuits in India now belonged to the missions there. And as part of the missions, and hence part of the property denied to the creditors in the colonies, it could not be seized.

Pitois replied that all the courts of the kingdom had recognized the justice of the creditors' claims to colonial property of the type he now sought, but the council still refused to allow him to make any seizures and on 25 April 1769 passed an arrêt declaring all movable and real property as well as all titles, bills, promissory notes, obligations, donations, and contracts once held by the Jesuits to be the property of the missions. Admittedly this arrêt could not apply to Lavaur's effects under the seals in Paris but it did make Pitois' work in India impossible. Both sides now apparently prepared to appeal to the crown.

In the meantime, in Paris, the Abbé Estevan, a former Jesuit and former curé of the parish of Chandernagar, initiated legal proceedings on behalf of the Compagnie des Indes against the creditors and gained the attention of the king. On 26 March 1773, Louis XV evoked the contest between Estevan and the creditors of the Jesuits to his Conseil d'Etat and the council prepared to decide the matter. The proceedings became more and more entangled as, in the meantime, the Inspecteur Général du Domaine in Paris took up and developed the argument of the superior council and asserted that all the missions and all
property depending on them, including Lavaur's titles and effects in Paris, belonged not to the creditors, nor to the council, but to the state.

The creditors based their rejoinder to these assertions on all the royal legislation issued on their behalf in 1763 to 1765. The lettres patentes of these years clearly allowed the creditors to sell the rentes which the Jesuits had acquired under the name of colonial missions and denied them only the property specifically making up cures, vicarages, seminaries, and schools. They also authorized the creditors to sell colonial property for the members of the Union.

To this argument the Inspecteur replied that the Union was comparing two unlike quantities, India and America. In India, the Jesuits' only activity had been to run the missions, and they had used for this purpose alone all the money which they had received in India. In America the Jesuits had engaged in commerce. The creditors replied that the Jesuit order was indivisible and that the legislation which gave the creditors the Jesuit property of the other colonies was founded not on the commerce which the Jesuits had engaged in there but on the debts which the society as a whole had contracted. They might also have said that this whole debate had taken place in France before the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 were issued. At that time the bureaux of administration of the colleges had argued as the Inspecteur now did.

At some time after the king evoked the discussion to his council, the whole affair went to the Commission of the Economats and there it apparently remained for some years. By 1777 the Commission had decided between the various parties in the affair, the creditors; the Inspecteur du Domaine; the Abbé Estevan; and another royal official who was active in the Commission, the Contrôleur des Bons d'Etat.
The decision reflected, if nothing else, the comparative weakness of the Union of Creditors. All the real property of any kind in India, including property apparently bought by the Jesuits for their own use, should belong to the missions, and hence to the state. All contracts, obligations, and other effects not found under the seals in Paris should be divided between the creditors and the missions, with the missions receiving one-quarter and the creditors three-quarters of the property. The effects in the churches were to belong to the missions.

The effects placed under the seals on Lavaur's death were divided into four categories. The contracts with a capital value of 1,075,007 livres 16 sols 7 deniers and accumulating four percent interest per year after 1776 were divided between the creditors who got contracts worth up to 614,742 livres 12 sols 3 deniers and the missions which got somewhat less. On the other hand, capital to the amount of 132,434 livres 15 sols 10 deniers became the property of the missions while the creditors fell heir to two "debts" on the Compagnie des Indes valued at 7,935 livres 7 sols and 124,698 livres 8 sols. The final agreement was embodied in a transaction between de Sartine, the Minister of the Marine, and the syndics and directors of the Union of Creditors which became law by the arrêts of the Conseil d'État of 22 March and 21 April 1777, and was put into effect after the Commission of the Economats approved it. Thus, finally, besides all the real property in India, including gardens and many terreaux and domaines, the missions got contracts and capital worth 592,500 livres from the Jesuits. The creditors, on the other hand, received no real property, and of the capital supposedly worth 747,846 livres and an additional four percent per year of that amount, they only ever collected 739,901 livres worth of contracts and accumulated interest.
Disposing of the Jesuit property in the American colonies also turned out to be a difficult task. As we have seen, the lettres patentes of 3 June 1763 had recognized the creditors' rights to all Jesuit colonial property not specifically endowed for education. The royal legislation had also authorized the Union to send delegates to the colonies to carry out the confiscation and sales according to the methods already laid down for continental France. By July 1763, and before they sent Pitois to India, the syndics of the Union had already sent representatives to Martinique, Guadeloupe, Saint Domingue, and Cayenne.

They were on the point of sending a man to Louisiana when they became aware of the situation in that colony. In Louisiana, the Procureur Général of the superior council had had an inventory of Jesuit property made and had had all the Jesuit property sold according to the practices of the colony before the news of the lettres patentes of 3 June reached him. As a result, by July 1763, the colonial officials had sold the Jesuits' property and goods and had received colonial currency of the type used in Louisiana for it. So far as the syndics of the Union in France could tell, the only thing that remained for them to do was to collect the money raised by the superior council from the sale of the property.

The crown apparently approved, for on 11 February 1764, it issued lettres patentes specifically for Louisiana, by which it ordered that the money raised from the sales in question should be handed over to the delegate of the Union, who had by now been sent to Louisiana anyway, and that he should bring it back to Paris. If there were creditors of the Jesuits in Louisiana, they were to apply to the Union in Paris to be reimbursed. As it turned out, the creditors of the Jesuits in
Louisiana had apparently already been satisfied and none of them applied to the union in Paris.\textsuperscript{131}

The delegate whom the Union sent to Louisiana was Lambert de Crouilly, who seems to have been a relation of Lambert, the Union's Procureur in the Parlement of Paris.\textsuperscript{132} We know little of how Lambert de Crouilly fared in Louisiana, or how he brought the money back to France, except that he brought it back in billets de monnoie which were not convertible into specie. It was only four years later, in March 1769, that the payments raised from the sales in Louisiana were made available to the members of the Union. Then it was not as sums of money but as 1,408 parties de rente, of which 1,407 were worth 25 livres each and one was worth 40 livres, that it was offered to the creditors. The rentes thus constituted had an obvious annual value of 35,215 livres, with a probable capital value of between 700,000 and 800,000 livres.\textsuperscript{133}

In the meantime, the fondés sent to the other American colonies had discovered that other superior councils had reacted in different ways to the suppression of the Jesuits. In Martinique, Guadeloupe, Saint Domingue, and Cayenne, the superior councils had not disposed of the Jesuit property in their jurisdiction. They had probably made inventories and appraised the property and appointed séquestres to receive money coming from the property but had not yet sold much, if any, of it. In the circumstances, the king responded to the syndics' request and between August 1764 and July 1765 issued legislation to govern relations between the superior councils and the union's delegates in these colonies.

The king applied the same rule to each of the colonies. In all cases, the council's séquestre was to hand over to the Union's dele-
gates all the titles to Jesuit property and to debts contracted by the Jesuits locally as well as a complete account of his own administration and any money he had already collected. The Union's representatives were then to sell by acte volontaire all the movable and landed property judged to the creditors by the lettres patentes of 3 June 1763, except for the property which the crown might wish to acquire and would buy from the creditors. The property was in all cases to be sold for an amount above the value at which the superior councils' officials had appraised it, and Union's delegates in the colonies were to send the money coming from such sales to the Séquestre of the Union in Paris. The creditors of the Jesuits in these colonies, like those in Louisiana, were to make their claims to the Union in Paris and have their names entered in the list of creditors being drawn up there.135

This was in theory how things were to develop in the Windward Islands. In practice, however, the Union's work there was more time-consuming and less rewarding than the lettres patentes could have suggested. In Guadeloupe, the Union was to experience some of the same difficulties as in India.136 Because Martinique and Guadeloupe were close together, the Union sent the same delegates to both places. We do not know who these men were in 1763, but by 1765 the Union had named Ruste, a négociant of Martinique, and Meroye to act on its behalf in these islands.137

In the meantime, the original delegates got to Guadeloupe sometime in the summer of 1763, only to discover that on 11 May of that year the Jesuit superior of the missions there had sold the two major habitations, probably the habitations of Besday and Houelmont, and the slaves on them, to a Sieur Lepreux. The delegates appealed to the superior council of Guadeloupe to ask that the sale be invalidated on
the grounds that it had taken place after the Jesuits' bankruptcy had been declared. Instead, the superior council passed an arrêt on 16 November 1764, by which it confirmed the sale of the property to Lepreux. The Union of Creditors then appealed to the Conseil du Roi, which on 24 January 1767 pronounced the arrêt of the superior council invalid. Lepreux accepted the verdict and offered the Union 600,000 livres for the property.

This solution was not acceptable to the sovereign council which now adopted a new policy towards the Union of Creditors. It now argued that the Jesuits had never owned any property in Guadeloupe; all their property had always belonged to the king. By an arrêt of 14 November 1767 the superior council of Guadeloupe passed a judgment stating that all the former Jesuit property in the colony belonged to the king. Again the creditors appealed to the Royal Council and this time they were sent before the Commission of the Economats.

For the next fifteen years the matter was discussed by three parties: the Procureur Général of the Commission of the Economats, of whom the most notable was Tolozan; the Controleur des Bons d'Etat of whom the best known was Turpin; and the syndics general of the Union of Creditors. In July 1781, the Commission invalidated the arrêt of the council of Guadeloupe of 14 November 1767. And on 9 March 1782, the Commission of the Economats confirmed the syndics' legal rights to the Jesuits' property in Guadeloupe.

That was not the end of the story. On 2 September 1783, Turpin, as Controleur des Bons d'Etat made an official opposition to the Commission's judgment of 9 March 1782 and argued that all the Jesuit property in Guadeloupe was part of the missions and hence belonged to the state. The evidence which Turpin produced to support his case was
the same as that which the superior council of Guadeloupe had used. He used documents relating to the original foundation of a Jesuit mission in Guadeloupe in 1651 by a Sieur Houel. Although the Jesuits had since sold this property, the fact remained, argued Turpin, that the intention of the original founder had been to establish a mission of the type excluded from the creditors' pursuits by the legislation of 3 June 1763. 142

The matter was settled by the Commission of the Economats in a compromise. On 10 September 1785, it decided that the creditors were the rightful owners of the movable and real property, the slaves, and the beasts of burden which the Jesuits had owned in Guadeloupe, that they should enjoy the revenue from this property starting on 1 January 1785, and that they should be able to sell it. In return, the creditors agreed that the crown should enjoy all revenues from the property for the period before 1 January 1785 and that they should renounce any claim they might have had to "buildings used in the service of the king". It was estimated that the buildings in question were worth about 92,000 livres. 143

The delegates of the Union then tried to take possession of the habitations in question, only to find that the present fermier, the Abbé Baudrier, was a sworn enemy of the creditors and refused to pay them. Despite royal opposition, the superior council supported Baudrier and even a new delegate of the Union sent out from France was unable to force Baudrier to pay his lease or even, presumably, to leave the property. There was by now apparently no question of selling the property to Lepreux and the final result of this tedious process was that by 1790 the creditors had received no money or payment of any kind from Guadeloupe. 144
Things developed more successfully in the other island in which Ruste and Meroye worked for the Union. In Martinique the delegates were able to sell the Jesuits' main house and gardens in Bourg de Saint Pierre, as well as other buildings, and several habitations with the slaves and animals attached to them. The buyers were Marc-François de Hayes de Bonneval, a chevalier of the Royal Military Order of Saint Louis and Nicolas Tournel, a lawyer already living in Martinique. The sale occurred on 16 May 1770 in the accepted way. A contract of sale was drawn up and approved by Doillot, Gabriel Hélo acted as Curateur in the Parlement of Paris, and Lambert, the Procureur of the Union gave his approval. The syndics in Paris received a down payment of 39,208 livres from the buyers.

What happened next is uncertain. The buyers never paid any more of the 600,000 livres which they had agreed to pay, and at some time after 13 August 1772, the delegates of the creditors reclaimed the property. They sold it again on 8 June 1775, this time apparently for colonial money. The price agreed on was 675,000 livres. In the meantime, they had fallen foul of the superior council of Martinique and now had to deduct 129,500 livres, still in colonial money, from the sale price. It is not clear whether the superior council claimed this money for itself or merely reduced the price by this much. The Union apparently did receive the rest of the price of the property, which would have been 364,000 livres in French money. We do not know how soon it received this money.

Once again, the intervention of the Commission of the Economats may have been decisive. In 1781 it intervened to suppress three arrêts which the superior council of Martinique had issued against the Union. A year later, however, the Commission was investigating the accounts and behaviour of Sieur Ruste. We assume that both were
in order, or at least that the syndics of the Union were able to put his affairs in order: one of the last acts of the Commission of the Economats was to confirm the Union of Creditors' rights to all the Jesuit property in Martinique.\footnote{151} So far as we know, by 1790, the property in Martinique had produced 403,208 \textit{livres} for the Union of Creditors.

Perhaps the most interesting case in the Sugar Islands was that of Saint Domingue. The Union apparently sent a delegate to this island in 1763 just as it had to the rest\footnote{152} but it was only in 1768 that affairs there began to be settled. The sovereign council of that colony seems to have accepted the provisions of the \textit{lettres patentes} of 27 October 1764 for this island and allowed the Union to dispose of Jesuit property there without offering any opposition. On 16 March 1768, the property was sold. Some went to the king for 300,000 \textit{livres}, \textit{argent des iles} or 200,000 \textit{livres} in French money, with interest at four percent per year, none of which he ever paid. The major portion, however, was sold to a Sieur Rouvray for 800,000 \textit{livres}, \textit{argent des iles}. Four percent interest was also charged on this amount each year. Rouvray did not pay for his property immediately, although by 27 November 1771 he had paid 200,193 \textit{livres} 13 \textit{sols} 9 \textit{deniers} in French money of the 533,000 \textit{livres} in the same currency he owed. By the same year the creditors had also collected 121,900 \textit{livres} which was the revenue from Rouvray's property for the period before he bought it.\footnote{153}

It would have been a relatively simple story except for one thing. Once the sale to Rouvray had taken place, there appeared from the ranks of willing officials in Paris a gentleman who had already served as the Union's \textit{fondé de procuration} in Louisiana and who now
wished to serve again. We do not know what his motives were but only that Lambert de Crouilly now offered to go to Saint Domingue to look after the Union's affairs there. He would place Rouvray in possession of his property and reclaim that which the king had agreed to buy.

The officials of the Union were apparently not anxious for him to go, and in their reports of 1772 and 1790 were to neglect him almost entirely, but they agreed to let him go to the colony, perform these two tasks, and recover whatever other money he might from the sale of the Jesuits' movable property there. The Union allowed him 10,000 livres for his expenses and apparently told him to come home when it was exhausted. It also promised him ten percent of all the money he recovered. 154

Lambert got to Saint Domingue by June 1768 and enlisted the help of the Intendant, de Bougarde, in taking possession of the king's property and de Rouvray's property there. He told the Intendant that he had come to take possession of the Jesuit houses of the Cap, to estimate the value of the movable property in them, and to fix a rent for the houses and market places on behalf of the king. 155

Exactly two years later, Lambert wrote to Rouhette, the chief counsel for the Union of the Creditors, and gave him a report of his mission. He included his accounts and he reported that he had looked after those affairs of the Union which he had been sent to settle, and he had recovered some small amounts of money from the sales of movable property. Even the money raised by these sales was not enough to pay his living expenses after his original 10,000 livres had been exhausted, however. He had been forced to sell all his belongings, to borrow more than 3,000 livres and he was returning home to France, a mere skeleton of a man, worn out by his work for the Union and three
major illnesses he had suffered in the colony, which had exhausted his purse and his body. He had reclaimed 17,765 livres for the Union in Saint Domingue.

When Lambert returned to Paris later in 1770, he failed to give any of the money he had collected to the Union of Creditors. He appealed to the Parlement of Paris and perhaps because of the influence of his relative there was granted an arrêt in his favour which ordered Doillot to pay him an additional amount for the expenses he incurred in Saint Domingue. Doillot made no such payment and the Union of Creditors, this time on the same side as the Controleur des Bons d'Etat, took the matter to the Commission of the Economats. It annulled the Parlement's arrêt and ordered Lambert to pay Doillot the 17,765 livres which he had recovered on the Union's behalf in Saint Domingue. The directorate of the Union had argued that Lambert's work in Saint Domingue had been over in three months: he need not have stayed longer. The matter went back to the Parlement of Paris and only ended on 26 March 1778, when Lambert voluntarily surrendered the 17,765 livres to the Union. In return, he received from the Union the sum of 2,400 livres on 2 April 1778. It was more than the ten percent of all the money he recovered that he had been promised. Thus, the Union received 339,859 livres from Saint Domingue, at a cost of 12,400 livres.

The last American colony in which the creditors reclaimed property and money was Cayenne. Here the story resembles that of Guadeloupe and Martinique. The lettres patentes of 1 August 1764 authorized the syndics of the Union to send delegates to the colony to receive money from the colony's séquestre and to seize and sell the rest of the property. The Union sent Joseph and Gaetan Prépaud, the sons of one of the syndics, to perform these tasks in Cayenne. Shortly before
their arrival, however, the governor of Cayenne, Turgot, seized all the Jesuit property in the name of the king and forbade the delegates to alienate any of it. After that, the council agreed to sell that portion of Jesuit property in Cayenne which was not actually needed by the crown to the Prépaud brothers. They apparently agreed to accept the council's offer, perhaps in the hope that they could avoid paying for the property and sell it for cash themselves. Thus, in July and August 1766, they acquired the five habitations of Loyola, Montlouis, Saint Regis, Mont Xavier, and Maripa along with the slaves on them. The value of the property, and presumably the Prépaud brothers agreed to pay this amount to the superior council, was 960,433 livres. It is not clear whether this amount was reckoned in French or colonial money.

What the two delegates did next is not known. They did send 120,000 livres to the Union in Paris at some time between 1766 and 1782, but in the latter year they were judged to be debtors to the Union for 1,110,333 livres. It is unlikely that any of this money came from the sale on 11 November 1777 to Sieur and Dame Marcenay of the habitation of Mont Xavier. At that time they paid 100,000 livres for the habitation in question, and we assume that this amount was paid in Paris as Rouvray's first payment had been. On 3 May 1782, the crown arranged to pay 200,000 livres in indemnités relatives aux missions du Levant to the Union for property which it had acquired in Cayenne. Like the rentes from Louisiana, this sum of money was not paid in cash and apparently could not be easily converted into cash. It would be offered to individual creditors as contracts. 164

In the meantime, the Prépaud brothers died and the Union of Creditors, now presumably having seen the council of Cayenne overruled
as those of Guadeloupe and Martinique had been, took possession of
the rest of the Jesuit property in Cayenne. On 2 May 1781, the syndics
sold the habitation of Montlouis to Puissant and on 27 March 1783,
they received 44,259 livres from him. On 31 December 1787, they
received 112,500 livres from the Marquis of Lafayette for the habitation
of Saint Régis and Maripa and forty-eight slaves on them. On
14 November 1787 and on 1 January 1790, they received 60,000 livres
and about 110,000 livres from Bajon for the habitations of Loyola and
Montlouis, known as the habitation of Beauregard. The Union received
a total of about 546,759 livres in cash and 200,000 livres worth of
contracts from the sale of Jesuit property in Cayenne.

Altogether, the Union received 1,644,201 livres in contracts and
1,289,816 livres in cash, or a total of 2,934,017 livres from the
colonial transactions we have considered. We cannot be absolutely
certain that this total is complete. We know only that in 1790, when
Rouhette presented the report from which most of our information about
the Union's receipts is drawn, he accounted more scrupulously for the
money raised by colonial sales than he did for that raised in France.
It would seem, then, that the confiscation and sale of Jesuit property
in the colonies produced about three million livres, which was sent to
Paris.

Thus, with the approximately five and a half million livres which
they had received from transactions in France, the officials of the
Union of Creditors in Paris had, by 1790, received a total of approxi-
mately eight and one-half million livres from the confiscation and
sale of Jesuit property everywhere. To use the precise figure which
Rouhette cited, they had received a grand total of 8,305,060 livres.
Of this amount, 6,706,250 livres had been received in cash and
1,749,141 livres in contracts. \textsuperscript{167}

If we add the assumed receipts of 700,000 livres of the provincial syndics to the total given by Rouhette, we find that the Union in France received a grand total of about nine million livres. \textsuperscript{168} This figure may be increased to 9,600,000 livres if we take into account the 400,000 livres owed by the crown for the professed house in Paris and 200,000 livres owed by the crown for property acquired in Saint Domingue. True, the crown never paid this money, \textsuperscript{169} but the fact that the crown owed it to the Union had value. The officials of the Union were able to use délégations, or rather sophisticated promissory notes on the crown's debt of 600,000 livres, to pay the Union's debts to the last of the Jesuits' creditors when the Union's caisse was depleted of cash and contracts' in the 1780's. \textsuperscript{170} It was with this slightly more than nine and one-half million livres in specie, contracts, and promissory notes that the officials of the Union had to repay the creditors of the Jesuits and to pay their own administrative expenses.
III Repaying the creditors

In order to repay the creditors of the Jesuits, the syndics in Paris and their counterparts in the provinces had to identify them legally. This task took ten years and resulted in the publication in 1772 of an Ordre Général or official list of all the recognized creditors. It will be easier to understand how the syndics repaid the creditors if we consider first, as the officials themselves did, who the creditors of the Jesuits were and how the Jesuits had become indebted to them.

One group of creditors had clamoured for attention long before the Union was formed. They were the creditors of Antoine Lavalette. Lavalette had become superior general of the Missions of the Windward Islands in 1753, probably because of his proven ability to deal with their financial problems. In 1756, his chief correspondents in France, the Lioncy brothers of Marseille, went bankrupt. The ships laden with Lavalette's goods intended to back the lettres de change which Lavalette had drawn in Martinique on that commercial house never reached France; they were seized by English privateers. The Lioncys' failure caused uneasiness among Lavalette's other French correspondents at a moment when he most needed their confidence. Plague among his slaves, the destruction by storms of his buildings, and the failure of his crops had nearly resulted in Lavalette's own bankruptcy. After the Lioncys' failure, he borrowed indiscriminately by means of lettres de change drawn on the Jesuit procureur of the Missions of the Windward Islands who lived in the professed house in Paris, de Sacy, or on other French négociants. The new demands resulting from Lavalette's most recent borrowing caused the Jesuit superiors to appoint the négociant Rey of Marseille to help Sacy satisfy the creditors of Lavalette, and
when the resources of the missions were not enough to cover the new wave of *lettres de change*, the superiors allowed Sacy to borrow money and advance more than 800,000 *livres* to Lavalette's creditors by the beginning of 1757. Sacy apparently had no idea how much money Lavalette had borrowed by this time.

While Sacy and Rey were thus employed, the French superiors decided to send a "visitor" to investigate Lavalette's affairs in the Windward Islands, to force him to stop using *lettres de change*, and, if possible, to make him return to France. Because of the war and the difficulties of travel in that part of the world, no "visitor" reached Lavalette until 1762, and Lavalette continued to borrow money by means of *lettres patentes* drawn on both French and foreign commercial establishments. By the end of 1757, the new provincial of Paris, Frey, appointed in April 1756, had ordered Sacy and Rey to stop borrowing money with which to acquit Lavalette's debts, and by 1760 Lavalette himself reckoned that he owed about four million *livres* in France.

Early in 1760, the Veuve Grou, holding one of Lavalette's unpaid *lettres de change* with a principal value of 30,000 *livres*, and the Lioncys, demanding more than a million *livres*, brought the entire Jesuit order to justice before the Consuls of Paris and Marseille. The Lavalette affair became the Jesuit affair when the process went before the *Parlement* of Paris in the spring of 1761. It was then that the Roman general, Ricci, intervened and appointed Griffet to try to satisfy the growing number of creditors making claims against Lavalette in France. Griffet, a respected man and a diplomat, but one who had no knowledge of commercial affairs, appointed Gatin, who was now the *procureur* of the Missions of America, to perform his functions.
So it was in 1761 to 1762, that as the Jesuits' lawyers fought in the Parlement of Paris for the preservation of the Jesuit order in France, Gatin in France, and Lamarche, the only "visitor" who reached his destination, in Martinique, tried to restore confidence among Lavalette's creditors. Realizing that by now Lavalette's debts amounted to at least four and a half million livres, they gave official notarized recognition to those creditors who could produce evidence of Lavalette's indebtedness, and they paid as much as they could in interest and capital to the creditors who were the most insistent or the most in need. They worked through the winter of 1761 to 1762, and the closure of the colleges on 1 April and the confiscation of Jesuit property in France after 23 April 1762 did not put an end to their activities. Their payments were limited by their ability to raise money. They received 502,000 livres from the order in France and borrowed 860,000 livres in England. When the Parlement sought to dissolve the Society of Jesus by its arrêt of 6 August 1762, Gatin could borrow no more in Europe and no one would accept Lamarche's lettres de change or other promises in the colonies. By the end of 1762, they had probably repaid over one million livres of the principal sums owed by Lavalette, and a large though incalculable sum in interest.

While Lamarche and Gatin had gone on trying to prevent the ruin of Lavalette and ultimately of the order, the Parlement of Paris had authorized the creation of the Union of Creditors. Of the forty-seven people or firms with forty-six claims who presented themselves to Terray in May 1762, all but six were definitely creditors of Antoine Lavalette, and of the remaining six, four may have been his creditors. The principal claims of Lavalette's known creditors in Terray's list amounted to 2,295,212 livres. No one imagined that this first list
of creditors was complete, and the crown and Parlement gave the creditors of the Jesuits two more years in which to present their claims. Even as late as 1767, the crown extended the deadline another two years. After May 1762, the syndics of the new Union were responsible for listing all the legal creditors. 16

To determine who was and was not a creditor of Lavalette, the syndics relied primarily on the notarized documents drawn up in 1761 to 1762. 17 In this way, though they failed to save the Jesuit order, Gatin and Lamarche had provided the means by which the syndics could identify the legal creditors of Lavalette. The fact that they had gone on trying to satisfy some of the creditors after April 1762 also meant that there would be some discrepancy between the list of creditors drawn up by Terray in May 1762 and the list of creditors drawn up by the syndics over the next decade. The principal amounts still owing which the latter listed would often be slightly less than the principal amounts claimed in the former. In all probability, this meant that Gatin and Lamarche had made payments to individual creditors between the time when the creditors presented themselves to Terray and asked to join the Union in May 1762, and August 1772, when the final list of creditors was published. Payments of this sort may have been made as late as 1764, 18 but were probably made in the spring and summer of 1762 while Gatin and Lamarche could still raise money.

In those few cases in which the principal amount claimed in Terray's list is less than the amount recognized as due in the Ordre Général, it is likely that the creditors did not have legal proof of all the money owed to them when they went before Terray in 1762, but that they were able to produce it by the end of the next decade. It may also in some cases have meant that interest due and unpaid in 1762
was added to the principal sum when the final list of creditors was made. In isolated cases, it may have meant that Gatin and Lamarche or even Sacy had made a payment to a creditor in 1757 to May 1762, that Terray's total reflected this fact, but that the evidence of the payment was lost before the *Ordre Général* was compiled. It is unlikely, however, that this happened often. The syndics of the Union were to have most if not all Gatin's and Lamarche's records at their disposal and would not have been anxious to pay more money than necessary even to their own members. Because it is based on the Jesuits' as well as on individual creditors' evidence, the most complete list of the creditors of Lavalette and information about their debts is that contained in the *Ordre Général* of 1772.19

The *Ordre Général* of 1772 was a document drawn up in compliance with the *lettres patentes* of 14 June 1763 and containing all the lists of recognized creditors made by the syndics of the *Parlements* of Paris, Toulouse, Aix, Grenoble, Dijon, Bordeaux, Rouen, and Rennes between 1762 and 1772.20 It did not include the creditors of Flanders, Franche-Comté, or Lorraine, who were to be satisfied without recourse to the Union, but it did, of course, include creditors from the colonies. It recognized debts contracted by the Jesuits up to 13 or 23 April 1762 and, in the case of Lavalette's debts, stated how much of these debts remained to be paid after Sacy or Gatin or Lamarche had tried to appease individual creditors.21 It was thus a statement of principal sums due to be repaid to the creditors of the Jesuits as of late 1764 or early 1765,22 and supposed to be repaid by the officers of the Union. In the case of Lavalette's creditors, and most others as well, it indicated that interest had fallen due and been unpaid on these principal sums since 1762. But it did not state the rate of such interest.
The \textit{Ordre} listed 126 creditors of Lavalette. If we also regard as creditors of Lavalette those nine claimants who were really creditors of the Lioncys but who, by 1772, had been accorded the status of creditors of the Jesuits, Lavalette may be said to have owed money to 135 people or firms on 23 April 1762. In fact, he may have owed money to more than 135 people on that day, but, if he did, the additional people were satisfied between 1762 and 1772 and their names are not in the \textit{Ordre Général}.\textsuperscript{23} Among the satisfied creditors we may place any French creditors lucky enough to have been complete repaid by Gatin or Lamarche after 23 April 1762. Much more important, we may include the English or Dutch creditors of Lavalette or of Griffet, Gatin, and Lamarche on Lavalette's behalf, who were repaid from the English seizures and sales in La Dominique during the last phases of the Seven Years' War. If the syndics' list of 1772 included no obviously foreign creditors of Lavalette, it was because, according to the syndics of the Union, his foreign creditors had already helped themselves to Jesuit property in the colonies.\textsuperscript{24}

The 135 legally recognized creditors of Lavalette had few things in common. By 1772, the list naturally included some heirs of Lavalette's original creditors.\textsuperscript{25} But if we consider only the original creditors, we still find the group far from homogeneous. On the one hand, there were the important but by now retired public figures of the Windward Islands, the former governors or intendants whom we have already met because all but one became syndics of the Union: Cazotte, Trochereau de la Berlière, Lemercier de la Rivière, Lefèvre de Givry, and de Bompar.\textsuperscript{26} Another well-known and possibly notorious creditor of Lavalette was the Demoiselle Beuvron, a relative by marriage of the Minister of the Marine, who exchanged intimate
letters with Lavalette during the years of his bankruptcy and dis-
grace.  

At least twenty-six other creditors of Lavalette lived or had lived for a time in Martinique or nearby islands and presumably knew Lavalette well. Of these, at least six were négociants, two were women of independent means, several were successful tradesmen, and of two others we know only that they had sold slaves to Lavalette. Between them, Lavalette's associates in the Islands and the Demoiselle Beuvron had lent him at least 1,731,779 livres which, through the efforts of Rey, Sacy, Gatin, and Lamarche had been reduced to 1,593,405 livres by about 1764. In short, the Ordre Général recognized that Lavalette's former associates in the Windward Islands and the Demoiselle Beuvron should be repaid principal sums amounting to somewhat more than one and one-half million livres.

The rest of Lavalette's legally recognized creditors lived in France. Most, as we would expect, were professional money lenders or commercial agents of one kind or another. Thirty-three French creditors are referred to as négociants and another thirty-five or forty would probably also have been if the men who drafted the Ordre Général had recorded the creditors' professions and places of residence more carefully than they did. Of the thirty-three recognized négociants, the Lioncy brothers were the most famous and, if only because they had so many creditors of their own, they also made the biggest claim. There were seven other négociants from Marseille, ten from Bordeaux, two from Lyon, one from Rennes, one from Le Havre, and others of unknown address. Between them, the négociants in France had lent Lavalette nearly four million livres, which the Jesuit officials had reduced to about two million livres by the time the various parlements
prepared their list of creditors.\textsuperscript{32}

In Paris, Lavalette owed money to men who are described in the Ordre Général as bankers. It lists seven Paris banking houses which corporately had lent Lavalette 243,675 \textit{livres} on one occasion and 206,329 \textit{livres} on another. Lavalette's other French creditors include several professional soldiers or sailors, at least one merchant, an écuyer, and only one royal office holder, a conseiller d'état. The profession of a number of Lavalette's creditors is not stated.

Altogether, Lavalette's French creditors\textsuperscript{33} had once lent Lavalette 4,249,052 \textit{livres}. Through Sacy's and Gatin's efforts, the principal amount had been reduced to 2,455,108 \textit{livres} by the time the various syndicates compiled their official list of creditors.\textsuperscript{34} Sacy and Gatin had thus clearly devoted their attention and their resources to Lavalette's French creditors and had reduced their claims by about forty-five percent. In the same period they had reduced the Jesuits' colonial debts by nine percent. As a result of these reductions of the original debt, the Ordre Général showed that by about 1764 or 1765, the creditors of Lavalette claimed principal sums amounting to 4,048,513 \textit{livres}. They also claimed interest and legal costs. It was this principal and the interest and costs attached to it that the syndics of the Union had to repay the Lavalette's creditors.\textsuperscript{35} The amount is increased to 4,072,110 \textit{livres} if we add the recognized claims of nine colonial creditors from Guadeloupe, Saint Domingue, and Cayenne, whom Sacy or Gatin had recognized, and the syndics included in the Ordre Général of 1772.\textsuperscript{36} All Lavalette's creditors and all creditors from the American colonies fell within the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris and the repayment of such creditors was the special responsibility of the syndics of the Union in Paris because these creditors
were creditors of the Jesuit order as a whole.\textsuperscript{37}

For several years while the Lavalette affair developed, the Jesuit superiors in France regarded the creditors in the colonies and the French creditors of Lavalette as the only creditors of the Jesuit order. Sacy and Gatin had been responsible for appeasing them and had done what they could. So far as we can discover, until 1761 few if any of the leading Jesuits in France had considered that there might one day be other French creditors of the Jesuits who would file claims against the order as a whole or against specific Jesuit institutions in France.\textsuperscript{38} And many of the French Jesuits, of course, would not accept any responsibility for what had happened in the colonies or in France as a result of Lavalette's actions.\textsuperscript{39}

But when the \textit{Parlement} of Paris succeeded in forcing the closure and seizure of Jesuit institutions in the spring and summer of 1762, and when, on 6 August of that year, it tried to dissolve the Jesuit order, other creditors appeared. They became very numerous as the crown and the \textit{Parlement} prolonged the period during which people might present their claims. Eventually, the syndics of the Union, in addition to Lavalette's creditors and the other colonial creditors, were to recognize in the \textit{Ordre Général} and assume responsibility for repaying about 1,260 creditors from all parts of the kingdom. They were either creditors of the order as a whole or, much more often, creditors of specific institutions.\textsuperscript{40} These approximately 1,260 creditors, presented more than 1,300 claims. It is a testimony to the relative conscientiousness of the Jesuit administrators of French institutions that most of the claims made against the institutions were for sums of money which, in the normal course of events, the Jesuits would never have had to pay or never have had to pay all at once.
The largest group of creditors in France who, after the creditors of Lavalette, also claimed the most money, were the holders of rentes created by the administrators of Jesuit institutions, and particularly Jesuit colleges, during the previous century. Such creditors were of two kinds. The first group numbered about 550 and held 575 separate rentes perpetuelles, with a total principal value of 1,977,825 livres, producing four or five percent interest per annum. Of these 575 rentes, only 101 had been created by Jesuits in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, and these 101 rentes had a total capital value of 350,766 livres. The rente perpetuelle had clearly not been so popular in that one-third of France as it had been in the other two-thirds. Although some of these rentes perpetuelles had been created as long before as 1664 or 1707, most dated from the 1740's or 1750's. In normal circumstances, the Jesuits would have expected to pay interest on these investments and to repay the specific original capital investments of a few rentiers each year. In many cases, the Jesuits had probably invested the capital received in this way in various kinds of more lucrative rentes—those on the aides et gabelles, the taille, the Hôtel de Ville, for instance. If the Jesuits themselves had been forced to redeem all the capital of all the rentes perpetuelles they had ever created, they would have been forced to sell their own rentes bought on the state or public enterprises referred to above. This avenue was not open to the Union of Creditors which had not fallen heir to all the rentes owned by the colleges. In most cases the rentes owned by the colleges would go after 1763 to the new college bureaux.

The other group of rentiers were the approximately one hundred holders of 102 rentes viagères with a capital value of at least 265,058 and probably as much as 450,000 livres. Thirty-five of the creditors
in question, claiming capital amounting to at least 67,300 *livres* and probably to as much as 100,000 *livres*, had made contracts with institutions within the jurisdiction of the *Parlement* of Paris, which once again appears to have been somewhat under-represented. These investors had given Jesuit institutions a lump sum and had expected to be paid interest on that sum for their lifetimes. Because interest would be paid for a comparatively short time, the rate of interest was comparatively high and the return on such an investment was usually about ten percent per year. In normal times the Jesuits would never have had to pay more than the interest on such investments. Once again, if the example of the institutions of the *Parlement* of Paris is any guide, the Jesuits appear to have used much of the capital thus invested in their institutions to buy securities which after 1763 would be in the hands of the new *bureaux* of administration. Together, the holders of *rentes perpetuelles* and *rentes viagères* claimed at least 2,242,883 *livres* in capital or, if our estimate of the real value of the claims in the second group is correct, about 2,428,000 *livres* in capital.

The third identifiable group of creditors were those to whom the Jesuits were indebted for goods provided or services performed for Jesuit institutions. These creditors were the proverbial butcher and baker and candlestick maker, and also the tailors, drapers, linen merchants, thread-sellers, laundrywomen, bleachers, shoemakers, hatters, haberdashers, and even wig-makers, leather merchants, salt and spice merchants, butter-sellers, oil merchants, stove-merchants, ironmongers, wood cutters and woodsellers, window fitters, plumbers, apothecaries and druggists who had provided the colleges and other Jesuit institutions with their daily needs. Besides the tradesmen, the list includes the domestic servants and gardeners whose work
requires no explanation and the doctors who had treated the Jesuits when they were ill. Perhaps the most surprising professions in the list are those of dancing teacher and tutor in philosophy. But we must remember that these were the people who had provided goods and services to the Jesuits when their institutions functioned normally. Some had large accounts, but most claimed very little. With rare exceptions, all claimed payment for services performed within the year immediately before the confiscation of Jesuit property. So far as we can tell, and this is one matter about which the Ordre Général provides precise and detailed information, the Jesuits of France owed very little money to men and women for services rendered before 1761. Except in rare cases, the Jesuit administrators had not expected their tradesmen, servants, or the professional people whose services they used, to wait to be paid. Had there been no legal action against the Jesuits in 1761 to 1762, even the approximately 380 people making 417 claims against the Jesuit institutions for goods and services rendered might have been paid within the year, as earlier creditors of this kind must have been.

One hundred and ninety-six, or nearly half the claims in this category were made by people who had dealt with Jesuit institutions in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. Of these, fifty were creditors of the Jesuits of Saint-Omer, who thus must be regarded as the exception to our rule concerning conscientiousness among Jesuit administrators. So far as we can tell, the Jesuits of Saint-Omer had left many of their tradesmen unpaid since the 1740's. The fifty-six claims against the Jesuits of Saint-Omer amounted to more than 15,347 livres in principal sums. Altogether, the creditors of this group from the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris claimed more than
113,500 livres and perhaps as much as 130,000 livres. The group as a whole claimed at least 227,574 livres from the Jesuits of France and perhaps more than 245,000 livres. This group of creditors did not include men or women who had given money or services to finance the improvement or maintenance of college or attached buildings. These creditors had been required by the lettres patentes of 14 June 1763, legislation passed by the Parlement of Paris in August 1763, and an arrêt of the crown or Parlement of December 1764 to go directly before the bureaux of administration and to arrange to have such bureaux repay them.

A fourth group of creditors whom the syndics recognized and assumed responsibility for repaying were the creditors who held obligations of one kind or another issued by the Jesuit administrators. These creditors had performed no services and invested no capital in rentes. They had, instead, lent money to the Jesuits, usually with the expectation of receiving their capital and considerable interest back in a short time. Such creditors made 170 recognized claims, of which eighty-eight, or, again, about half, were made against Jesuit institutions in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

Besides showing which Jesuit houses normally depended on short-term loans in order to survive, this category of claims is the one which tells us most about the ways in which Jesuit administrators reacted to the crisis of 1758 to 1762. We would not expect the sale of rentes to increase in a crisis, since, however unscrupulous the Jesuits might have tried to be, the number or at least percentage of willing rentiers would not have increased in such circumstances. Anyone who had heard of the fate of the Jesuits in the Iberian peninsula or the legal processes in Marseille or Paris would not be more likely
than before to regard Jesuit institutions as a safe place in which to put his capital or from which to receive a small but guaranteed annual income for years to come. Nor would we expect the Jesuits to increase their consumption of goods or their use of services during such a crisis. Exceptional Jesuits might have acquired new clothes in preparation for hard times or have bought more wine to store, but it is unlikely that this went on on a large scale. But when we come to the question of borrowing money, we are dealing with another matter. Men need money when other things fail. They need it to flee, to become financially independent when their normal source of support crumbles. In a crisis they often think they need a great deal of it.

With these reflections in mind, we may ask certain questions which an analysis of this category of claims should permit us to answer: had the Jesuits borrowed more money than usual in the year or two before the confiscation of their property? The Parlement and many of the creditors later believed that the Jesuits had secretly sold their movable property in the winter of 1761 to 1762, a claim which it has been impossible to substantiate or to disprove. But a study of the billets and obligations issued by the Jesuits in return for cash during the years of the crisis should surely tell us whether the Jesuits prepared for bitter and difficult times ahead by borrowing what they could while they still could. Did the Jesuits in France prepare for their own ruin by reckless borrowing?

The simple answer to both questions is that, so far as we can tell, they did not. It is true that the billets and obligations held by the claimants in this fourth group almost all date from 1759 to 1762, but that is to be expected since, by their nature, these were short-term loans. We will understand more about the significance of
these particular billets and obligations if we consider the case of the institutions we are familiar with, the Jesuit houses of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

In the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, only twenty of the thirty-nine colleges held obligations of any kind in 1762, and none of the other institutions, such as the professed house or the noviciate, apparently held any. Of the twenty colleges which had incurred such debts, eight had borrowed less than 1,000 livres and seven others less than 10,000 livres. Only the two Colleges of Saint-Omer, with obligations of 10,550 livres, the College of Arras, with obligations of 12,688, and the two Colleges of Lyon, with obligations amounting to 62,334 livres arouse suspicion.

A closer look at the first three colleges shows that more than half their obligations dated from before Lavalette's bankruptcy, and reveals more that the colleges of Artois and Flanders were badly administered and probably very poor than that they responded to the crisis by borrowing as much money as they could. But in Lyon the case is very different. All the obligations and there are forty-two of them, date from after the crisis of 1758. Most date from 1760 to 1762. Thus, although we have found no proof and no suggestion that this may be so, it seems very likely that the Jesuits of Lyon were preparing in 1760 to 1762 for the day when their property might be confiscated and they might be exiled from their home. Whatever the reason for the large amount of borrowing done by the Jesuits of Lyon in 1760 to 1762, it remains true that they borrowed almost half the money claimed by this group of creditors in the territory of the Parlement of Paris. In that jurisdiction, creditors claimed 130,626 livres in capital for unredeemed billets and obligations. In France
as a whole, this group claimed 229,631 livres.

The rest of the legal creditors of the Jesuits listed in the Ordre Général are not part of such obvious categories of creditors. Thirty-eight people claimed a variety of taxes and feudal dues, although the Ordre lists only thirteen principal sums claimed by such creditors. The rest apparently demanded varying annual payments or payments in kind. Thus, although the creditors claiming taxes or feudal obligations demanded a total of 1,838 livres in principal, we may assume that their real claims were much higher. We may estimate the total principal sums owed to these people at 4,000 or even 5,000 livres.

The sixth and last group of creditors were included in the Ordre Général not because the Jesuits had incurred debts to them but because they had been involved in the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762. They had borne some of the costs of that event, and the royal legislation pertaining to such matters made the Union responsible for paying such people. Eight people or institutions claimed principal sums of more than 40,595 livres and perhaps as much as 46,400 livres for money paid to Jesuits for their travel or living expenses at the time of the suppression. Sixteen men employed by bailliages and sénéchaussées claimed more than 16,051 livres for making inventories of Jesuit property and belongings, and the crown had made the Union responsible for paying them as well. This group thus claimed between 56,646 livres and 62,450 livres.

The Ordre Général, then, listed the claims which the syndics of the Union were supposed to repay and the principal value of these claims was at least 6,830,682 livres, and probably about seven and one-half million livres. Besides these more than seven million livres, the more than 1,400 creditors whom we have considered were also entitled to interest on their principal and legal costs. This being so, it is
not surprising that in 1774, just two years after the publication of the *Ordre Général*, the crown estimated that the Jesuits had left debts totalling nine million livres. We assume that the crown was recognizing not only the creditors who would be repaid by the syndics of the Union but also the creditors of Flanders, Franche-Comté, and Lorraine who claimed an undetermined amount of money and the 151 creditors who claimed more than 100,000 livres, and who had been sent to the bureaux of administration of the colleges. In 1790, a critic of the Union said that the *Ordre Général* of 1772 had listed scarcely eight million livres worth of debts, but it is unlikely that he was considering the creditors of the colleges or the interest and costs to which all the creditors were entitled.

We may now consider how the officials of the Union of Creditors used the nine and one-half million livres which they had collected in a variety of forms to repay the approximately seven and one-half million livres in principal sums and undeterminable amounts in interest and costs to the legally recognized members of the Union whom it was their duty to repay. The Officials of the Union would perform this function in accordance with the normal, legal practices of the society in which they lived.

These practices require some explanation. So far, we have considered the creditors and their claims according to the ways in which the Jesuits had become indebted to their creditors. This approach has permitted us to consider aspects of the Jesuits' bankruptcy and the confiscation which otherwise would not have been apparent. But it has obscured the fact that, although they had to record the nature of individuals' claims against the Jesuits, the officials of the Union were much more concerned about something else. They, and the ordinary creditors, too, were concerned about the order in which creditors were
to be repaid. In fact, the whole reason for making an Ordre Général
was to provide the syndics with an instrument to enable them to repay
the creditors as fairly as possible. The Ordre Général was, quite
literally, the order in which the creditors should be repaid.

A creditor's position in the Ordre told him or anyone else that he
would be repaid either all or a previously determined percentage of the
money owed to him, after one creditor and before another. In the case
of a privileged creditor, it meant that his whole class of creditors
would be repaid before any other creditors. Indeed, it was probably
the need to list creditors in a correct order which had delayed the
publication of the Ordre Général for so long. It was no easy matter
to integrate all the separate orders prepared by the syndics of the
Parlements of Paris, Aix, Toulouse, Grenoble, Dijon, Bordeaux, Rennes,
and Rouen into a definitive list. But by September 1772, the syndics
in Paris had finished the Ordre Général and the Parlement of Paris
had approved it.

The form of the Ordre Général was the usual one in the eighteenth
century. The 1,400 or more creditors whom the syndics were obliged
to repay were divided into four classes. The first class consisted
of 122 creditors with 124 claims, whom the Jesuits had recognized as
privileged creditors. They would be repaid before any of the other
classes could be satisfied. Each privileged creditor had equal rights
with all the other members of his class, and thus all 122 creditors
would have to be paid the whole or the same percentage of their claims
at the same time. The principal claimed by this class in the Ordre
of 1772 amounted to at least 143,068 livres and probably to more than
150,000 livres. This class included people to whom the Jesuits had
become indebted in all but one of the ways we described earlier. The
exception is not an obvious one; the Première Classe of the Ordre
Général included not a single creditor of Lavalette.
The second class, or créanciers hypothécaires, consisted of about 480 creditors with 489 claims against the Jesuits for capital of more than 4,184,694 livres. It was not the most numerous class but it was the class which demanded the most. What distinguished these creditors from the others was their possession of legal acts, which were normally notarized, recognizing their claims and granting them an hypothèque or lien or mortgage on their debtors' property. The members of this class were listed according to the dates of their hypothèques, with the holder of the earliest act listed first and the most recent listed last. Within this class, which was to be repaid after the privileged creditors, the first in the list would have to be paid his full claim or a previously decided-upon percentage of his claim before the second could be paid anything, and so on down the list of nearly 500 creditors. The second class of creditors included many of the men and women who had lent money to Lavalette, or who held rentes perpetuelles created by French Jesuits. It also included holders of billets and claimants of taxes and feudal dues.

The third class of creditors were the créanciers chirographaires, men and women who could prove that the Jesuits owed them money and who thus could claim to be repaid from the seizure and sale of Jesuit property, but who possessed no hypothèque and only rarely had notarized proof of their claims. Because they were not holders of "mortgages" it was often understood that they should be repaid from the seizure and sale of movable property, or mobilier, rather than of real property. This rule was a difficult one to enforce, but as late as 1768 and 1772, the syndics apparently still thought it should be applied. The third class in the Ordre we are considering consisted of 823 claims, and somewhat fewer creditors, and was representative of all the groups mentioned earlier: the creditors of Lavalette, the rentiers, the
holders of billets, and the claimants of taxes and feudal dues. It also included twenty-three creditors already listed in the second class who were claiming arrears of interest due on their *renes perpetuelles*. As a class, these creditors claimed at least 2,237,862 *livres* in principal sums. They were listed alphabetically and were supposed as a class to be repaid all or a previously agreed upon percentage of their claims at the same time.

The fourth class of creditors held *rentes viagères* on French Jesuit institutions and were subdivided into *hypothécaires*, of whom there were seven, and *chirographaires*, of whom there were ninety-four. They would be paid either with the other *hypothécaires* or *chirographaires*, or after the third class had been repaid, depending on the arrangements made by the syndics. The approximately one hundred members of the fourth class had claimed capital amounting to between 265,058 *livres* and 450,000 *livres*.

The *Ordre* in this way listed all the creditors whom the syndics would have to repay, but it also listed other would-be creditors. It included the names of the 151 creditors of the second and third classes who claimed more than 100,000 *livres* in capital, and whom the syndics regarded as legal creditors of the Jesuits but whom the *bureaux* of administration of the colleges would have to repay. And it listed about one hundred people whose claims the syndics rejected. The sum of all the recognized claims was the same amount as we considered when we added together the various kinds of claims based on the ways in which the Jesuits had become indebted to their creditors: at least 6,830,682 *livres*, and probably as much as seven and a half million *livres*. All the recognized creditors were also entitled to interest or arrears on their capital and legal costs.

We have said that the *Ordre Général et Définitif* was the instrument
which would enable the syndics of the Union to repay the creditors justly and we have considered how it was expected to work. Eventually, it would be used in the way we have described and it would determine who would and would not receive the money collected by the syndics. But it was not published until 1772, and before that the syndics managed without it. Just as they had not waited until they had drafted the list of creditors to begin selling the Jesuit property to which the creditors were entitled, so now they did not wait to complete the final Ordre before trying to repay some of the creditors.

On 21 August 1765, a meeting of the syndics decided, with the approval of the Parlement of Paris, to carry out the first distribution of funds to the creditors. The syndics had just received 1,700,000 livres from the sale of rentes formerly administered to the Jesuits of the professed house in Paris and they used this money to carry out their plan. As they explained later, they wanted to avoid letting money lie dormant in their caisse while the creditors' unpaid capital continued to accumulate additional interest which eventually the syndics would have to pay anyway.

Since they had not yet finished making the Ordre Général, the syndics decided to make up a special list, in the normal manner, of all the creditors who had by now presented their claims to the Union in Paris. Although the list has since been lost, we may assume that it contained the names of the creditors of specific institutions in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris and also creditors from all over France and from the colonies who were making claims against the Jesuit order as a whole. In the circumstances, the syndics decided to repay the privileged creditors of this list the capital, interest, and legal costs to which they were entitled; the hypothécaires, or creditors of the second class, a quarter of their capital, interest, or arrears and
costs; and the chirographaires, or members of the third class, a tenth of their interest or arrears, and costs.

In order to receive their payments, however, the creditors had to produce evidence to support their claims, to swear that they had not received any part of their claim before and were not acting on behalf of the Jesuits. And they had to offer a sizable caution or deposit. The last requirement prevented many creditors who would otherwise have been eligible from participating in the first distribution. At the same time, the syndics declared that they would henceforth keep a sum of 200,000 livres in their caisse to cover unexpected expenses. Both these actions on the part of the syndics caused some of the creditors to harbour bitter feelings against the directorate of the Union.

The first distribution took place over a period of about two and a half years. In March 1767, the syndics decided formally to extend the provisions of the decision made on 21 August 1765 to the creditors of the jurisdictions of the Parlements of Aix and Toulouse, which had just submitted their ordres of creditors to the syndics in Paris. The Parlement of Paris approved this decision and the provincial creditors were to be repaid by the syndics of their own parlement unless the provincial syndic ran out of money. In this case, the Notaire Séquestre would provide the money that was needed. At the same time, the syndics apparently extended the first distribution to include the fourth class of creditors and accorded to the hypothécaires among them the privileges of the second class and to the chirographaires the privileges of the third class.

Even so, as the syndics themselves admitted, an insufficient number of creditors were able to profit from the decision of 21 August 1765; too few had been able to provide the necessary deposit. For this
reason when, by 1768, the syndics gained a further approximately 875,000 livres from sales in Paris and contracts worth hundreds of thousands of livres from Louisiana, they decided to hold another distribution which would be quite different from the first. Most of the privileged creditors under the jurisdictions of the Parlements of Paris, Aix, and Toulouse had by this time been repaid, and it was a question of providing for the second and third class of creditors, especially those who had not been able to raise the deposit required in 1765 to 1767.

On 13 January 1768, the syndics therefore decided to extend their decisions of 21 August 1765 and 13 March 1767 to those creditors, and apparently they meant the creditors under the jurisdictions named, who had not been able to profit from them earlier. Thus, according to the terms of the second distribution, the syndics would exempt the hypothécaires whose hypothèque dated from before 1 May 1761 from the necessity of offering a deposit, provided they took the necessary oath that they had not already received the money being offered to them and were not acting on behalf of the Jesuits. The syndics also decided to repay a second quarter of their capital to hypothécaires whose hypothèque dated from before 1 January 1759. As for the chirographaires, the distribution of ten percent offered in 1765 was now extended to those creditors of the three jurisdictions of Paris, Aix, and Toulouse who had not been able to profit from it before. None of the members of this class would have to pay a deposit. This legislation was extended to include the creditors in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Dijon and another group of creditors from Provence by a decision of the syndics of 2 September 1768. In the meantime, the crown had extended the period in which the creditors could make their claims until the end of 1768.
The third distribution took place after the syndics met on 1 September 1769. They still had many contracts of rentes and 240,850 livres produced by the sale of houses near the professed house in Paris, and it was these receipts which made the third distribution possible. By now the syndics had received the ordre made up for Parlement of Bordeaux and a supplement from Provence, with the result that they now decided to extend their earlier decisions to include all the creditors who had submitted their claims to or who lived in the territory of the Parlements of Paris, Aix, Toulouse, Dijon, and Bordeaux.

In addition, the syndics decided to repay the rest of their capital to those creditors who held an hypothèque dating from before 1 January 1750 and who had already received half their capital. In this case, the creditors in question were to receive one quarter of their payment in cash and the other quarter in contracts. The syndics would also pay a quarter of their capital to those creditors whose hypothèque dated from 1 January 1750 to 31 December 1758, but the payment would be made in contracts, not in specie. Any creditor eligible to be repaid under this clause who wished to wait to be repaid in cash could do so. There is no way of determining how many did. The hypothécaires whose hypothèque dated from after 30 April 1761, and who until now had been prevented from receiving the first quarter of their claims by being unable to provide a deposit, were now permitted to receive a quarter of their capital on condition that they paid a fifth of it as a deposit.

The syndics repeated the rule that where possible the provincial syndics should repay their own creditors and recognized that if the provincial syndics did not have enough money, the Séquestre of the Union in Paris would make up the difference. Because their caisse
was completely empty, the creditors of the Parlement of Toulouse were to be paid by the Séquestre Général of Paris.

Although the syndics of the Union had probably received the ordres made up by the Parlements of Dauphiné and Normandy before they authorized the third distribution to take place, it is almost certain that the creditors from these parts of France were excluded from it. Like the creditors of Brittany, whose ordre was completed in 1771, and individual creditors from Metz, Pau, and Rousillon, who seem to have been included in the ordre of the Parlement of Paris at the last minute, they waited until the syndics published the Ordre Général and distributed money or contracts on the basis of it.

When they presented the Ordre Général to the general assembly of the Union on 13 August 1772, the syndics explained several matters which they had not previously made clear. They were unable to state how many creditors had so far been reimbursed or how much the creditors had received, but they did explain how they intended to reimburse the members of the Union in the future. The Ordre Général was made up of the individual ordres which the syndics had prepared for the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris and which other syndics had prepared for the Parlements of Toulouse, Aix, Dijon, Bordeaux, Dauphiné, Normandy, and Brittany. Creditors from Flanders, Alsace, Lorraine, Metz, Pau, Perpignan, Franche-Comté, and Venaissin, except for those who were creditors of the Jesuit order as a whole, would be provided for, but not normally by the syndics of the Union in Paris. To the creditors whose names appeared in the Ordre Général, the syndics explained that the second class of creditors, the hypothécaires, should be repaid from money produced by the sale of real property or, if this were not enough, from the sale of movable property. The third class of creditors, the chirographaires, should be repaid from money
produced by the sale of movable property, or mobilier. So far as we can determine, if there were any privileged creditors who had not yet been reimbursed, they were to be paid from either source. The holders of rentes viagères were regarded either as hypothécaires or chirographaires depending on the nature of their original claim. The syndics gave official sanction to the distributions which had already taken place but also put an end to them. They relieved all creditors of the responsibility of offering a security or bond before they could be reimbursed, and they ordered a fourth distribution to take place, which was to be the first distribution based on the Ordre Général of 1772.

It was not an easy thing for the syndics to organize a distribution in 1772 because, at the time, neither they nor the provincial syndics possessed much money. The Paris syndics had already spent the approximately three million livres in cash which they had received on the earlier distributions and on the expenses of the Union. Of the more than one million livres raised by the provincial syndics before 1790, little if any seems to have been available in 1772. All that the Paris syndics possessed at the time were the promises of the crown or of wealthy people who had bought property and not yet paid for it, contracts on the aides et gabelles, contracts on property in Louisiana, and the expectation of contracts from the Compagnie des Indes once the Lavaur affair was finally settled. All promissory notes and contracts apparently produced interest of four or five percent per year. Despite the circumstances, the syndics nevertheless decided to declare a fourth distribution.

From their remaining cash, they would pay the capital, interest, and costs of any privileged creditor in the Ordre Général who had not yet been repaid. They would pay the remaining unpaid créanciers
hypothécaires according to their place in the official list. The first would be paid from the cash that the syndics had in their caisse, and to insure that there should be as much as possible, the syndics made available 150,000 livres of the 200,000 livres which until this year they had held in reserve. When the specie was exhausted, the hypothécaires were to be offered, with the right to refuse, either the various contracts on rentes or colonial sales which the syndics held or else promissory notes on people or institutions which had not yet paid for real property they had bought or on real property which the union had not yet been able to sell.

The chirographaires were to be paid up to thirty-five percent of their capital from the sale of movable property and so were any hypothécaires whose hypothèque dated from after 1758 and who had not yet received as much as thirty-five percent of their capital. Those hypothécaires who held rentes were also to be paid up to thirty-five percent of their interest or arrears. In the event that there was not enough money to pay such people, they were to be offered contracts on unsold movable property if they were willing to accept such contracts.

All creditors were given time in which to decide whether to accept contracts or promissory notes or whether to wait until they could be paid cash. They were also required to give proof that the Jesuits' debts to them had been contracted before 13 or 23 April 1762. All creditors who had not already done so were required to swear oaths to a commissioner of the Parlement of Paris that the amount listed in the Ordre was indeed due to them and that they had not yet been repaid. Creditors in the list prepared by the syndics of the Parlement of Paris would be paid interest on their claims from the day on which they
made their demand and presented their titles to the syndics of Paris. 108

From 1772 on, the avowed first aim of the syndics in repaying the creditors was to satisfy the second class in the Ordre, the hypothécaires. On 11 March 1773, the syndics decided to repay all the principal, arrears, or interest of the creditors of this class whose hypothèque dated from before 1 January 1753. They would be paid half in cash and half in contracts coming from sales in Louisiana. The creditors whose hypothèque dated from 1 January 1753 to April 1760 might also be fully repaid, but in contracts only. Any creditor could refuse to accept payment in contracts and wait to be repaid in cash. On 13 August 1774, the syndics allowed creditors whose hypothèque dated from the period up to, but probably not including, 1758 to be repaid the rest of their capital, interest or arrears, and costs. They would be paid half in money and half in contracts or promissory notes. Again, the creditors had the option of refusing to be repaid in contracts, and we do not know how many used it. 109

So far, because of our lack of knowledge on the one hand of the amounts of money received and paid by the provincial syndics or of the periods of their receipts and distributions, and, on the other, of the precise number of creditors involved in the early distributions, it has not been possible to estimate how many creditors had been repaid or how much the creditors had received from the first three distributions. Even though we knew approximately how much money the syndics in Paris had received by certain dates, 110 it was equally impossible to estimate how much of this money was spent on actual repayments and how much on the administrative expenses of the Union. But with the aid of the Ordre Général, it is possible to estimate approximately how many of the creditors should have been repaid and how much money or its equivalent in contracts or promissory notes they should have received in capital
by the end of 1774.

By this time, all the privileged creditors should have been completely repaid and all the hypothécaires whose hypothèques dated from no later than the end of 1757 should have been completely repaid in cash and contracts. All other creditors, whether hypothécaires, or chirographaires, and regardless of whether they were in the second, third, or fourth class, should have been repaid at least thirty-five percent of their capital if they were willing to accept contracts in place of money. If we add together the totals claimed by the privileged creditors and by the hypothécaires whose hypothèques date from no later than the end of 1757, and if we also add thirty-five percent of the capital claimed by the remaining members of the second, third, and fourth classes, we find that by the end of 1774, the syndics had authorized the repayment of between three and three and a half million livres in capital to all classes of creditors. This meant that 122 creditors of the first class and about 280 creditors from the second class should have been completely repaid. A further nearly one thousand creditors were eligible to receive at least thirty-five percent of their capital.

If we take into account the likelihood that some creditors refused to be paid in contracts and that others could not produce the evidence which the syndics required, this estimate is similar to the one made by the royal council in October 1774. Although it may have been using equally hypothetical means of calculation, the council then stated that three million livres of the Jesuits' debts had been repaid since the suppression in 1762. There is, of course, much room for error in such calculations, but one thing is clear. Because of the limited resources on which the syndics could draw, it is unlikely that the syndics had repaid much more than four million livres by the end of
1774, and probable that they had not repaid more than three.  

The syndics of the Union in Paris seem to have been more fortunate in the following decade. The sale of property in Lyon and the settling of the Lavaur affair, as well as the receipt of money paid for property in Martinique all made it possible to include more creditors and especially more hypothécaires in succeeding distributions. On 18 May 1775, the syndics decided to repay all the hypothécaires whose hypothèques dated from the period up to 12 November 1759, and on 5 September 1772, they decided to pay a further fifteen percent of their capital to the hypothécaires whose hypothèque dated from the period after 12 November 1759, and to all members of the third and fourth classes who had not yet received fifty percent of their capital. On 31 January 1779, the syndics continued the complete repayment of hypothécaires up to those whose hypothèque was earlier than 2 April 1760. Then, on 8 March of the same year, the syndics decided that the hypothécaires of 1 April 1760 to 31 March 1762 should be allowed, if they wished, to be entirely repaid in promissory notes on buyers of Jesuit property who had not yet paid for the property they had bought. Such promissory notes bore a five percent interest per annum. Finally, on 7 December 1785, the syndics made a similar arrangement for the remaining hypothécaires of 1 April 1762 to 13 April 1762.

After this, the problem was to repay the chirographaires of the third and fourth classes. A week after they had settled the affairs of the hypothécaires, the syndics decided to repay the chirographaires a further fifteen percent of their capital in a mixture of cash and contracts. By 1788, the syndics had received money coming from the sale of property in Cayenne as well as from Bronod's estate and were able to continue making payments. They offered the unpaid members of both the third and fourth classes a further fifteen percent of their
capital, apparently in cash, and as a result could claim to have repaid eighty percent of the chirographaires' capital. They then resorted to an expedient for which they were to be criticized two years later. They offered the last twenty percent of their capital to creditors claiming a total of 400 livres or less, but only on condition that the creditors would abandon their right to any interest or costs. A short time later, they extended this right to people who claimed capital not exceeding 1,200 livres. This arrangement could have applied to just over 500 creditors, and apparently many of them took advantage of it. It is not surprising, however, that a critic of the Union was able, in 1790, to describe this as an attempt on the part of the syndics to avoid paying interests and costs that were legitimately due.

Although our knowledge about the repayment of the creditors is largely theoretical because it is based on the general statements made at various times by the officials of the Union, and occasionally by other officials, we are able to consider how the theory actually worked in one case. It is the case of Plumard de Rieux, one of Lavalette's creditors of the second class, whose hypothèque dated from 8 January 1762. So far as we can follow this case, it confirms all that the syndics stated or intended to happen concerning the various distributions.

De Rieux had lent a sum of 34,000 livres to Lavalette. On 11 January 1766, apparently in accordance with the decision of the syndics of 21 August 1765, he received 8,500 livres, or twenty-five percent of his capital in cash from the syndics. On 22 July 1768, the claim was transferred to an heir of de Rieux, a Monsieur Dangueil, with 25,500 livres in capital still to be repaid. After 22 July 1768, the unpaid balance collected interest of four percent per year, although a tenth of that interest and a tenth of that tenth were periodically withheld. On 28 April 1774, in accordance with the deliberations of the syndics of
August 1772, Dangueil received a payment of 3,400 livres, or a further ten percent of de Rieux's capital. In this way, the creditor in question was repaid the minimum thirty-five percent of his principal as ordered by the deliberation of 1772. Then, on 28 October 1776, Dangueil received another 5,100 livres or fifteen percent of the capital, and this was in accordance with the syndics' decision of 5 September 1776 to pay a further fifteen percent to the creditors of the second class whose hypothèque dated from after 12 November 1759 and to all other creditors of the third and fourth classes. Thus, by 1 July 1780 there remained to be paid to the heirs of Dangueil a principal sum of 17,000 livres, or half the capital once lent to the Jesuits, and 11,441 livres in interest accumulated since 1768. The total amount which the heirs claimed in 1780 was thus 28,441 livres.122

After the syndics' deliberation of 8 March 1780, the heirs decided to accept the final payment in promissory notes, and it happened that their notes were on the 400,000 livres which the king had not yet paid for the professed house in Paris. We know about this case because one of the heirs, Bellanger, a conseiller d'État, appealed to the crown for payment of the remaining principal. He was told that he would need a special authorization from the syndics of the Union in order to be paid more than just the interest on his promissory note, and that, in any case, he could not be repaid before 1784. We do not know whether Bellanger ever received the remaining capital, though he probably continued to receive interest on his note until 1790.123

The officials of the Union remained responsible for the creditors' affairs right up to 1790 when the Revolutionaries began to make new arrangements for the sale of former Jesuit property and for the repayment of the remaining creditors of the Jesuits.124 In that year, Rouhette gave the report of his own and other officials' work which has
formed the basis of much of this chapter. It contains what may be regarded as the officials' final statement concerning the repayment of the creditors.

No new decisions were made after 1788, but by 1790, the syndics in Paris and the provinces had repaid all the privileged creditors and all the hypothécaires, or holders of secured debts, all their capital, interest or arrears, and legal costs. The syndics had also repaid all the capital, but not the interest or costs, of the chirographaires, or holders of unsecured debts, who had originally claimed less than 1,200 livres. The rest of the chirographaires of the third and fourth classes had received eighty percent of their capital, but not of their interest or costs. In a very few instances, legal hearings involving creditors were still going on, but Rouhette was sure they would conclude in a manner satisfactory to the creditors. At the same time, Rouhette admitted that the Union still owed three million livres in payment of capital, interest, and costs to members of the third and fourth class of creditors, and in administrative expenses.125

It is not easy to translate Rouhette's remarks into a precise account of what the officials had done. He had undoubtedly been referring to the creditors whose names appeared in the Ordre Général, and whom we have studied, when he spoke of the repayments that had been made. By comparing his statement with the recognized claims in the Ordre Général, we may conclude that the Union had undertaken to repay capital of at least 143,068 livres to the privileged creditors, 4,184,694 livres to the second class of creditors, and 2,200,000 livres to the third and fourth classes.126 Altogether, all classes should have been repaid between six and six and one-half million livres in capital. Payments, as we have noted, were made in a mixture of cash,
contracts, and promissory notes. Even allowing for some creditors' refusal to accept contracts or notes, the inability of some to substantiate their claims, and the probable disappearance of others, it is indeed likely that the capital sum of between six and six and one-half million livres had been repaid to the creditors of the Jesuits by 1790. At the same time, the syndics of the Union appear to have left unpaid at least 300,000 livres of the capital owed to the third and fourth classes.127

On the other hand, Rouhette, who had earlier implied that the Union had received approximately nine and one-half million livres in cash, contracts, and promissory notes,128 admitted that the Union still owed, in addition, a further two and one-half million livres in interest payments and legal costs as well as in administrative expenses. The significance of this fact is obvious. While, as Rouhette had indicated, the Union had repaid capital of between six and six and one-half million livres to the creditors and had promised to pay a further 300,000 livres remaining to be paid of their capital to the chirographaires, it had also paid or undertaken to pay a further six to six and one-half million livres in interest or arrears, legal cost, and operating expenses of the Union. Although we know that the Union's expenses consisted of salaries for the officials in Paris and the provinces and for their representatives in the colonies, and of payments such as the one to the Econome Général, it is impossible to separate the creditors' interest payments and legal costs from the Union's administrative expenses. That may not matter. Both were, after all, part of the cost of the confiscation of Jesuit property, its sale, and the repayment of the creditors. From any point of view, the business of repaying the creditors had been an extremely expensive one.
Why had it been so expensive? A critic of the Union, Desenne, accused the syndics of inactivity, and called them scoundrels who desired only to perpetuate the existence of the Union, in order to perpetuate the payment of their own salaries. But this explanation is unsatisfactory for two reasons. For one thing, the syndics of the Union do not appear to have received their salaries in the last years of the Union's existence. For another, they seem to have been extremely busy during most of their twenty-nine years in office. To this fact, the work described in this chapter is a testimony.

It is as we review its work that another explanation for the cost of this administration becomes apparent. Rather than being too inactive, too dilatory, and too concerned about their own salaries, the officials of the Union had been just the reverse. They had done too many things for the Union, and they had perhaps even cared too little about their own salaries. They had spent months selling the property to which they were entitled, not because they wanted the process to be slow but because they meticulously performed all the tasks and submitted to all the legal restraints required in carrying out such sales. It took them years to prepare the **Ordre Général** of the creditors, and a glance at the **Ordre** explains why: every claim was examined at a variety of levels before a creditor could have his name included in the **Ordre**, even if he claimed only forty **sous**. Finally, all the claims were laboriously worked into a detailed list which may have been a necessary instrument for repaying creditors but was certainly a testimony to the officials' willingness to be fair to even the meanest creditor.

And if it took years to prepare the **Ordre**, it took decades to repay the major creditors. Why? Desenne said the syndics were irresponsibly slow. But perhaps they were just too conscientiously attentive to detail. Surely it would have been easier, when money became avail-
able, to appease the most clamorous of the creditors in the way that Sacy or Gatin had done, than to follow rigorously the list of creditors in the Ordre. But follow the Ordre the officials did, and it made them unpopular with at least some of the creditors whose names came at the end of the list. 132

The syndics' conscientiousness about detail impeded their work. But it was not the only development which had prevented them from acquiring the necessary money and repaying the creditors sooner. The syndics' powers to act had also always been excessively limited by other people who were working for other interests. The Parlement's men had made the major initial seizures of property. And the Parlement, following its policy of providing for the former Jesuit colleges and their new administrators before any of the other claimants to Jesuit property, had seen to it that the Union of Creditors received only that small amount of property which could not be classified as educational property. The syndics had had to wait to know the Parlement's pleasure before they could sell the property which they were allotted. Even the sales were controlled by the Parlement.

Then the crown and the city of Paris decided to buy the most valuable property held by the creditors. But they either never paid for it or else paid in contracts which were difficult or impossible to convert into money. At every turn, officials of the royal government, from Sartine to the Controlleur des Bons d'Etat, tried to take what they could from the Union. Given the limitations on the syndics' powers, the Parlement's proclivity to favour the new administrators of Jesuit colleges when it decided the fate of Jesuit property in the first years of the confiscation, and the policies of other public authorities, the syndics' conduct is entirely understandable. It is not surprising that the syndics took so long to repay the creditors so little of their
capital and interest. In the circumstances, the surprising thing is that the syndics managed to repay as much of the capital and interest as they did.

Could things have happened in any other way? Certainly, the officials of the Union had not created the Union according to a whim, but had attempted to follow legal precedent as they and the Parlement understood it. Similarly, even the Parlement, as it carried out its early policy of keeping whatever property it could for the colleges, or the royal officials, as they later took whatever property they could for the crown, were performing respectable functions.

Perhaps the problem was a far larger one than Desenne or Rouhette or any other contemporaries appreciated. Perhaps the fault lay in making the syndics responsible to a particularist court, allowing them to be at the mercy of royal officials seeking property for the crown, and in obliging them to adopt the slow and tedious business practices traditionally used by syndics serving unions of creditors. This is to suggest that it was the entire system of doing business under the old régime that was at fault. We shall consider this point again as we study the work of the Econome Général du Clergé.
Chapter VI The King's men

I The Econome Général

The Parlement of Paris had created the offices of most of the men who administered Jesuit property after the seizure of that property in April 1762. There was one administrator whom members of the Parlement named in conjunction with members of the king's council, and the man they chose already held a royal appointment. The Econome Général du Clergé named in the lettres patentes of 2 February 1763 to administer the benefices attached to the Jesuit colleges and to pay Jesuit pensions had long administered ecclesiastical property for the crown. His office had developed in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, as the king had sought to increase his control over the revenues from vacant consistorial benefices in his nomination.

Traditionally, the crown had applied the régale, or fruits of its vacant benefices, to pious works, of which the most important had been the maintenance of the Sainte Chapelle and the payment of the initial expense of incoming benefice-holders, especially bishops. But although the crown had developed standard uses for the régale it was a long time before it developed a standard means of administering it. In the early medieval period, the benefices had usually been held in time of vacancy by the clerks who were likely to succeed to them. But even in the Carolingian period, the crown had tried to use royal rather than ecclesiastical officials to administer the benefices. For most of the medieval and early modern periods, the crown had relied on existing royal officials, such as the bailiffs, seneschals, or receivers of the
Royal Domain to collect the régale and send it to the Chamber of Accounts. ³

In the fourteenth or early fifteenth century there developed a short-lived system of independent diocesan économès séquestres responsible to the crown for the administration of vacant benefices in the king's nomination. The clergy regarded them with distrust and in 1417 Charles VI suppressed them. Indeed, we know more about their suppression than their creation or their work. ⁴ It was left to Henri III to try to revive them in 1578. But again the clergy feared them, and just two years later, the Assembly of Mélun gained their suppression. The administration of vacant benefices was again resumed by existing local officials. ⁵

These officials might have continued to administer the vacant royal benefices indefinitely had not the crown begun to use the régale for an additional purpose and found the revenues raised by the bailiffs, seneschals, and receivers of the Royal Domain inadequate. ⁶ The new purpose was the payment of gratifications and pensions to New Converts, or Protestants who had abjured their faith and become Catholics. The clergy had begun as early as 1598 to vote regular allowances to the New Converts and in 1652 the Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement had established a special fund to supplement the clergy's allowance. By 1676, these funds had proved insufficient, and Louis XIV had created the Caisse des Conversions, whose sole purpose was to provide money with which to pay pensions to converted Protestants. Initially, the Caisse was supported by the revenues of the Abbeys of Cluny and Saint Germain. Then in July and November 1677, the crown added one-third of the revenue derived from the vacant royal benefices to the Caisse. It was this additional revenue which was to be known as the Tiers des Economats. ⁷
The first head of the Caisse was Pellison-Fontanier, and he remained in charge of it until his death in 1693. In spite of the co-operation which Pellison received from royal officials and prelates throughout the kingdom in collecting the money, and in spite of the general efficiency of the whole operation, the resources of the Caisse remained insufficient to pay all the pensions required by the New Converts. It was probably for this reason that in 1691, Louis XIV sought to improve the administration of vacant benefices in his nomination and thus to increase the Tiers. In December of that year, he issued an edict ordering the creation in every diocese of royal officials who were to be known as conseillers économés séquestres, and who were to be responsible for the benefices in question. This time, the experiment, after shaky beginnings, was to lead to the establishment of a centralized royal administration of benefices in the king's nomination. The new administration, known as the Economats, was to last for a century and to be dismantled only by the Revolution.

Initially, the conseillers économés séquestres, who were responsible to the royal judges having jurisdiction over the property, were to administer the temporal possessions of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbeys, chapels, and conventual priories in the king's nomination, as well as any other benefices which were sequestered. The edict prescribed very carefully exactly how the économés séquestres were to look after the property in their charge. They were to receive all the revenues from a vacant benefice until the new holder of the benefice was named. They were to take all the money and produce owed to the crown by existing receivers and leaseholders and to renew old leases and constitute new ones to ensure the most economic administration of the property possible. To this end, the crown ordered present holders
of leases and present administrators to hand over the relevant papers pertaining to their leases and administration to the new officials.

The latter were thus made responsible for all but one aspect of the administration of the royal benefices. It was the heirs of the previous benefice-holder who were responsible for immediate repairs to the benefice. Repairs which became necessary in the course of the vacancy were to be overseen by the économés séquestres, who would make arrangements with the substitute of the Procureur Général in the local bailliage or sénéchaussée to have the repairs made by local workers.

Other clauses of the edict gave the économés séquestres control over the tithes not yet collected on the property, and charged them with the responsibility for seeing that divine service was conducted and alms, pensions for religious, décimes, and other taxes were paid. They were to keep strict accounts and to submit them regularly, in the case of the vacant benefices, to the judges of the territory in which the benefices were located, and, in the case of sequestered benefices, to the judge who had ordered the sequestration. They were to turn over the profit of their administration to specially named royal officials.

The edict provided that the économés séquestres should receive two sols per livre, or ten percent, of their total receipts, and from this amount they were to pay all the expenses of their administration as well as their own salaries. They were also allowed a lump sum of 500 livres a year, to be paid in two instalments, which constituted a kind of security on which they could draw at the discretion of the farmers of the Royal Domain. They were exempt from the responsibility of lodging soldiers and paying the taille. In the following year, the Conseil d'État issued an arrêt limiting the amount of the security which the économés séquestres were required to post, and in 1696, it
ordered that, on the authority of the intendants of the generalities, the économes séquestres should use money coming from the sale of deceased benefice-holders' movable property to pay for repairs to benefices. 12

In many cases, the dioceses made the appointment of the new royal officials, who were either individuals operating within particular dioceses or companies assuming responsibility for a whole province. 13

By the crown's own admission, the économes séquestres functioned well, and it was primarily a need for revenue rather than a dissatisfaction with the network of économes séquestres which in October 1703 led the crown to create new offices of contrôleurs of the économes séquestres in every diocese. The controllers, as their name suggests, were to audit the économes séquestres' accounts of their receipts from leases of property and their expenditures for various charges and repairs. The controllers were to be paid half the amount which the économes séquestres had been allowed in 1691, one sol per livre, or five percent of their revenue. 14

In 1707, the crown attempted to make more money by increasing the number of économes séquestres and their controllers in each diocese to three. But in 1708, this system having proved unworkable, the number was reduced to two of each office in each diocese. 15 Since the new officials received the same commission as the old, the costs of administration after 1708 were reckoned at six sols per livre, or thirty percent, of all the revenue collected. 16

This was the arrangement which lasted until 1714. The only significant developments of the interim period occurred in 1712, when the économes séquestres and their controllers were allowed a total of eighteen deniers per livre, or seven and a half percent of the money raised by the sale of deceased benefice-holders' movable property, and the intendants of the generalities became responsible for scrutinizing
the accounts of both the économes séquestres and their controllers. 17

By November 1714, the crown found this greatly enlarged network of économes séquestres and their controllers unproductive and unnecessarily expensive. The War of the Spanish Succession, and the consequent need for the immediate revenue which the sale of these offices produced, had come to an end. And the network of officials had failed to increase the amount of the Tiers des Économats allotted to the Caisse des Conversions. The crown therefore suppressed the entire system of économes séquestres and their controllers, and in its place established a new, centralized administration headed by two counsellors and secretaries of the king, Antoine Barrangue and Charles Boucher. In future, these two men were to be responsible for the administration of all the royal benefices in the kingdom. 18

Nor was the appointment of two men to take the place of many économes séquestres the only kind of centralization that had occurred. Since 1700, Boucher had been charged with the administration of confiscated Huguenot property under Henri d'Aguesseau, father of the famous chancellor and successor to Pellison at the Caisse des Conversions. 19 Hence, in 1714, the two administrations converged in fact, if not yet in theory, in the person of one of their administrators. 20

Boucher and Barrangue were charged with exactly the same responsibilities as the individual diocesan économes séquestres had had since 1691. They had a representative or préposé in each diocese, who helped them to acquit their responsibility for leasing the property and administering all the revenue thus collected. The new économes séquestres were responsible for the conduct of their representatives, and, thus, for all the vacant royal benefices in the kingdom. They received the same six sols per livre, or thirty percent, of all the
money collected, in the same way as their predecessors had done. They were required to hand over four of the six **sols** to the crown, which would use them to reimburse the previous office holders and to pay off the debts incurred by the earlier **économes séquestres**. The **économes séquestres** were specifically charged to see to it that the **Tiers** destined for pensions for New Converts should be paid to the receiver of the **Economat**, who was at this time Petit le Marcenou. Once again, they were to present the accounts of their administration of individual benefices to the intendants of the generalities in which the property was found. They were also to give a yearly account of all their activities to the **Conseil d'Etat** before they could receive their own payment. In the following year, they were granted a portion of the revenue raised by the sale of movable property belonging to former benefice-holders.

It is doubtful whether the new administration was any more efficient than the old. In 1716, Doyot de Choloy was named to replace Barrangue and Barrangue was charged to hand over all his accounts and pay his arrears. In the meantime, a special commission had been appointed to investigate Boucher's administration of Protestant property. No action was taken against either Barrangue or Boucher, and, for the time being, the latter remained in office. Soon after Doyot de Choloy replaced Barrangue, Boucher and Doyot de Choloy acquired a third, though apparently inactive, partner, Sebastien Marchal de Sainscy, the Receiver of the Domain and **Bois** of Metz.

Two important developments occurred in 1721. On 12 August, the **Conseil d'Etat** put an end to the payment of six **sols** per **livre** to the **économes séquestres**, making it clear that the repayment of the officials of the period before 1714 was now at an end. In place of the six **sols**
per livre, the économes séquestres were now, once again, to take two sols per livre, or ten percent, from their total receipts with which to pay their expenses and salaries.  

And on 10 October, it named La Vergne de Tressan, Bishop of Nantes, Archbishop of Rouen, and Grand Aumônier of the regent to be Director of the Economats as well as of the administration of Protestant property. Then, on 22 May 1722, following the death of Doyot de Choloy, Sebastien Marchel de Sainscy became an active partner of Boucher and with him assumed the responsibilities for the administration of the royal benefices.

It was only in 1724 that the crown acted against Boucher, whose accounts it found to be in disorder. On 22 February, Boucher, who had previously been replaced as administrator of Protestant property, was relieved of his functions as économ sequestre as well. At the same time, Marcenou, whose administration had been equally incompetent, was replaced as receiver of the Economats. It was Sebastien Marchal who now assumed the functions of sole économ sequestre and became at the same time receiver of the Economats. Thereafter, the économ sequestre, or Economé Général du Clergé, as he came to be called, would be responsible for receiving not only the revenue from vacant benefices in the king's nomination, but also that revenue which came from confiscated Huguenot property. From this revenue he paid the gifts and pensions granted by the king to New Converts, and the Caisse des Conversions ceased to function. In carrying out these tasks he was to be responsible to the Director of the Economats, La Vergne de Tressan. Now, both in theory and in fact, the administration was centralized. The administration of vacant benefices providing the Tiers des Economats, the administration of confiscated Protestant property, and the payment of royal pensions to New Converts was con-
centrated in a single, centralized administrative body headed by the \textit{Econome Général du Clergé}, under the Director of the \textit{Economats}. In the future, the chief administrators would change very little. La Vergne de Tressan remained director until 1733, when he was replaced by Count de Félix du Muy. Du Muy remained in office at least until 1746, and perhaps even until about 1763, when Jarente de la Bruyère, the Bishop of Orléans, assumed the position. Jarente de la Bruyère was replaced at some time before 1787 by Feydeau de Brou, a \textit{conseiller d'etat}, who remained in office until 1789. The office of \textit{Econome Général} remained in the possession of Sebastien Marchal de Sainscy or one of his direct descendants for the whole period from 1724 to 1787.

From the beginning of the new regime, the \textit{Conseil d'Etat} sought to encourage the \textit{Econome Général} to present his accounts in a regular fashion. It immediately told not only Boucher and the heirs of Doyot de Choloy, but also Marchal himself, who had been in office only two years, to submit all their accounts to Monseigneur Tressan. That this was not done is clear, and it was probably Marchal's slowness in submitting the accounts of his predecessors that explains the establishment in 1734 of a special, permanent commission of the \textit{Conseil d'Etat} to judge the affairs and the accounts of the \textit{Economats} and the administration of Protestant property. The Commission of the \textit{Economats} was to continue to judge the accounts of the \textit{Econome Général du Clergé} until 1787.

Throughout the period from the appointment of Sebastien Marchal de Sainscy as \textit{Econome Général} in 1724 until the duties of the \textit{Econome Général} were enlarged to include the administration of Jesuit benefices in 1763, the functions of this official remained more or less the same.
He carried out his administration in the way laid down by the earlier edict, especially that of 1691. He continued to receive ten percent of his receipts of revenue coming from vacant benefices in the king's nomination, and he used the money to pay his expenses and commission. He took a further seven and a half percent of the money raised by the sale of movable property formerly belonging to a deceased benefice-holder, and after 1746 received five percent of this amount, as well as three deniers per livre of the money left by the previous office holder. But he was forbidden to take any of the revenue coming from confiscated Huguenot property or given in pensions to New Converts, which he remained responsible for paying. He also had to turn over the two-thirds of the revenue coming from royal benefices which was not to be used for New Converts' pensions to the Royal Treasury. After 1741, he had to arrange to have repairs to benefices carried out, after the crown had given its approval. He continued to have a representative in each diocese and to be responsible for whatever that representative did.

Because of a general lack of evidence, and because, in the accounts which have survived, no receipts or expenditures remain constant or even nearly constant from one year to the next, it is difficult to determine precisely the volume of business transacted by the Econome Général in the period before 1763. This much we do know: during the five years from 1733 to 1737, the period for which the most complete set of accounts exists, and which appears to be a typical period, the Econome Général received a total of 204,000 livres, or an average of 40,800 livres a year from the leases on Protestant property, and a total of 213,745 livres, or an average of 42,749 livres a year from the Tiers des Economats. Considered altogether, the revenues destined
for the payment of New Converts' pensions amounted to a total of 417,745 livres 5 sols 7 deniers, or an average of 83,549 livres 1 sol 1 denier a year for this period. From this amount, the Econome Général in fact paid a total of 405,917 livres, or an annual average of 81,183 livres 8 sols in pensions and alms to New Converts in the same period. It is not clear what happened to the nearly 12,000 livres collected for pensions but not spent on them.  

The administration of revenue destined for the payment of pensions and gifts for New Converts was, of course, only one of the Econome Général's functions. He was also required to receive and pay to the crown the other two-thirds of the revenue coming from the vacant benefices and all the revenue coming from certain abbeys in the king's control. In fact, the Econome Général received a total of 962,519 livres 7 sols 8 deniers or a yearly average of 192,503 livres 17 sols 6 deniers from all the royal benefices during these five years. Of this amount he spent a total of 203,210 livres 6 deniers, or an average of 40,642 livres 1 denier a year on expenses other than the payment of pensions to New Converts. These additional expenses included the Econome Général's own commission of ten percent of the revenue from vacant royal benefices, many unspecified amounts which the crown ordered to be spent, and the incidental expenses of the whole administration.

Altogether, in 1733 to 1737, the Econome Général received a total of 1,166,591 livres 7 sols 8 deniers or an average of 233,303 livres 19 sols 6 deniers a year, from the various kinds of property he administered. Of the total amount, he spent 609,127 livres 6 deniers of an annual average of 121,825 livres 8 sols 1 denier on pensions for New Converts and other authorized expenses, including his own salary. The
remaining 557,392 livres 7 sols 2 deniers, or yearly average of 111,478 livres 9 sols 5 deniers, which was nearly half of all the revenue he collected, was to be carried over as part of his receipts from one year to the next and was apparently eventually to make its way to the Royal Treasury. While it is doubtful that as much money as this was handed over to the Royal Treasury, there is every reason to think that the other transactions described in the accounts of these years did occur. 45

In the meantime, during the 1720's, Sebastien Marchal had entrusted an aspect of his affairs to a dishonest secretary, Sechepeine, who apparently embezzled some of the revenue he administered. As a result, there occurred in the 1740's and 1750's the Sechepeine affair, which was probably the first sign that Marchal's accounts were not entirely in order. 46 This event did not, however, provoke the crown to remove Sebastien Marchal from office. He was by now an old man, and on 19 January 1743, the crown named Pierre Marchal to share his father's administration, and, in the event of his father's death, to assume the functions of the Econome Général alone. 47 Three years later, both father and son were replaced by a second son of Sebastien Marchal, Louis-Pierre-Sebastien Marchal de Sainscy. The new Econome Général was to share his administration with his brother-in-law, Edme-Louis Meny, a barrister in the Parlement of Paris. 48 On 16 June 1761, Louis-Pierre-Sebastien Marchal de Sainscy became sole Econome Général. 49 It was he who took responsibility for the administration of Jesuit benefices on 2 February 1763. It will be seen that his new responsibilities for the Jesuit benefices were not unlike his old ones for the royal benefices. Only in taking charge of the payment of Jesuit pensions would the Econome Général be performing new duties.
II New duties

The *lettres patentes* issued by the king on 2 February 1763 charged the *Econome Général du Clergé* with the provisional administration of all the benefices attached to the Jesuit establishments in France which had been closed during the preceding year. The stated intention of the crown in issuing these *lettres patentes* was three-fold: to provide subsistence allowances for the Jesuits, to assure the upkeep of former Jesuit colleges, and to create an administration to look after the ecclesiastical benefices attached to the colleges. The crown's emphasis appears to have been on establishing the administration.

To this end, the crown charged the *Econome Général* with the responsibility for administering the Jesuit benefices from 1 January 1763, which meant that he was to receive revenues coming from the harvests of 1762. He was authorized to receive all the money due to be paid on the Jesuit benefices after 1 July 1762, whether the money was derived from leases or farms or other kinds of financial arrangements. To make his task easier, the crown ordered that all holders of leases and other receivers of revenue coming from the property in question in the period after 1 January 1763 should pay the *Econome Général* without delay. At the same time, it enjoined him to help the leaseholders who had paid their leases to recover any revenues owed to them.

The *Econome Général* was authorized and encouraged to oversee any urgent repairs which needed to be made to buildings on Jesuit benefices. He could undertake repairs costing less than 200 *livres* without satisfying any formalities. After a royal judge had awarded the contract, the *Econome Général* could oversee repairs worth more than 200 *livres* and up to one tenth of the annual revenue of the benefice. The *lettres patentes* also explained that if the
revenues of the colleges to which the benefices belonged were insufficient to pay necessary expenses, the Econome Général should be prepared, on royal authority, to supplement the revenues of the colleges. In some instances, the colleges were still giving money to former Jesuits, but it is not clear that in making this statement, the crown had only the welfare of the Jesuits in mind. The Econome Général was to receive one sol per livre, or five percent, of his receipts for his own allowance and expenses. Although the Commission of the Economats required that he keep his accounts of the administration of Jesuit property separate from his accounts of the administration of the other property he controlled, it was clear from the beginning that the Econome Général was to administer the Jesuit benefices "in the same way" as he administered the benefices in the Economats.

A comparison with the legislation which first established the centralized Economats in 1716, and which subsequently defined the tasks of the Econome Général, reveals that the new administration was indeed an extension of the old. In only two matters were there any apparent differences. The conditions under which the Econome Général was to have repairs to benefices undertaken were more carefully defined in the legislation of February 1763 than they had been before. And the Econome Général's allowance of one sol per livre of his receipts from the Jesuit benefices was less than the two sols per livre he had been allowed on the revenue coming from the royal benefices in his control. No explanation for this change was offered. The crown may have been trying to strike a balance between the two sols per livre granted on vacant royal benefices and the lack of payment the Econome Général received from the Protestant property he administered.

Although members of the Parlement of Paris had shared the respon-
sibility for appointing the Econome Général with members of the Royal Council, the parlements' reaction to his appointment was by no means uniform. The Parlement of Paris registered the lettres patentes of 2 February on 5 February 1763, at the same time as it registered the Edict of February which governed the administration of the colleges. It clearly thought both pieces of legislation were very important.  

An anonymous writer in Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques summarized the attitude of the Parlement of Paris, stating that it was natural to place the benefices attached to Jesuit colleges en Economat as they had been rendered vacant by the extinction of the Society of Jesus in the previous year. He saw in the legislation of 2 February the crown's refusal to grant either the Jesuits or the creditors of the Jesuits any further rights to the benefices, which should now be used to support the colleges. He also regarded the legislation as an expression of the crown's own willingness to assume responsibility for providing subsistence allowances for Jesuits. 

In contrast with the Parlement of Paris, at least one provincial parlement, that of Rouen, delayed registering both pieces of legislation because it opposed the principle, which was not expressed in either piece of legislation, of expecting the colleges to pay allowances to Jesuits. Similarly, it had no confidence that the payments which the Econome Général du Clergé was supposed to make to the colleges if they should need help would in fact be made. By the end of 1763 most of the parlements had registered both royal orders, which thus became law throughout France.

During the next fourteen months, a whole series of royal legislation and legislation issued by the Parlement of Paris further defined the Econome Général's new functions. Lettres patentes granted, for the
most part, in 1763 and early 1764 confirmed the existence of most of the former Jesuit colleges and also confirmed the colleges' possession of the benefices formerly attached to them. Most of the colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris were to assume control of their benefices in 1766 or 1767, when the Econome Général's administration would end. In return for relinquishing the benefices, the Econome Général was supposed to receive an annual payment from the colleges, starting in the year after they took control of the benefices. From the beginning, then, it was made clear that the Econome Général's administration of Jesuit benefices was intended to be temporary. 8

In March 1763, the Parlement of Paris passed an arrêt requiring that henceforth the Econome Général should pay the décimes due on the Jesuit property which he administered before he met any other obligations relating to it. 9 In April, the crown authorized the Econome Général to create new leases on Jesuit benefices in the place of the uneconomic old ones presently existing. In cases where he deemed it economically advantageous to do so, the royal legislation granted him the right to make baux à ferme for periods longer than the usual three years, and to sell these to the highest bidder, who would then assume control of his benefice or benefices no earlier than 1 January 1764. 10

In June, at the request of Marchal de Sainscy, the Royal Council passed two arrêts which were to be renewed annually for at least three years. One arrêt postponed for a year all legal proceedings involving Jesuit benefices, while the other immediately exempted one category of proceeding from the provisions of the first arrêt and gave the intendants the sole right to judge conflicts between leaseholders of their generalities and the Econome Général du Clergé. 11 And, in July, the Parlement of Paris, acting on Marchal's request, ordered that all accounts,
records, and other information about the revenue from the benefices which were presently held by court-appointed économies or by clerks of the bailliages and sénéchaussées should be handed over to Marchal or his diocesan representatives.\textsuperscript{12}

Then, in November, the crown again took up the matter of the repairs which many of the buildings on Jesuit benefices required. It extended the provisions of the lettres patentes of the previous February, and authorized virtually any repairs that would enhance the value of the benefices and thereby permit the Econome Général of the bureaux of administration of the colleges' which would eventually control the benefices, to charge higher leases for them. In order to raise the money to pay for these additional repairs, the lettres patentes of 21 November authorized the Econome Général du Clergé to borrow up to 150,000 livres from the Union of Creditors of the Jesuits.\textsuperscript{13}

The lettres patentes of both 2 February and 21 November 1763 were reconfirmed by another set of lettres patentes issued in February 1764. On this occasion, the question which provoked royal intervention was the rôle of the économies séquestres appointed by the bailliages and sénéchaussées to administer Jesuit property in the period before February 1763. The crown now ordered these officials to conform to the provisions of the legislation of the previous February and November by handing over all the accounts of their administration of Jesuit benefices and any surplus revenue they had collected from the benefices to the Econome Général.\textsuperscript{14}

Finally, on 2 April 1764, the king specified precisely what rôle the Econome Général du Clergé should play in the administration of the pensions to be paid to former Jesuits.\textsuperscript{15} Before February 1763, the subsistence allowances had been paid by the économies séquestres
appointed by the bailliages or sénéchaussées. Or, if their revenues had been insufficient, the allowances had been paid by the Econome Séquestre of Paris. By removing the benefices from the control of these officials in February 1763, the crown had altered the arrangement and asserted that the Econome Général du Clergé should pay Jesuit allowances in the future. But because it was some time before he received the necessary money from the provinces, the initial responsibility for finding the money for him to use to pay the pensions had fallen to the crown.

What the crown did in April 1764 was to recognize that granting the Jesuits regular pensions which had begun to fall due in 1763 had made it necessary to rationalize the payment of these pensions. What was more natural than to select as its agent the Econome Général du Clergé, who already administered the benefices once belonging to the Jesuits? It therefore charged the Econome Général to pay all authorized Jesuit pensions at six month intervals and any special travel allowances granted by the crown. For this purpose, he was to use the revenue coming directly from the benefices or, after 1766, from those bureaux of administration of the colleges which, by that time, would control their own benefices and make annual payments to the Econome Général. If this revenue were insufficient, the Econome Général was to apply to the keeper of the Royal Treasury for a supplement. On the other hand, if the Econome Général had more than enough money, he was to use his surplus to repay the money the crown had already spent on Jesuit allowances. When all those debts were repaid, he was to deduct his surplus from the money which the colleges already administering their own benefices owed to him.

In the same declaration, the crown required that the Econome
Général should present an annual account of his administration of Jesuit property and pensions to the Controller General of Finances. His first account was to be presented on 1 January 1765 and was to include a statement of his receipts and expenditures for the whole period since 1 January 1763. The declaration made no mention of the commission which the Econome Général would receive for performing these tasks, but it did state that his administration of the pensions would last until all had been completely paid, which presumably meant until the last of the Jesuits qualifying for a pension had died. It remains to see how far the Econome Général was able to conform to the laws governing his administration of Jesuit property.
II Administering Jesuit benefices and pensions

According to the royal legislation of 1763 and 1764, the Econome Général du Clergé was to receive money from Jesuit benefices and the crown and to use this money to pay Jesuit pensions. In practice, the whole system was extremely complicated. Even the Econome Général's administration of the Jesuit benefices was by no means simple. The lettres patentes of 2 February 1763 had made him responsible for administering about two hundred benefices attached to former Jesuit colleges, professed houses, missions, and residences throughout France. Of these, a total of sixty-four belonged to twenty-two of the thirty-nine colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. All sixty-four benefices in question belonged to colleges, and only five collegial benefices in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris were not administered by the Econome Général. The sixty-four benefices were of unequal value, but together they were probably worth almost as much as the other approximately one hundred and thirty benefices in the rest of France. The Econome Général remained in charge of collecting the revenues from all the benefices assigned to him until the date on which the colleges or other houses assumed control over them again, and in some cases until those dates had passed.

We do not know how Marchal collected the revenue from the Jesuit benefices during the first year of his new duties. He probably relied on his own diocesan representatives, rather than on the économes séquestres appointed by the bailliages and sénéchaussées, to help him. In many cases, he appears to have had to wait until 1764 to collect the revenue due in 1763. In October 1763, the Econome Général made other arrangements to avoid being directly involved in the administration of many of the Jesuit benefices, however. Taking advantage of
the royal legislation of April 1763, which had encouraged him to make long-term leases of the property when it was profitable to do so, he undertook to share his administration with a company of entrepreneurs, of whom the most prominent was Claude Roque, an agent de change and administrator of the municipal octrois of Montpellier.

Roque's principal partner was Jacques Bernard Le Roy, who had formerly been a lieutenant general of the Admiralty at Marenne, and who shared his part in the company, at least temporarily, with his son-in-law, Gobert de Choisy, also at one time of the Admiralty at Marenne. The other members of the company were Duris and Devilliers, and a fifth person, who was probably Bernard Turgan. Nothing is known about the last three before their involvement with Roque in this company.

Having formed the company, which was known as "Roque, Le Roy, and Company", "Le Roy, Roque, and Company", or "Roque and Company", the individual members set about to make separate agreements about the nature of their leases of the Jesuit property with Marchal de Sainscy. In this way, each member of the company was directly responsible to the Econome Général and could negotiate separately with him about the administration of specific benefices. They may even have submitted separate accounts to him.

It was the company, nevertheless, which assumed a lease of the "major part" of the Jesuit benefices in France for the nine year period between the harvest of 1764 and that of 1772. It became responsible for more than seventy benefices, of which at least sixteen were in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. The rest were scattered throughout France, particularly in the jurisdictions of the Parlements of Normandy, Brittany, Toulouse, and Bordeaux. Roque apparently remained the head of the company while the others assumed responsibility
for the property in the various regions of France. Thus, Duris became farmer general of the Jesuit property in Brittany, Normandy, and probably all the rest of Western France, while Le Roy assumed the same functions in the South, principally in the regions of Bordeaux, Toulouse, and Provence. It is not clear what Devilliers and Turgan did, but they were not totally inactive. Individually, these men appear to have been regarded as Marchal's representatives in the provinces in which they worked.

The lease made the company responsible for all the benefices in its charge and required that it make payments to the *Economé Général* for the privilege of administering the property. It is not certain how much money fell due each year, but it appears to have been the sum of all the leases due on the individual benefices, according to an assessment made by the *Economats* in 1763 or 1764. The farmers of the various regions of France appear to have made semi-annual payments to the *Economé Général*, after the local administrators of the property had paid them in June and December. But it is unlikely that the members of the company submitted complete accounts when they made their payments. It may have been for this reason that the *Economé Général* ceased after 1766 to record the amount of his receipts from individual benefices and, instead, showed only his total receipts from each *bailliage* or *sénéchaussée* in the accounts which he submitted to the Controller General.

The same system of farming benefices to entrepreneurs, who in turn made leases with local administrators, also obtained for those benefices not controlled by Roque and Company, and it continued to be used for the entire period during which Louis-Pierre-Sebastien Marchal de Sainscy and his successor, Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy, administered the *Economats*. In most cases, the profit earned by the farmers
who dealt directly with the \textit{Econome Général} was the difference between the higher amount which they charged the local administrators under them and the lesser amount which the \textit{Econome Général} charged them for their leases. In some cases, especially after 1772, when the number of Jesuit benefices administered by the \textit{Econome Général} was fewer, the \textit{Econome Général} probably dealt directly with the local administrators, who, like their earlier counterparts, had to earn more money from the benefices than they were required to pay for their leases if they were to make a profit.\textsuperscript{23}

In the event that a farmer of Jesuit benefices had difficulty collecting the amount he had assessed a local administrator for his lease, the farmer could have recourse to the Commission of the \textit{Economats}, according to the terms of the \textit{lettres patentes} of 2 February 1763. The Commission might then order the delinquent administrator to pay his lease, and might also enlist the help of the \textit{Econome Général} to see that this was done.\textsuperscript{24} In all cases, the amount which the farmers were supposed to pay the \textit{Econome Général} was the previously assessed annual lease minus the feudal dues and ecclesiastical taxes to which the benefice was subject. Frequently the farmers also deducted the cost of repairs worth up to ten percent of the annual value of the lease, and in the event that the crown should authorize a special payment from the revenues of a certain benefice to be made to a specific college or churchman, they deducted that amount as well. Before recording his receipts, the \textit{Econome Général} must also have deducted his own five percent commission which was assessed on the original value of the lease.\textsuperscript{25} For the period 1762 to 1771, few leases were not paid at all, but many were not fully paid.\textsuperscript{26}

The revenue which entered the \textit{Econome Général}'s caisse as a result of this process was not simply the sum of all the leases on the
benefices. Rather, it was an unpredictable amount which had been greatly reduced before it reached his caisse. Some of the money which the Econome Général listed as forming part of his receipts never actually reached his caisse at all. It appears to have been retained by his own diocesan representatives, who then used it, on his orders, to pay Jesuit pensions. For that matter, it is not clear precisely where the money which Marchal recorded as his net receipts was at any given time. Marchal's caisse, like those of the Econome Séquestre of Paris and of the syndics of the Union, extended throughout France.

In accordance with the stipulations of the king's Declaration of 2 April 1764, the Econome Général du Clergé submitted a statement of his receipts from Jesuit benefices and his expenditures connected to the régie to the Controller General each year. Normally he apparently submitted the same statement to the Director of the Economats as well, and this official then became his spokesman before the Control General. Then, at a later time, the Econome Général sent a more detailed statement of his administration of the benefices and his payment of Jesuit pensions to the commissioners general of the Economats, who judged his undertakings with all the advantages of hindsight. Many of the statements which the Econome Général presented to the Control General in the years 1764 to 1773, and some of his correspondence with the Director of the Economats with the Control have survived. It is they and the judgments of his accounts rendered by the Commission of the Economats for the years 1762 to 1764 and 1773 to 1777, which form the basis of our knowledge of how the régie of Jesuit benefices and pensions worked in the period between 1763, when the Econome Général assumed responsibility for it, and 1787, when Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy ceased to be Econome Général, and the administration, in altered form, passed to a new appointee.
What we have considered so far has pertained, naturally, to the whole of France. The Econome Général's responsibilities extended throughout the whole country, and it was only Roque's company which had chosen to be organized on a regional basis. In one respect, the Econome Général divided the country into the jurisdictions of the various parlements and sovereign councils, and that was for the purpose of presenting his accounts. This fact enables us to undertake a detailed analysis of the revenues produced by the Jesuit benefices under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris during the first ten years of the Econome Général's administration.  

The sixty-four Jesuit benefices in that part of France with which we are primarily concerned consistently produced slightly less than half the total revenue collected from the Jesuit benefices in France as a whole. For the ten year period from 1763 to 1772, the revenue coming from the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris after the Econome Général had deducted his five percent commission amounted to 952,985 livres, or an average of 95,299 livres per year, while the whole of France produced 1,953,561 livres, or an average of 195,356 livres a year.  

Not surprisingly, the colleges whose benefices consistently produced the most revenue were those of La Flèche and Paris.  
In the ten year period under consideration the benefices of La Flèche produced a total of 234,374 livres and those of Paris produced a total of 180,223 livres. Together they produced between one-third and one-half of all the revenue collected in the territory of the Parlement of Paris. In the next rank came the benefices of Lyon, Poitiers, and Amiens, which each produced about 90,000 livres during the decade.  
They were followed by Orléans and Reims, which produced 75,019 and 51,616 livres respectively. Billom, Tours, Eu, Roanne, and La Rochelle each paid between 30,000 and 20,000 livres to the Econome Général.
the same period. Saint-Omer and Moulins each raised about 15,000 livres, while Bourges and Charleville raised nearly 10,000 livres each. The remaining six groups of collegial benefices, those of Aurillac, Compiègne, Mauriac, Blois, Fontenay-le-Comte, and Langres, produced less than 10,000 livres each. The last two produced less than 1,000 livres each. Of this revenue, which totalled 952,885 livres, 567,407 livres came directly from the farmers of benefices. The rest came from the bureaux of administration of those colleges which after 1765 had resumed the ownership of their benefices and which were required to go on making payments to the Econome Général after doing so. In most cases, the second amount was probably raised by the same local administrators who had previously administered them. It is not certain how much revenue the leases on the benefices were supposed to have produced in this period.

We do, however, know what kind of financial arrangements the crown had made for the period after 1 January 1765 when the bureaux of administration of the colleges began to resume control of their benefices. It is instructive to compare what the crown intended with what actually happened after this time. Of the twenty-two colleges with benefices in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, the Colleges of Bourges and Poitiers were attached to the universities of their towns and hence did not have bureaux of administration. Their benefices continued to be administered by Roque and Company under the Econome Général for the whole period we are considering. The colleges in Lyon had a bureau of administration which, though it may have controlled some, did not control all the benefices previously attached to these colleges. The Econome Général continued to administer at least one and possibly several of Lyon's benefices during this decade. Six other colleges, La Rochelle, Tours, Blois, Compiègne, Fontenay-le-
Comte, and Langres, had bureaux of administration which resumed control of the benefices after 1765, but which were deemed financially unable to make regular payments to the Econome Général. The crown retained the right, if their fortunes improved, to require them to make payments to the Econome Général, and the bureaux of the first three colleges did make some payments between 1766 and 1772. 41

The remaining thirteen colleges with benefices had bureaux of administration which, after 1765, resumed control of their benefices and were required to make specific annual payments to the Econome Général, usually for periods of thirty years. 42 In all cases, the assessment of the payment was based on a college’s presumed ability to pay. Thus, La Flèche was assessed 30,000 livres a year for ten years, 20,000 livres a year for a second ten years, and 10,000 livres a year for the last ten years. 43 Paris was assessed 15,000 livres a year for thirty-five years, and Orléans 5,000, 4,000, and 1,000 livres a year in each of three succeeding decades. 44 The Collège des Bons-Enfants which had gained most of the benefices once belonging to the Jesuit college in Reims was to pay 3,000 livres a year for thirty years. 45 Amiens, Billom, and Châlons-sur-Marne, which in 1767 gained the rest of Reims’ benefices, were each assessed 3,000 livres a year for the first ten years, 2,000 livres a year for the next ten years, and 1,000 livres a year for the last ten years. 46 The other seven colleges in question were required to pay lesser amounts. 47 According to the crown’s reckoning, in the decade 1763 to 1772, the bureaux of administration holding former Jesuit benefices were supposed to pay a total of 486,400 livres to the Econome Général. 48

They did not pay as much as this however. So far as we know, during the first seven years of the operation of the new system,
which are the last seven years of the decade from 1763 to 1772, only
the Colleges of Charleville and Eu paid their full assessments. 49
Orleans, Billom, and Roanne nearly met their assessments. 50 Of the
rest, La Flèche, Paris, the Collège des Bons-Enfants in Reims, and
Moulins paid between eighty-three and eighty-six percent of their
assessment, with La Flèche and Paris again paying the lion's share of
the total bill. 51 Saint Omer paid two-thirds, Amiens paid one-half,
Aurillac paid nearly three-tenths, and Mauriac paid less than one-
sixth of their total assessments. 52 Only the College of Châlons-sur-
Marne, appears to have made no payment at all.

Altogether, between 1766, when the bureaux first began to make
their payments, and 1772, when our information stops, the bureaux
of administration of the colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement
of Paris paid a total of 385,578 of the 486,400 livres, or nearly
eighty percent of the revenue which they were supposed to have paid to
the Econome Général in this period. On the other hand, if we compare
the revenue he collected from the benefices in the periods before and
after the bureaux of administration assumed control over them, we
find that, for the most part, in the territory of the Parlement of
Paris, the decision to restore the benefices to the colleges resulted
in a decrease in revenue for the Econome Général, though probably
also in a more regular income. 53

Our information about the Econome Général's receipts for the
period after 1772 pertains to the whole kingdom and does not allow us
to consider the situation in the territory of the Parlement of Paris
separately. It is, nevertheless, sufficient to allow us to make
suggestive comparisons about the development of the Econome Général's
administration of the revenues from the benefices. Thus, during the
first five years of his administration, from 1763 to 1767, the Econome
Général had collected a total of 964,258 livres from all the Jesuit benefices in France, regardless of their method of administration. Between 1768 and 1772, he had collected a further 989,303 livres. And between 1773 and 1777, he collected a total of 1,044,087 livres. From one five years to the next of the first fifteen years of his administration, the Econome Général collected a gradually increasing amount of revenue from the Jesuit benefices in France, although his collections in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris actually declined slightly. We have no information about the Econome Général's receipts from leases of Jesuit benefices or from college bureaux in the subsequent decade.

It was with the money from leases of benefices or later, from college bureaux, that the Econome Général was supposed to pay Jesuit pensions. In practice, it is doubtful whether anyone ever seriously believed that the régie of Jesuit benefices would be able to pay the cost of the pensions due originally to as many as 1,500 Jesuits. Even if the crown did attempt to predict the annual value of the benefices before making its Declaration of 2 April 1764, it cannot have found any evidence to suggest that the régie could be self-supporting. The declaration itself, which made provision for the possibility of either a deficit or a surplus in the Econome Général's caisse is ambiguous on the subject. Nor do any of the letters exchanged between the office of the Controller General and the Director of the Economats suggest that the Controller General had any hopes that the régie would pay all the pensions, although on one occasion de Boullogne did ask why the revenue from benefices had declined from one year to the next. No one appears to have expressed surprise when the régie consistently failed to produce enough money to pay more than a small portion of the pensions. Marchal's function, then, seems to have
been to administer the benefices as well as he could and, with the help of the crown, to pay Jesuit pensions.

This being so, it is not surprising that even the greatly reduced revenue which Marchal received from the provinces should have been subject to a number of further reductions before Marchal could use it to pay pensions. First, the Econome Général had to use it to pay any charges on the benefices in addition to the ones the farmers acquitted before they paid the Econome Général their leases. Then he had to pay for any very expensive repairs to benefices which the crown had authorized. The first 150,000 livres of these expenses were supposed to have come from loans from the Union of Creditors, and at least 88,000 livres did come from that source. The rest Marchal would have to raise. Finally, the Econome Général had to use some of the money he had received to pay expenses which, in his accounts, are described as "sums spent on the orders of the king". We know little about these expenses except that some of the money was given, according to the provisions of the lettres patentes of 2 February 1763, to former Jesuit colleges which were short of money.

The fact that the category of sums "spent on the orders of the king" existed, suggested that the crown considered that the régie existed for royal convenience rather than just to produce money with which to pay Jesuit pensions. Had the crown wished, it could have paid all the "sums spent on the orders of the king" directly from the Royal Treasury, without the help of the Econome Général. But it apparently found it expedient to use the revenue of this régie instead. In this way, the crown abandoned a principle established by the Parlement of Paris. The court expected Jesuit property to be used to satisfy Jesuit obligations. The crown did not.
The money remaining in the Econome Général's caisse after all these expenses had been met was supposed to be used, along with the necessary supplement from the Royal Treasury, to pay Jesuit pensions. The Declaration of 2 April 1764 had actually told the Econome Général to bring to the Royal Treasury any money that was left over at the end of a year and then receive it back from the Treasury when the king decided what amount should be paid in pensions during the following year. At least in the early years, the Econome Général did bring some money to the Royal Treasury. But normally what seems to have occurred was a paper transaction. The crown issued a declaration stating the amount of money that should be paid in two instalments during the year. After that, the Econome Général wrote to the Intendant of Finances to state how much money he had in his caisse after all the other expenses had been paid, and applied to receive the rest of the money for Jesuit pensions from the Royal Treasury. In later documents, all the money allotted by the crown for the payment of pensions was referred to as coming from the Royal Treasury. In the period 1764 to 1773, the Econome Général who had already received a five percent commission on revenue coming from Jesuit benefices, received a further one and a quarter percent commission, or three deniers in the livre, for handling this money, some of it for a second time. Between 1774 and 1781, the additional commission was increased to two and a half percent, or six deniers in the livre, and after that it apparently stopped. Marchal received the second commission on the amount which the crown authorized to be spent on pensions, not on the amount he actually spent, which in at least one period was more than the crown had authorized.

We do not know how Marchal paid the pensions to the Jesuits. It
is not clear whether his own diocesan representatives made the payments or whether the farmers of the benefices were ever involved in the process. But whoever made the payments in the various regions of France did not make them directly to the Jesuits but to the Jesuits' attorneys. After July 1764, the attorneys had to show a number of notarized attestations about the former Jesuits' residence and activities before they could receive the payment. After 1767, when the Parlement of Paris banished former Jesuits from the kingdom, a number of Parisian bankers and notaries became agents who paid pensions to attorneys acting on behalf of those Jesuits who had left the kingdom. After 1773, when the pope disbanded the Jesuit order, the treatment of Jesuits in France improved, and some of those who had fled abroad returned. The Econome Général continued to administer the payment of pensions to Jesuits in France until the Revolution.

To what extent did the régie of former Jesuit benefices pay the cost of Jesuit pensions and gratifications? A lack of evidence makes it impossible even to attempt to answer this question for the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris alone, for the whole period. But we can answer it with some qualifications for the whole of France during the first fifteen years of the Econome Général's administration. We have just seen that the amount of revenue from the benefices which was supposed to be applied to the payment of pensions was the sum remaining after the Econome Général had acquitted a large number of charges directly connected with his administration, and some probably not connected with it. In fact, during the years 1763 to 1767, he retained 516,209 livres of the 984,288 livres he received from the benefices, and was to apply this 516,209 livres to the payment of pensions. In the same period, the crown authorized 2,075,000 livres to be spent
on pensions. In these five years, then, the régie had produced nearly twenty-five percent of the revenue authorized to be spent on the pensions of former Jesuits.

During the five years from 1768 to 1772, the Econome Général's expenditures were higher, and, of the 969,272 livres he collected from the benefices, he can have applied at most only 512,399 livres to the payment of pensions. At the same time, the amount of money the crown allotted for the Jesuits decreased to 1,826,750 livres, so that the régie produced as much as twenty-eight percent of the necessary revenue. Between 1773 and 1777, the Econome Général apparently collected 1,044,087 livres from the benefices, and, after the amounts normally forming part of his expenditures had been deducted, he had 869,974 livres left. This amount was nearly fifty-four and a half percent of the 1,597,925 livres that the Econome Général paid in pensions during that five years. Of course, the amount of money spent on pensions in 1773 to 1777 was only three-quarters of the amount authorized to be spent in 1763 to 1767. During the first fifteen years of the Econome Général's administration of Jesuit benefices and pensions, when the volume of property administered and pensions paid was at its height, the régie produced a small but increasing percentage of the money necessary for Jesuit pensions.

In 1782, events occurred which suggest that the money may never have been spent on Jesuit pensions at all, however! It was then that Louis-Pierre-Sébastien Marchal de Sainscy retired from the office of Econome Général du Clergé and was replaced by his son Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy, who had shared his father's administration since 1767. Before he could become Econome Général, however, Louis-René had to put up a surety bond of 300,000 livres, something which no Marchal had had to do before. Moreover, the retirement provided the
new Director of the Economats, Feydeau de Brou, with an excuse for investigating what was going on in the Economats. The investigation revealed that the elder Marchal de Sainscy had left a deficit of 1,460,573 livres in the caisse of the régie of Jesuit benefices. 78

Neither the Économe Général nor the crown ever seems to have offered an explanation for the deficit. The crown apparently did not believe that Louis-Pierre-Sébastien had stolen the money, or it would, presumably, at the very least, have placed his son and successor under rigid surveillance. 79 Nor did the work of the Commission of the Economats up until the retirement or even afterwards provide any explanation for the elder Marchal's deficit. The commissioners of the Economats had investigated one matter which may have contributed to Marchal's administrative problems. This was the bankruptcy of Roque and Company, which had occurred in 1771 to 1772 and which had resulted in the failure of that company to pay its leases to the Économe Général. At the time of its bankruptcy, it owed Marchal 214,988 livres for the period 1764 to 1772, an amount which by 1777 had been reduced to 150,000 livres. 80 That amount remained unpaid until it was written off by a new set of administrators more than three decades later. 81 But although it contributed to Marchal's problems as an administrator responsible for finding entrepreneurs capable of assuming leases on the Jesuit benefices, Roque's failure can hardly be regarded as the cause of Marchal's deficit. Marchal does not seem to have been responsible for money which did not enter his caisse. 82

The commissioners of the Economats may not have offered an explanation for Marchal's deficit, but the work they did during the 1780's is itself at least a partial explanation. It was in this period that they judged Marchal's accounts for 1773 to 1777, and their judgments reveal a peculiar fact. According to the commissioners, Marchal had had, as
early as 1773, a *reliquat* or unspent surplus, accumulated since 1768 or earlier, of 1,062,607 *livres*. The judgments go on to show that he had apparently not handed this money over to the crown, but, rather, had kept it and his current net receipts from benefices in the *caisse*. And he had used current receipts from the Royal Treasury to pay the Jesuits' pensions in 1773 to 1777. By 1777, his surplus was 1,528,135 *livres*. Since Marchal was more than five years behind in presenting his accounts when he retired, it was basically this surplus which, after 1782, was found to be missing from his *caisse*. The surprising thing is that most of the surplus had apparently been accumulated before 1773.

It is surprising because the documents of the Control General dating from the period 1764 to 1773 indicate that the *Econome Général* had applied his net receipts from the Jesuit benefices of one year to the payment of Jesuit pensions in the next. The records therefore showed no surpluses in this period. Moreover, the documents of the Control General bore notes apparently written by members of the Control which showed that the Control had authorized Marchal to apply his net receipts to the payment of pensions and had given him the difference between the amount allotted by the king to be spent on Jesuit pensions and the *Econome Général*'s net receipts.

What is even more startling is that the amount which the commissioners general of the *Economats* show to have been Marchal's surplus by the end of 1772 is almost the same as the sum of all Marchal's net receipts for the period from the beginning of the *régie* until the end of 1772. But whereas the papers of the Control General state that the net receipts had been applied directly to the payment of Jesuit pensions, and that Marchal had received only the additional money needed for this task from
the crown, the commissioners imply that Marchal received from the crown the whole amount allotted for the pensions and kept his net receipts as well. Assuming that the similarity between Marchal's net receipts for 1763 to 1772 and the amount of the surplus shown by the commissioners for 1773 is not simply a coincidence, it appears that the commissioners were finding Marchal responsible for receiving the same money twice or that Marchal received far more money than he needed to pay the pensions.

The means of checking either hypothesis are limited. Only one other set of judgments of Marchal's accounts made by the commissioners general of the Economats in this period has survived. Because it concerns Marchal's payment of Jesuit pensions in 1772, it can be compared with what the papers of the Control General say about the same subject. This time we find, as before, that the Control General stated that Marchal received from the crown the difference between the amount ordered by the king to be spent on pensions and the net receipts of his régime. On the other hand, the commissioners stated that he had received both an amount equal to that which the Control General had accepted as the crown's payment and the total amount accorded by the crown for pensions for this year. In this case, it looks as though the money for the pensions had been paid twice over.

In short, then, there are two plausible explanations for the deficit of 1,460,573 livres which was discovered after 1782. On the one hand, in spite of the evidence to the contrary in the papers of the Control General, the crown may consistently have given more money to the Econome Général than he needed to pay Jesuit pensions. On the other hand, the commissioners general, judging the accounts of the father on the evidence of the son more than a decade after the event, may have recorded a large part of Marchal's receipts twice, and may thus have found him responsible for a surplus which he never had. The
second explanation would appear the more probable, had not Louis-René conformed to the crown's decision that he should assume responsibility for his father's debt, and thereby tacitly admitted that the judgments of the commissioners general of the *Economate* had been correct.

The younger Marchal continued in office for five years, during which he probably repaid all but 600,000 *livres* of his father's debt. He did this by means of some administrative expedients, which may have meant foregoing his commission and making an initial payment of 160,000 *livres* and annual payments of 60,000 *livres* or more. It is not apparent whether it was to safeguard its own interests and to see to it that no further money was lost, or whether it was to help Louis-René make this annual payment that the crown at this time altered the means by which Jesuit pensions were paid. It was now twenty years since the confiscation, and many of the Jesuits who had originally claimed pensions were dead. The royal assessment of pensions in 1781 had been only 168,000 *livres*, an amount which the *régie* of Jesuit benefices could be expected to acquit without further help from the Royal Treasury. So far as we can tell, soon after Louis-René assumed office, the *régie* of Jesuit benefices began to be expected to pay Jesuit pensions from current receipts from the benefices.

Our understanding of how this arrangement worked must be based on the accounts for only one year, 1786. In that year, the *Econome Général* received 224,364 *livres* from the benefices, before all the charges on the benefices were paid. His expenditures, including a payment of 226,600 *livres* in pensions to Jesuits and the remaining charges on the benefices, amounted to 316,182 *livres*, or 91,819 *livres* more than his receipts. Apparently Louis-René paid this deficit from his own pocket and then deducted it from his father's debt to the Royal Treasury.
In this way, Louis-René could administer the régie of Jesuit benefices and pensions without having recourse to the Royal Treasury. But it was not true that the benefices had produced all the money necessary for the Jesuit pensions. The Econome Général’s net receipts from the benefices, after the charges had been deducted, were 134,782 livres, or fifty-nine and a half percent of the 226,600 livres spent on the Jesuit pensions in 1786. Nevertheless, if we compare the Econome Général’s net receipts and expenditures on Jesuit pensions for 1786 with those of the first fifteen years of his administration of benefices and pensions, we find that the general trend observable in those early years continued in 1786. The revenue coming from Jesuit benefices in 1786 provided a greater portion than ever before of the money allotted for the payment of Jesuit pensions. But if this meant that the régie was in a healthier state than ever before, the same cannot be said of the office of Econome Général.

Early in 1787, Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy declared his bankruptcy and on 17 February 1787, the crown ordered that seals be placed on his personal property and caisse. For the time being, it allowed him provisionally to continue to receive payments from both the consistorial and Jesuit benefices, but only under the supervision of the Controller of the General Receipt of the Economats, Le Gris, who had just been named for this task by Feydeau de Brou. The problem of sorting out the accounts of both father and son, which had not yet been judged beyond 1780, fell to the Commission of the Economats, Le Gris, and the Controller of the Bons d'État. By 13 May, it was clear that although Louis-René had repaid much of his father’s debt, the whole régie of the Economats, including the administration of both consistorial and Jesuit benefices, was over one million livres in debt to the crown.
On the same day, the crown, on the recommendation of Feydeau de Brou, named Isidore-Simon Brière de Mondetour, a barrister in the Parlement of Paris, to assume the functions of Econome Général in the place of Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy. Brière assumed responsibility for the vacant consistorial benefices in the king's nomination and for those benefices attached to former Jesuit houses and colleges which were still under the régie. He was also to receive the payments made by those bureaux of administration which were still making annual payments to the Econome Général. For his office, Brière de Mondetour put up a surety bond of 600,000 livres.  

In other ways, the new Econome Général was to function in a different way from the Marchals de Sainscy. He would not receive a commission but, rather, a regular salary of 20,000 livres a year. At the same time, he would continue to collect the commissions which the Marchals had received from the various revenues they had administered, but was to apply this revenue to the payment of his own fixed salary, to the costs of administration, to the payment of interest on his bond, and to the repayment of the debt left by the Marchals. The new Econome Général would also administer more caisses than the earlier officials had administered. Besides the caisse for consistorial benefices and other matters traditionally dealt with by the Economats, and the caisse for Jesuit benefices and pensions which the Marchals had had, Brière was also to have a third caisse for payments made by the successors to benefices, and a fourth for the taxations, or commissions, deducted from his receipts. The legislation of 13 May 1787 said nothing about the administration of Huguenot property or pensions for New Converts, but they appear to have been administered, as before, as part of the first caisse. Brière was to submit his accounts to Feydeau de Brou at three-month intervals, and became responsible for putting the
accounts of Louis-Pierre-Sébastien and Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy in order. 97

It is doubtful whether Brière de Mondetour's administration of the Economats was markedly more successful than that of the Marchals had been. In 1789 three of the four caisses he administered received a total of 1,319,814 livres, and the volume of business Brière thus transacted was more than five times the volume of business transacted by the Economome Général in an average year fifty years before. 98 But Brière also spent more money than he received. In the same year, the caisse for consistorial benefices, Huguenot property, and various kinds of ecclesiastical pensions including those paid to New Converts, received a total of 990,718 livres. But it also had expenditures of 889,678 livres or more. 99 At the same time, the caisse for the administration of the various commissions received a total of 189,697 livres, but had expenses amounting to 203,646 livres. 100 We do not know what happened to the caisse which was to receive payments from the successors to benefices, but the situation in the caisse of the Jesuit benefices and pensions was similar to the situation in the caisse used for the commissions.

In 1789, the Jesuit benefices administered by the Economome Général or by the bureaux of administration of the colleges to which they were attached produced a total of 139,399 livres. 101 The individual sources of this revenue are not apparent, but at least eleven of the thirteen bureaux charged with this duty in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris were still making annual payments to the Economome Général. 102 At the same time, the expenditures of the régie amounted to 260,000 livres, of which 206,650 livres were spent on Jesuit pensions. 103 Although, according to the earlier system of reckoning net receipts, the régie
had produced slightly more than fifty-three percent of the Jesuit pensions paid in this year, its expenditures had also exceeded its receipts by 96,000 livres.

In the same year, a new royal commission, which superseded the old Commission of the Economats, investigated the state of the Economats since Brière had taken over. It found that the situation in 1789 was similar to the situation of the two previous years. In fact, its evaluation of the state of the four caisses was little different from what we have observed for 1787. It pointed out that the first caisse normally had an annual deficit of 71,000 livres, while that of the Jesuits normally had one of 98,000 livres. The new commission was unable to make any observations about the caisse of the successions, but it also noted that the caisse of the taxations usually had a surplus of 25,000 to 30,000 livres, which was to be used to repay the debt of 2,400,000 livres by then existing in the Economats.

The new commission also studied ways in which the situation might be improved. It pointed out that for the whole period from 1764 to 1788, the Royal Treasury had provided what was missing from the Jesuit caisse to pay Jesuit pensions. Since the king had sanctioned the decree of 2 November 1789, which placed virtually all ecclesiastical property at the disposal of the nation, it was unlikely, however, that the Public Treasury would continue the practice of its predecessor. It was now necessary for the Economats to become completely self-supporting. To this end, the commission proposed to reduce the annual deficit of about 169,000 livres in the first two caisses by reducing the expenditures of the régie. It proposed to submit all pensions of over 1,000 livres paid on the Economats to a graduated tax of from ten to forty percent. None of the Jesuit pensions would be subject to this tax as they were all below 1,000 livres. At the same time, the commission
recognized that it was functioning in uncertain times and that the decree of 2 November 1789 had prepared the way for the eventual abolition of the Economats. It is unlikely that the recommendations of the commission were ever put into effect.

While this report was being prepared and delivered, the National Constituent Assembly had begun a protracted discussion about the advisability of retaining the Economats. The discussion developed in the course of the Assembly's debate on the nationalization of all church property. In June 1790, on the recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Committee, the Assembly decided that since the districts were not yet able to assume full responsibility for all the ecclesiastical property in their jurisdiction, the Economats should continue to exist and the Econome Général should continue to carry out his various functions for at least another year. This legislation was not undone by the law of 5 November 1790 which charged the districts with the administration of most of the ecclesiastical property in France.

Thus, Brière de Mondetour continued to administer the property in the Economats, including Jesuit property, until 1792. But he probably did not continue to pay Jesuit pensions after 1790 or 1791, when the few remaining former Jesuits became pensioners of the state. Finally, on 29 August 1792, on the report of the Committee for the Examination of Accounts, headed by Borie, the Assembly voted to suppress the Economats and the office of Econome Général entirely. From 1 September 1792, Brière de Mondetour and his assistants were forbidden to carry out any of their former tasks. On that or the next day, the department of Paris was to send two commissioners to Brière's office to take possession of the registers pertaining to Brière's and
the Marchal's administration of the Economats. On the same day, the committee having noted that the deficit of the Economats was by this time more than 2,039,032 livres, Brière was ordered to turn over the 695,689 livres which he had in his caisse on 1 June 1792. By 1 January 1793, Brière was to turn over all the accounts of the Economats and to prepare a list of revenue still owed to his régie on that day.

We do not know whether Brière de Mondetour carried out this order. A year later, Borie and the rest of the National Convention were still trying to clear up the affairs of the Economats, and the process did not end there. In the meantime, the Assembly and the Convention had decided to treat all remaining Jesuit property as though it were biens nationaux and to sell it in the same way as other church property. By 1793, the king's men had ceased to administer Jesuit benefices and pensions.

The Economes Généraux of the period 1763 to 1792 may have been more dishonest men and more inept administrators than other men who held and disposed of other Jesuit property. The Economes Généraux may not have been so efficient as the Econome Séquestre of Paris and his provincial counterparts or so conscientious as the syndics of the Union of Creditors. It may be true that the incapable family of Marchal de Sainscy was replaced in 1787 by an equally incompetent functionary. Brière de Mondetour may have squandered the chance he had to re-establish the Economats on a solvent basis. The evidence is too incomplete and too contradictory to permit us to do more than to take very seriously the possibility that this was the case. We do know that the commissions which judged the affairs of the last Economes Généraux came to these general conclusions.

As we consider the work of the judges of the Economes Généraux, a much clearer conclusion emerges, however. Whether it was apparent to
contemporaries or not, the development of a deficit in the régie of Jesuit benefices and pensions which amounted to as much as the total net receipts of that régie for the first fifteen years of its existence, demonstrates that something was very wrong with the whole system of supervising the administration of Jesuit benefices and pensions, and probably with the whole system of supervising all the work of the Econome Général. While it was true that Louis-Pierre Sébastien Marchal de Sainscy was probably responsible for losses from his caisse, and equally true that Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy and Brière de Mondetour had to bear the consequences, more was involved than just the work of individual Economes Généraux. The administration of the Economats, including the administration of Jesuit benefices and pensions, had been overseen almost until the end by members of the Royal Council, the Parlement of Paris, the Control General, and the Commission of the Economats. If the last two Economes Généraux had had to suffer the consequences of the development of a deficit in the caisse of an earlier Econome Général, it was nevertheless their superiors, who included a large part of the royal government itself, who had allowed such problems to develop and to remain undetected for so long.

The part played in the administration of Jesuit property by the Econome Général du Clergé may be compared with the work done by the Econome Séquestre of Paris and his provincial subordinates and with the work done by the syndics of the Union. Individual administrators had faults which prevented them from acquitting their responsibilities for the administration of Jesuit property as well as they might have done. The Econome Séquestre of Paris was probably partially responsible, just as the Marchals de Sainscy were doubtless very largely responsible, for their bankruptcies. The syndics of the Union of Creditors had probably failed to use their receipts as profitably as
they might have done and thus wasted some of the money produced by Jesuit property. The difficult economic situation of the 1780's undoubtedly contributed to making it impossible for all three parts of the administration to do what had originally been expected of them.

This much being so, it is even more certain that the main reason why the three parts of the administration failed as they did in greater or lesser degree in the 1780's, was because, however well or badly they had been provided for initially, they all suffered from a lack of direction after the first ten or fifteen years of the confiscation. After 1771, the Parlement failed to take an active part in the affairs of either the Econome Séquestre of Paris or the syndics of the Union of Creditors. By the 1780's, not only was the Econome Général further behind than ever in the presentation of his accounts to the Commission of the Economats, but the Commission, acting for the royal government, was also seriously behind in judging them.

After 1789, the Revolutionaries tried to sort out the problems in the three administrations. They appointed new administrators. More important, they also appointed new directors to oversee the work of the new administrators. In this way, as in so many others, the Revolutionaries would try to correct the faults of the old régime.
Chapter VII Revolutionary changes in the administration

I The Revolutionary administration

All that the Parlement of Paris had done with Jesuit property had shown that its principal concern had been to maintain the Jesuit colleges after the expulsion of the Jesuits. Its other concerns, which it had subordinated to the first, had been to assure that the creditors of the Jesuits were repaid and that the former Jesuits received subsistence allowances. These policies had not been entirely successful. At the end of the old régime, it was clear that the Econome Séquestre of Paris had gone bankrupt without receiving or handing over to the colleges or to the Union of Creditors the amounts of money anticipated by the organizers of the confiscation, that the Union of Creditors was still in possession of unsold Jesuit property, and that the Econome Général had also gone bankrupt, while his régie of Jesuit benefices had failed to produce enough money to pay Jesuit pensions. Moreover, the Parlement had neglected the former Jesuit colleges after 1771, and they were in all kinds of distress. Similarly, the Jesuits' creditors had not been completely repaid and former Jesuits still needed pensions at the end of the old régime.

The end of these problems was not an object which the Revolutionaries sought actively. But as they dealt with all the matters left over from the old régime, and especially as they undertook to rationalize and to acquit the old régime's debts, they took up the problems originally caused by the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762. To understand how the Revolutionaries dealt with problems which under the old régime monarchy had been allowed to persist from one year to the next,
we must appreciate how the new, Revolutionary governments functioned.

The original National Assembly subdivided itself into many committees, each of which studied problems, made recommendations, and drafted laws on subjects which its name implied. One of the committees established in the first year of the Revolution was the Ecclesiastical Committee, which was concerned with the disposition of the property belonging to the French church and with the fate of the secular clergy and members of religious orders. Another was the Financial Committee, concerned with raising the money to pay for the day-to-day expenses of the government and with repaying the national debt. Its tasks were even more extensive than those of the Ecclesiastical Committee. The Financial Committee was helped by lesser committees, such as the one on public accounts, which was also an early creation. It looked into the affairs of public officials of the old régime who had gone bankrupt or had otherwise been considered dishonest. Over the next ten years, other committees or commissions came into existence. They included the Committee on Pensions and the Committee on Public Instruction. New régimes changed the names, membership, and some of the functions of the original committees.

It was these committees which gave France a new public administration. Occasionally they solved administrative problems by introducing a new law. If that were not enough, an existing committee might suggest the creation of a new committee to study the matter further. More often, however, it chose one of two other alternatives. It either handed the problem over to an existing, separate administration made up of salaried public officials employed by the state, which it or another committee had created at an earlier time. Or it recommended the creation of another administration, also to be made up of salaried public officials employed by the state. Such administrations were
frequently headed by a man or men who had been distinguished venal public servants under the old régime and who had now become salaried public servants under the new French state. The administrations employed salaried accountants, auditors, and various kinds of clerks and secretaries, to work in bureaux. It will be easier to understand how the new bureaucracy worked when we study specific new administrations.

The beginning of the end of the administrative problems which we have studied occurred when the National Assembly decided to confiscate church property and to use it to secure the national debt. On 2 November 1789, the Assembly followed a precedent established by the confiscation of Jesuit property and the suppression of several orders by the Commission des Réguliers. By a vote of 510 to 346, it decided to place the property of the French church at the disposal of the nation. At the same time, it assumed responsibility for supporting the French clergy. Hereafter, members of that body were supposed to receive annual allowances of 1,200 livres each. Five days later, the Assembly tried to prevent the clergy from making off with any of its movable property or titles to its real property. The Assembly ordered royal judges to place seals on all ecclesiastical houses and to make an inventory of their contents. On 19 December, it ordered the sale of four hundred million livres' worth of church lands by public auction. The story of the confiscation of French church property is told in the general histories and understanding it is secondary to our present purposes. What matters in this instance is that the National Assembly established an administration to hold and sell the property of the French church, and that it was this administration which dealt initially with the problems we have been studying.

The Financial Committee, the Committee on the Examination of Accounts,
and the Ecclesiastical Committee were quick to realize that seizing and selling even four hundred million livres' worth of church property and using the proceeds to repay the national debt would be a huge task requiring the services of more than existing administrators. On 21 December, the Assembly therefore decided to create a special financial department to deal with some of the new problems. It would be called the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire. It was supposed to receive all the extraordinary taxes and money raised by the sale of church lands and other biens nationaux, such as crown lands and the property of the émigrés. And it would provide the money to pay the great variety of debts contracted under the old régime. Or so its creators, who made it responsible to the Assembly, envisaged.

The creation of the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire was the first step in the Assembly's creation of a whole series of administrations and bureaux which would deal with the biens nationaux. When the assignats failed to raise sufficient money, the relevant committee and the Assembly as a whole realized that they would have to find another means of disposing of the church property. On 17 March 1790, the Assembly decided to allow the municipality of Paris to sell two hundred million livres' worth of church property. It also wished to encourage other municipalities to play this intermediary role, and, to facilitate this development, it created a new committee from its own membership.

The new committee was the Committee of Alienation. It originally consisted of twelve and later of twenty-two members of the Assembly, and it had two functions. It drew up laws on the alienation of national property and it oversaw the sale of the property by the municipalities. Each member assumed responsibility for several departments. But the task thus envisaged proved too much for the members of the committee, and within the year they gave it up. By 31 August 1791, the Committee
of Alienation had ceased to function and its official existence had come to an end. Although the committee had ceased to function, the principle that the municipalities should be charged with the sale of the biens nationaux remained unchallenged. The problem was to decide which centralized administration should oversee the sales.

On 30 September 1791, the Assembly handed over the functions of the first Committee of Alienation to the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire, and thereby apparently justified the existence of the latter. Since its creation at the end of 1789, the Caisse had received very little money and had otherwise done very little. At the beginning of 1790, it had been organized into two parts, the one an administration, and the other a caisse. On 25 April 1790, the first and only director of the administration was named. He was Antoine-Léon-Anne Amelot, the Marquis of Chaillou. Under him, a bureau of 165 salaried employees came into existence and began to handle everything connected with the sales except the money derived from the nationalized property. Amelot's bureau thus kept the accounts of the caisse, authorized expenditures, and made or received inventories of the property.

The money which came to the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire was held by Jean-Jacques Le Couteulx du Molay of Rouen. By December 1790, he had organized his bureau of seventy-two employees and the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire as a whole was ready to assume ultimate responsibility for the sale of all nationalized property, which would continue to be carried out by intermediaries in municipalities and districts. It initially had a budget of 440,000 livres. Officially assuming its extended functions on 30 September 1791, it continued to oversee the sale of the national property and to be the official extraordinary treasury on which the assemblies could draw to pay the creditors of the state until it was suppressed in January 1793. But it was not
empowered to decide which of the old régime creditors should be repaid, or even to make payments directly to recognized creditors.

Part of this task would be performed by the new Régie de l'Enregistrement, as the reorganized Domain was called. It would register sales and other transactions involving the property and it would also play a part in deciding who was and who was not a legitimate creditor of the old régime government or of old régime institutions which either had been suppressed, were in the process of being suppressed, or were being reorganized without independent revenues or budgets of their own. The Régie de l'Enregistrement had a director and twelve administrators in Paris, as well as a bureau of accounts and correspondence. In each of the departments, it had a director and a number of other officials. In both places there were innumerable clerks and auditors. It would officially work with the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire until the Caisse was suppressed. It, too, was officially suppressed in 1793, though, like the Caisse, it actually continued to exist in a slightly altered form for many years after its official suppression.

For some time after the suppression of the original Committee of Alienation, neither the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire nor the Régie de l'Enregistrement was responsible to a specific committee in the Assembly. Then, on 5 December 1791, the Legislative Assembly created a Comité de l'Extraordinaire des finances of twenty-four members. It would oversee the work of the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire, and perhaps also of the Régie de l'Enregistrement, in the old manner. In the Convention, it was succeeded by a new Committee of Alienation made up, apparently, of totally different men from those who had constituted earlier committees. It would seem to have been on the recommendation of this new committee that, on 4 to 7 January 1793, the Convention officially suppressed the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire, and, despite Amelot's protests, united it
to the General Treasury. Amelot continued, for the moment, to run the affairs of the Caisse as before, although it was renamed the Domaines nationaux and he assumed the title of Administrateur des Domaines nationaux. He continued to perform his official duties until 15 October 1793, when he was imprisoned by the Terror for a year. The new Domaines nationaux continued to exist without him, in a variety of forms, for a further two or three decades.

To complete the repayment of all the creditors of the state, the National Assembly created a public administration known as the Direction générale de la Liquidation. It was charged to use public money, including that derived from the sale of church property, to pay public debts, including those recognized by the Régie de l'Enregistrement. The main difference between it and the Régie was the extent of its dealings. It was supposed to put an end to all venal offices and compensate the office holders. Between 1790 and 1793, its annual budget for salaries and expenses grew to 768,000 livres and its bureaux came to employ 313 clerks. The first director of the administration was Dufresne de Saint Léon, appointed by the king on 23 December 1790. He was succeeded exactly twenty-three months later by Louis-Valentin Denormandie, who remained in control of the Direction générale de la Liquidation until some time after the turn of the century. In the early years of its existence, its work was overseen by two Committees of Liquidation of the National Assembly.

The major task of the Direction was to verify and approve claims on the government, and to pay the claims which it recognized. John Bosher has identified six kinds of claims dealt with by the Direction. Of these, the three which should concern us are the claims for debts owed by the clergy, the claims for royal pensions, and claims on the feudal domains of the church and crown. In short, the Direction had
to deal with a lot of problems connected with or arising from the ones we have studied.

Thus, within the first year of the confiscation of the ecclesiastical property, the Revolutionaries had created three administrations to organize the sale of national property, to dispose of the property, and to handle the money produced by the sales. They were the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire, the Régie de l'Enregistrement, and the Direction générale de Liquidation. The Convention sought to suppress the Caisse and the Régie, but the Caisse re-emerged as the Domaines nationaux and the Régie survived the law against it. The Direction also survived the period of the Convention.

After April 1791, much of the work done by these three administrations which arose out of the bankruptcy of the Jesuits and the confiscation of their property was overseen not by national committees or a national government but by the municipality and department of Paris. A law of 14 April 1791, had charged that body with repaying most of the remaining creditors of the Jesuits. A decree of 18 July 1793 created a special bureau under the Domaines nationaux to administer the sale of Jesuit property from Paris. Thereafter, unfinished Jesuit business, and especially the repayment of anyone who could be regarded as a creditor of the Jesuits, was administered by bureaux of the Domaines nationaux, of the Enregistrement, and of the Direction, always under the control of the municipality and department of Paris. Together, the bureaux of these three administrations carried out a very thorough investigation of what they understood to be the remains of the Jesuit affair in 1791 to 1825.

As the bureaux working under the city of Paris undertook their investigations, and as they corresponded with each other over the years, their nature, and perhaps that of the administration they represented,
changed slightly. This change is the most evident in the titles of the writers or endorsers of various letters and memoranda. There normally seem to have been Directeurs of the Domaines nationaux and of the Enregistrement, but on occasion the two offices were combined as one. At lower levels, there were originally Receveurs des domaines de l' enregistrement and Régisseurs of the same combination. Then, after the Year XIII (1805 to 1806), all officials seem to have been of the Domaines. By then, too, they were avowedly public servants of the municipality of Paris and the department of the Seine. Their connection with any national authority by that time and until the end in 1825 to 1826 was extremely tenuous, if it existed at all.

In this way, the Ecclesiastical Committee, the Financial Committee, the Committee on Public Accounts, and the Committee on Public Instruction which had been created in the first years of the Revolution, initiated the Revolution's review of unsolved problems which had had their origins in the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762. The early Revolutionary assemblies established a three-part bureaucracy which dealt with many of the remaining administrative problems. Then, gradually, the responsibility shifted to Paris. At first Paris accepted the bureaucracy created by the assemblies and maintained the distinction between the various parts. Then, under the Empire, when most of the really important business was over, the city of Paris reorganized the bureaucracy in minor ways so that it should not be responsible to a national authority but to Paris itself. It was the local government of Paris which completed, as much as they ever were completed, the remaining financial and administrative aspects of the Jesuit affair. It was the municipality of Paris and the department of the Seine that tried to finish the tasks first undertaken by the Parlement of Paris.
II Judging the former administrators

From the beginning, the members of Revolutionary assemblies thought one of their chief functions was to judge the former administrators who were responsible for the bankruptcy of the French state. Judging old administrators was accompanied by judging old institutions. It is well known that by January 1793, the Revolutionaries had abolished the monarchy and condemned the king to death. But it is less well known that more than three years before, they had judged the main royal court the Parlement of Paris, and condemned it. There were few if any former Jesuits in Paris to enjoy hearing the court composed of their old enemies referred to as "the former" Parlement. But the former Parlement of Paris passed into oblivion and its passing apparently caused little public regret. It had contributed to its own destruction on that day in June 1788, when it had refused to approve the "doubling of the Third".

The end of the Parlement had not automatically meant the end of its servants or the end of the administrations created by the Parlement to carry out its policies. It did happen, however, that all the remaining officials and administrators whom it had named to hold Jesuit property or to satisfy Jesuit creditors were relieved of their functions and in some way discredited by the Revolutionaries. But while leading parlementaires went to the scaffold, the few remaining servants of the Parlement who had been involved in the Jesuit affair were given a hearing and then allowed to go their own ways and perhaps even to find a place in the new régime.

It would have been logical and convenient to study the Revolutionaries' treatment of the administrators of the old régime who had dealt with the Jesuit affair in the same order as we have studied the creation
and work of these officials in the preceding chapters. This would have meant considering what the Revolutionaries did with the Econome Séquestre of Paris and any provincial économés séquestres whose régies had not ended before the Revolution, the officials of the Union of Creditors, any bureaux of administration of former Jesuit colleges which had survived until the Revolution, and the Econome Général du Clergé. But the Revolutionary legislators were concerned primarily with the serious issues arising from the confiscation of all church property. They were unaware of the history of the creation of the old régime administrators who had managed the material aspects of the Jesuit affair until the Revolution. The Revolutionaries looked into the affairs of the administrators whom we have studied, only as their investigations of broader aspects of old régime administration brought these administrators to their attention.

The existence of the Union of Creditors of the Jesuits and of its directorate seems to have been the first matter in the Jesuit affair which the Revolutionaries noticed. This happened when the Committee on Accounts was reviewing the affairs of the old régime in 1789 to 1790, and when Desenne spoke to the National Assembly in the early part of 1790. Desenne was a vocal critic of most institutions of the old régime, and especially of what he regarded as the abominable practice of creating a union of creditors when someone who was indebted to more than one person went bankrupt. He accused the officials of such unions, and specifically the officials of the Union of Creditors of the Jesuits, of being self-seeking, self-perpetuating administrators whose only interest was in prolonging their work so that they might continue to receive their salaries or their commissions indefinitely.

Soon after Desenne addressed the National Assembly, the principal
official of the Union of Creditors of the Jesuits, Rouhette, replied to these criticisms. He showed just how the officials of the Union had proceeded over the years and demonstrated that large numbers of creditors, including those with very large claims, had been almost completely repaid. Having apparently believed Rouhette, the National Assembly nevertheless decided on 23 and 28 October 1790, to dissolve the Union of Creditors of the Jesuits, and to put an end to the work of its directors. It gave them until 1 January 1791 to complete their work and submit their accounts.

In April 1791, the Assembly gave the responsibility for winding up the affairs of the Union of Creditors to the municipality and department of Paris, and to it alone. The various bureaux of the Enregistrement, Domaines, and Liquidation, now functioning under the municipality and department of Paris, soon acquired what they could of the records of the Union, including a copy of the Ordre Général et Définitif of the Creditors of 1772, various statements made by creditors, and papers relating to Doillot's administration. The bureaux used Doillot, Lambert, Rouhette, and Bouclier, all of whom had been appointed to various positions in the Union or in the sale of Jesuit property, to help to sort out what remained of the Union's affairs. None of them had any legal or official status as administrators after 1 January 1791.

The results of the investigations into the Union's affairs carried out by the various bureaux in Paris are fascinating. The bureaux discovered for themselves, in the course of the next decade, a number of facts which Rouhette had already brought to the attention of the Assembly in 1790. And they gave substance to these facts. The bureaux discovered and demonstrated that the Union had not succeeded in selling the two major Jesuit establishments in Paris which formerly had been
handed over to it. Nor had the Union sold certain provincial or colonial property. As the National Assembly gave way to the Legislative Assembly, and as the Convention and Directory assumed the government of France, the various supervisory committees of the bureaux, and finally the Minister of Finance, sent requests to all the bureaux under the municipality and department of Paris for more information about the money owed to the Union. Over the decade, the bureaux discovered that although the Union had sold much property in France and the colonies, it had failed to collect almost 400,000 livres for property sold in France. The bureaux found out that the value of unsold colonial property belonging to the Union was more than 600,000 livres. They apparently also estimated the value of other, as yet unsold real property and rentes in France at over a million livres.

Otherwise, the bureaucrats worked with Doillot, Lambert, and Bouclier to find out how much money the former administrators owed the Union. The members of the bureaux thought they discovered some irregularities in Doillot's accounts. They noted that by 1792, the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire, as the Domaines nationaux had been called, had received 70,281 livres from Doillot. The recipients and Doillot himself apparently regarded this amount as the surplus which Doillot had in his caisse when his régie came to an end on 1 January 1791. By 1796 to 1797, a further investigation, carried out on the advice of the Minister of Finance, revealed that Doillot had failed to hand over a further 301,522 livres 17 sols 3 deniers. The bureaux demanded this sum from Doillot and threatened him with legal proceedings and severe punishment if he failed to pay it.

In response to this threat, Doillot produced evidence that he had used some of this money before 10 December 1790 to pay legitimate creditors and members of the Union money which the Jesuits had owed to
them, and had given the remainder to the National Treasury on that day. The bureaux were not satisfied, and, apparently out of fear of punishment, Doillot paid the required amount to the Revolutionaries in Year IV. He paid the money in assignats because since 1787, he had been dealing in notes issued by the Caisse d'Escompte, and since 1793, he had been using the paper money, the assignats, which the government had authorized to be used in all business transactions in France. In return, he was chided by the Bureau de Liquidation for having failed to make his payments in metallic currency. As late as 1810, the Bureau de Liquidation was still discussing the matter of Doillot's accounts, which never seems to have been cleared up to either party's satisfaction. Doillot continued to maintain that he had been forced to pay the same money twice.21

It was in the course of investigating the affairs of the Union of Creditors that the members of the Paris bureaux of the Enregistrement, Domaines, and Liquidation became aware that there had existed an Econome Séquestre of Paris and that Edme-Louis Bronod had held this office. The bureaucrats took seriously the statements in the Parlement's legislation of 23 April and 6 August 1762, which had instructed Bronod to give his surplus revenue to the Union of Creditors.22 As the new administrators analysed the affairs of the Union, they found that Bronod had died in 1781 with a surplus of 96,447 livres, which they assumed belonged to the Union. They wondered why this money had not reached the Union and tried to reclaim it for the creditors.23 They said nothing about the Econome Séquestre of Paris after 178124 and nothing at all about the provincial économes séquestres. We may assume that all of them, including the économes séquestres of Bourges and Poitiers, had ceased to function before the Revolution began.

Although the municipality and department of Paris does not seem to
have settled the matter of Doillot's or Bronod's accounts, it did what it could to put an end to the work of the officials of the Union of Creditors. In 1793, an official of a bureau of the Enregistrement and Domaines wrote to his superior to state what he knew and was generally believed to have been the achievement of the now defunct Union. He stated that it had been given real and other property valued at twelve million livres and had sold more than nine million livres' worth of this property. The creditors of the Jesuits were still owed 2,678,264 livres. The various bureaux would continue to try to satisfy the remaining creditors, about whom very little was known. In 1801, a new set of bureaucrats again sought the same kind of information about the Jesuit property and the state of the Union's affairs at the time of its suppression. The bureaux were never quite satisfied that they had completely understood the work of the officials of the Union.

Thus, bureaux of three administrations, the Enregistrement, the Domaines, and the Liquidation, created by the National Assembly, worked under the municipality and department of Paris to put an end to the affairs of the Union of Creditors. They obeyed the two decrees of the National Assembly and tried to carry out the directions of committees, of a Minister of Finance of later legislative bodies. Repeatedly the members of the bureaux wrote that they were receiving the cooperation of the former officials of the Union. Nevertheless, they failed, it would seem, to shed noticeably more light on the affairs of the Union than Rouhette had done in his report of 1790. In particular, they had failed to understand Bronod's accounts which had apparently been satisfactory to his superiors until at least 1773, or those of Doillot, which do not seem to have been questioned under the old régime. In short, the bureaux put an end to the affairs of the old Union of
Creditors, but they did not unravel the mystery surrounding its financial affairs in the last years of its existence.

The best explanation for this state of affairs was offered by Doillot in 1793, when he suggested that the involvement of so many Revolutionary bureaux of three separate administrations in the Union's affairs was the reason for much confusion. Moreover, although the membership of the bureaux did not change with each political régime, it did change quite frequently. Successive committees or ministers of successive political régimes ordered the bureaux to undertake the same tasks more than once. Because the membership of the bureaux changed, no one objected that the investigations had already been undertaken. The Revolutionary bureaucracy's investigation into the affairs of the Union of Creditors demonstrated that the new régime was not noticeably more capable or more efficient than the administrators of the old régime had been.

On the other hand, by forcing Doillot to pay, perhaps for the second time, more than 300,000 livres, which members of the bureaux thought he owed to the Union, the Revolutionaries proved that they were stronger than the administrators of the old régime had been. The latter had apparently not succeeded in regaining large amounts of money owed by its administrators involved in the Jesuit affair. But if Doillot's protests were true, the Revolutionaries were also less humane than the old régime governments had been.

Just as the Revolutionaries had considered the remaining affairs of the Econome Séquestre of Paris and the Union of Creditors as part of the larger problem of dealing with the unfinished business of the old régime, so, too, they examined what was left of the affairs of the Econome Général du Clergé for a broader reason than just because he had been supposed to administer Jesuit benefices and pay Jesuit pensions.
In his case, the Revolutionaries began their investigations mainly because he had been a significant royal official in the service of the crown and of the old régime church. Once the members of the National Assembly had decided to confiscate the property of the church, they automatically took on the unfinished business of his administration. The Revolutionaries continued their investigations into the affairs of the Econome Général and of the Economats for an even longer time than they spent on the affairs of the officials of the Union of Creditors because they found the papers of the Econome Général and his régie in an even more confusing state than those of the other administrators.

As in the case of the Union of Creditors, the judgment of the Econome Général and of the Economats began in the National Assembly. The first speech against the continued existence of the Economats in their traditional form was made by Lanjuinais of the Ecclesiastical Committee on 18 December 1789. Treilhard, of the same committee, spoke on the same subject on 5 February 1790, and on that day the Assembly passed the first decree preparing the way for the suppression of the Economats. For the rest of 1790, the Assembly dealt with the Economats and its administrator in two ways. On the one hand, on 12 July, it authorized the Econome Général, who was by this time Brière de Mondetour, to continue his administration throughout the year. On the other, it asked pensioners of the Economats, who, in this year, still included former Jesuits to declare themselves. The second kind of legislation implied that the Assembly was trying to assess the value of legitimate claims on the Economats in order to determine what it would cost to replace it with an agency or agencies controlled by the government. In July 1790 and again in January 1791, the National Assembly authorized the Public Treasury to pay certain pensions
which until then had been paid on the Economats; in August 1790, it ordered the municipality of Paris to pay others which had formerly been paid on the Economats.

The National Assembly never did undertake a full-scale public inquiry into the affairs of the Economats, but the Legislative Assembly did. Borie of the Committee for the Examination of Accounts read a report on 29 August 1792. He accused the régie of the Economats of the faults which we have already observed in that administration. It was costly, slow, and, despite the nomination of Brière de Mondetour in 1787, still very far behind in the presentation of its accounts. After submitting his report, Borie urged the Assembly to accept his project for a decree to abolish the Economats and force Brière to give a full account of the last years of its existence. The Assembly accepted the recommendation, and ordered the régie of the Economats to stop on 1 September 1792. After that, Brière de Mondetour was to present all the accounts, for all those previous years of the Economats' existence which had not been accounted for.

This law does not seem to have gone into effect until the following year, however. On 8 July 1793, Borie, again in the name of the Committee for the Examination of Accounts, presented to the National Convention another report on the same subject, and on 10 July 1793, the Convention added some of the articles recommended by Borie to the original decree of 29 August 1792. In both reports, Borie made it clear that the conclusion of the business of the Economats and the submitting of accounts by Brière were matters that concerned the nation and were in the public interest. They should be carried out in such a way as to reflect a concern for the national interest, rather than for the interest of the former Econome Général. We do not know whether under the Legislative Assembly or the Convention, Brière actually paid
the more than 600,000 livres which in 1792 he was supposed to owe to the state. There is at least a hint of fraud in the conclusion of the affairs of the Economats. It is not unlikely that one of the Revolutionary administrators, Lessard, who was connected to the Bureau de Liquidation, stole money from Brière's caisse, while analysing its contents.45

Even this was not the end of laws about the Economats passed in the Revolutionary assemblies. Although it seems doubtful that the legislation can have affected many people, on 24 March 1794, the National Convention voted to suppress all pensions which might still be drawn on the Economats or the French clergy. On 16 July 1795, the laws on the subject did come to an end. On that day, the Convention pronounced on the method by which the Econome Général and his provincial representatives should give account of their administrations. In none of these laws was the payment of Jesuit pensions seriously considered.46 However, as the Economats ceased to exist, and as the last Econome Général was replaced by men whose job it was to analyse his accounts, that régie obviously ceased to be able to pay Jesuit pensions.

The decrees of 29 August 1792 and 10 July 1793 had made it quite clear that the Bureau de Liquidation and its various bureaucrats would be in charge of concluding the affairs of the Economats. But by March 1793, and perhaps even before, the remaining affairs of the Economats, like those of the Union of Creditors, were being scrutinized and concluded by the three sets of bureaux of the Enregistrement, Domaines, and Liquidation, which worked under the authority and direction of the municipality and department of Paris.47 Why the municipality and department of Paris should have been entrusted with this task remains obscure. The decree of 11 August 1790, which regulated the remaining business of
the Union of Creditors, may have set the precedent for the decree of 29 August 1792, which authorized the officers of the directory of the department of Paris to seize Brière's accounts. After that the Parisian bureaux may naturally have taken over all the affairs of the Economats.

As a result, the various Parisian bureaux which had put an end to the unfinished business of the Union of Creditors also concluded the unfinished business of the Economats, and specifically that relating to the Jesuit affair. The bureaux were authorized to recover the money owed to Brière de Mondetour, although there is no evidence that they succeeded in collecting it. They also investigated what remained of the old Roque-Berard Affair. Roque had been one of the leaseholders who had managed many of the Jesuit benefices in France under Marchal de Sainscy in 1764 to 1772. He had gone bankrupt while still responsible for the benefices, and, by failing to pay most of his or his company's leases, he had discredited Marchal de Sainscy and himself. Roque's other creditors had initiated legal proceedings against him under the old régime.

The bureaux continued the investigation begun before the Revolution. They discovered details about Roque's management of the benefices which had probably not been known by the Economé Général's superiors. They discovered more about Roque's associates and his legal relationship with his wife, who invested in his enterprises and went bankrupt with him, than can be gleaned from the old régime's papers on the same subject. But, in the end, after two decades of requesting information from each other about Roque's bankruptcy, the Paris bureaucrats had not learned very much. They discovered that Roque probably still owed the Economats 119,857 livres 7 sols 8 deniers. But they had not explained why Roque had gone bankrupt while holding the
benefices. Nor had they explained the bankruptcy of the last venal Econome Général, Marchal de Sainscy, or the financial troubles of his salaried successor, Brière de Mondetour. In general, the investigations carried out by the Parisian bureaux into the affairs of the Economats had been more thorough, but not more enlightening than those of the old régime administrators. The Revolutionaries had suppressed the Economats, but after two decades of work, they had not made sense of its accounts or recovered its missing money.

The Revolutionaries had investigated the affairs of the Econome Séquestre of Paris, the officials of the Union of Creditors, and the Econome Général du Clergé. They had suppressed the offices of the remaining administrators of Jesuit property. But they had not put an end to all the problems which the administrators had left unsolved. Without the administration created by the Parlement and the crown, how did the Revolutionaries solve the outstanding problems caused by the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762?
III  Revolutionary solutions to old problems

In November 1789 the Revolutionaries had declared all the property of the French church to be the property of the nation. The decree of 2 November did not specifically include all the Jesuit property which had not been disposed of under the old régime, however. Over the next five years, the Revolutionaries decided what to do with the remaining Jesuit property. A decree of 30 August 1792 declared all ecclesiastical benefices belonging to the Jesuits to be public property. On 18 July 1793, the Convention issued a decree making all the Jesuit property which had belonged to the now defunct Union of Creditors the property of the nation. And, by decrees of 8 March 1793 and 10 December 1794, all college property and buildings, including any former Jesuit colleges which had not already been taken over in the course of the Revolution, were nationalized. In this way, all colleges, college benefices, noviciates, professed houses, missions, and their attached property, which had once belonged to the Jesuits, and which had not passed into private hands before 1789 or been nationalized along with other church property in 1789, became the property of the French nation.

The districts and the municipalities were apparently expected to sell it in the same way as other biens nationaux. In this matter, as in others, they functioned under the direction of the Paris bureaux of the Enregistrement, Domaines, and Liquidation. By 1794, all the former Jesuit property in that part of France which had fallen under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris had ceased to be administered or disposed of in ways that the Parlement had intended, by the administrators whom it and the crown had appointed.

The Revolutionaries not only assumed control over the remaining
property which had once belonged to the Jesuits. They also gradually accepted responsibility for fulfilling obligations which, under the Parlement of Paris, had been supposed to be paid with revenue produced by leasing or selling the property. The Revolutionaries undertook to ensure that the former Jesuits continued to receive pensions and that the creditors of the Jesuits were fully repaid. To carry out these tasks, they used the Paris bureaux; they also tried to use the municipalités and districts.

The case of the Jesuits was very different from that of their creditors. At the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789, there remained in France fewer than 300 former Jesuits who were still entitled to pensions drawn on the Economats. About 150 of these men also received a supplement from the General Assembly of the Clergy. There may also have been a handful of former Jesuits living privately in various parts of France and not claiming pensions. There were certainly several French Jesuits in White Russia in 1789 to 1814, and it is unlikely that any of them claimed or received pensions from the French crown or clergy.

The nearly 300 Jesuits who were entitled to pensions continued for the first year of the Revolution to be pensioners of the Economats and were supposed to be paid by the Econome Général. According to a decree of 19 February 1790, the Jesuits were given the same status as all other non-mendicant monks. This meant that, like other religious, they were entitled to receive certain sums of money from the state, depending on their ages. In theory, since the new state pensions were larger than the Jesuit pensions drawn on the Economats, this meant that Jesuits who had no other independent source of revenue were authorized to receive state pensions to complement the
ones drawn on the Economats. Thus, after February 1790, former Jesuits under seventy were supposed to receive a total of 1,000 livres a year, and those over seventy were supposed to receive a total of 1,200 livres a year. The state would pay what the Econome Général did not.11

That was the law. In reality, there seems to have been some confusion over implementing it. Undoubtedly the new régime was already having difficulty meeting all its obligations to pay a multitude of pensions.12 Concurrently, the municipalities were complaining that neither they nor the new districts could afford to pay pensions due to be paid on the Economats.13 Whatever the reasons, the Assembly decided on 27 June 1790 to promulgate a decree guaranteeing the payment of all legitimate pensioners of the state for the year 1789, and ordering the payment of some pensioners, including former Jesuits who were already entitled to pensions, for the first six months of 1790.14 Payments to the Jesuits were apparently still to be made by the Econome Général. Then, on 12 July, the Assembly authorized the Econome Général to go on paying pensions to Jesuits for the rest of 1790.15

That was not all that the Assembly did to maintain the payment of allowances to Jesuits. On 31 July 1790, in the name of the Committee on Pensions, Camus suggested, and the Assembly ordered, that pensions formerly paid by the clergy should continue to be paid from the money collected for the clergy by the officials of the districts. The only restriction that Camus proposed was that no pension of this kind should exceed 600 livres.16 This new law would doubtless affect the supplements to pensions drawn on the Economats, which had formerly been paid by the clergy to Jesuits over a certain age.17 Thus, until mid-
July 1790 at least, the Assembly continued to authorize the payment of Jesuit pensions or supplements in the traditional way. It was still the Econome Général and the clergy whose money was to be used. But now the Assembly would watch both processes very closely and delegate some of the clergy's authority to officials of the districts.

The major change in the Revolutionaries' policy about Jesuit pensions came within a year of their decision to do away with the Economats. At the end of 1790 or the beginning of 1791, the Jesuits ceased officially to be pensioners of the Economats, and the Public Treasury became responsible for providing their pensions. Henceforth, as long as the Revolutionaries authorized the payment of pensions to Jesuits, they apparently expected the municipalities and districts to hand out the public money to which the Jesuits were entitled. It was in this way that the Jesuits legally and officially became the creditors of the French state for the pensions to which they were entitled.

There is some doubt whether former members of religious orders did receive pensions during the remaining years of the Revolution, however. Despite the various laws of 1790, it is unlikely that all the Jesuits entitled to pensions actually got them that year or in 1791. On 18 February 1791, the representative of the Jesuits to the Ecclesiastical Committee, Siron, made three complaints to that Committee. He explained that the Committee on Pensions, headed by Camus, had been of no use in guaranteeing the payment of Jesuit pensions. Some of the Jesuits had not been paid their pensions for 1790, and the basic pensions of 400 to 600 livres, which the Econome Général was still supposed to pay the Jesuits, was insufficient. The reply of the Ecclesiastical Committee revealed its powerlessness and a new departure in the conduct of its affairs. It could guarantee nothing for 1790. But for 1791, former
Jesuits should address themselves to the directories of the municipalities, which would pay the pensions from the funds of the Public Treasury.

On 1 April, Siron again complained to the Ecclesiastical Committee that Jesuits without independent revenues and depending only on their authorized pensions could barely survive. They had found their own municipalities and districts unwilling to pay them. Siron requested a decree on this subject from the Ecclesiastical Committee and the Assembly. The Committee replied that the districts were responsible for paying Jesuit pensions. Jesuits who had no independent resources were to behave just as any other former member of a religious order and to request payment from their districts. If the districts would not assume this responsibility, then the Direction of the appropriate départment would have to do so. This correspondence can hardly be regarded as a sign of the Revolutionaries' willingness to help destitute Jesuits. But it does reveal that the Ecclesiastical Committee, and perhaps the whole government, regarded the Jesuits as public pensioners.

It has been impossible to trace the payment of Jesuit pensions during the Revolution. It seems unlikely that many former members of religious orders received state pensions after 1793. For that matter, it seems unlikely that there were by that time many Jesuits left. The list of Jesuits of the Province of Lyon "who remained faithful to their vows until the end" includes the names of at least seventeen Jesuits who were still alive after 1789. Five of them survived until the Consulate. Of the rest, two perished in Paris in 1792, and six died in other parts of France between 1791 and 1799. Others died in Peking, London, or Madrid. The list is too incomplete to demonstrate a general trend. But it is obvious that even men who had been only thirty-three
at the time of the suppression of the Jesuit order in 1762 were over sixty during the Revolution. There must have been a certain natural mortality rate among them, and few Jesuits can have sought pensions after the first years of the Revolution.

The Revolutionaries were apparently better able to draft legislation about Jesuit pensions than to carry it out. They abolished the Economats, which they deemed a public liability, and sought to establish a more just and comprehensive system of carrying out its tasks. Making the Jesuits officially creditors of the state was one way in which they sought to do this.

The fate of the Jesuits' creditors during the Revolution is also difficult to trace. The Union of Creditors came to an end on 23 October 1790, and its remaining records tell us little about its affairs after 1789. But although we cannot consider the Revolutionaries' treatment of the creditors from the creditors' point of view, there is no lack of information about the ways in which the legislators sought to ensure that the remaining creditors should be repaid. In April 1791, the National Assembly had made the municipality and department of Paris responsible for acquitting the rest of the Jesuits' debts. Just as the Assembly had instructed former Jesuits to seek pensions from the municipalities, districts, or departments, so it now made a similar provision for the creditors. The Revolutionaries did not explain why they delegated this authority in the way that they did. It is probable that the municipality and department of Paris was the only body that might have had enough money, produced mainly from the sale of nationalized property, to acquit the Jesuits' and other bankrupt societies' or corporations' debts. Moreover, it still had sufficient unsold Jesuit property which, if sold, might pay much of the remaining debt. According to the new law, creditors were to apply to
the Bureau de Liquidation des dettes des Jésuites, which was a subsection of the Bureau de Liquidation. The Paris administration was soon divided into districts or arrondissements, each of which seems to have been responsible for dealing with leftover Jesuit business in a specific part of France.

On 18 July 1793, the Convention took up the matter of the unpaid Jesuit debts as part of its law on national property. The decree of that day ordered that Jesuit debts should be paid from money raised from the sale of Jesuit property. In contrast to the situation under the old régime, the process was to take place under the National Treasury. Although the details of the process were still administered by the Paris bureaux, a new development had occurred. The problem of repaying the creditors of the Jesuits was no longer the province of a semi-private union of creditors, but had become a responsibility to be administered by the state. But despite this involvement of the new public administration, it would be five more years until the creditors of the Jesuits became officially the creditors of the state. In the meantime, the Bureau de Liquidation appears to have been more involved in regaining money owed to Jesuits or old régime administrators than in repaying Jesuit creditors.

The future of the creditors of the Jesuits was again taken up in earnest by the Directory. It was that régime which actively asserted its desire to liquidate all "public" debts. The Conseil des Anciens appointed a commission of Laussat, Lindet, and Lecouteulx to consider the means by which the state could satisfy the Jesuits' creditors. The members of the commission studied proposals of other members of the Conseil and made proposals of their own. The commission intended to take a firm, but not unjust stand towards the creditors. On 31 March 1798, Lecouteulx reviewed its findings and recommended the promul-
He recommended that the *Ordre Général et Définitif* of the creditors prepared in 1772 should continue to be the instrument by which legitimate creditors of the Jesuits should be determined. He also suggested that before being paid any money at all, a creditor should produce a legal certificate granted under the old régime by a trésorier or a payeur, stating that the creditor in question had not already been repaid under the old régime. Lecouteulx also argued that the commission should not recognize a creditor of the Jesuits unless his name had appeared in the *Ordre* of 1772.

Slight modifications of these arguments were embodied in the decree of 31 March 1798. The decree repeated other provisions of the legislation of 1791 and 1793, and ordered anyone having information about the previous administration of Jesuit property to present registers and other accounts pertaining to that property to the *Liquidateur Général*, who was apparently the head of the *Bureau de Liquidation* in Paris. Moreover, the decree of 1798 abrogated those provisions of the laws of 1791 and 1793 which had implied or stated that the creditors of the Jesuits should still be repaid from the sale of former Jesuit property. Henceforth, any remaining creditors of the Jesuits were to be paid from the general funds of the National Treasury, "like the other creditors of the Republic". The repayment of Jesuit creditors, like the payment of Jesuit pensions, seems to have been a matter on which the Revolutionaries could make just laws, but not act with any sureness of success. It is unlikely that they repaid many creditors after 1798.

The enactment of the decree of 1798 appears to have become the responsibility of the Parisian bureaux of the *Enregistrement*, *Domaine*, and *Liquidation*. They continued to function, under increased control from the municipality and department of Paris, until about 1825. By then, the amounts of money involved were so small that the state had
ceased to take much interest in the remaining financial aspects of the Jesuit affair. At least one bureaucrat had complained of the needless expense involved in trying to bring such inconsequential matters to an end. For the Revolutionary legislators and bureaucrats, 1798 seems to have marked the end of the problems which arose because of the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762. The same date may serve for us as well.

By 1798, the French state had assumed the ownership of the Jesuit colleges and their attached property, which had been controlled by local authorities since 1762. It had taken over ecclesiastical benefices, including those once belonging to the Jesuits and administered by the Econome Général du Clergé, or the local bureaux of administration of the colleges after 1763. And it had declared the novic平安es and professed house held by the Union of Creditors after 1762 to be public property. In one way or another, all the property once held by the Jesuits, which had not been sold under the old régime, became biens nationaux, and was to be used in the national interest. Similarly, by 1798, the few remaining Jesuits and their creditors, who after 1762 or 1763, had been provided for by économos séquestres, the officials of the Union of Creditors, or the Econome Général, were to be creditors of the new French state.

All remaining aspects of the Jesuit affair were administered by the new officials of the French state by 1798. As they had delegated these duties to the new officials, the Revolutionaries had also made another change in the administration of the Jesuits' property and obligations. Before 1762, the Jesuits had normally used their property to educate the young, to pay the debts which resulted from their execution of their educational and pastoral functions, and to provide for their own members. After 1762, the Parlement and the crown had organized the
administration of Jesuit property in such a way as to respect this traditional connection between the Jesuits' property and their obligations. After 1762, Jesuit colleges remained open under new administrators, and the education provided in them was supposed to be financed from property attached to the colleges in the time of the Jesuits. Other Jesuit property was supposed to produce the money with which to repay the Jesuits' creditors and pay former Jesuits' subsistence allowances. In practice, other resources were drawn on to supplement the revenue produced by Jesuit benefices for Jesuit pensions. But theoretically the connection between Jesuit property and Jesuit obligations was maintained throughout the old régime.

Under the Revolution, the connection between the former Jesuits' property and their obligations was gradually severed, both in fact and in theory. After 1789, the same officials might be charged to administer former Jesuit property and former Jesuit obligations. And, in nationalizing the remaining Jesuit property, the new French state did guarantee that the property would be used in the public interest. But after 1790, it did not expect to use the property to fulfil the former Jesuits' obligations. Instead former Jesuits and their creditors alike became creditors of the Public Treasury at large. By 1798, the Revolutionaries had completely taken over and completely transformed the functions of the old régime administrators of Jesuit property. In this way, the history of the administration which had been created in 1762 to 1764 to seize, hold, and dispose of Jesuit property came to an end.
Summary and Conclusion

The traditional enmity between Jansenists and Jesuits reached a climax in 1761, when the Parlement of Paris found the Jesuit order in France responsible for Lavalette's debts. The order failed to pay those debts, and, in 1762, the Parlement of Paris expelled the Jesuits from their institutions in its jurisdiction. In 1764, it tried to expel them from the whole of France, and only the king's intervention prevented the expulsion. Three years later, the Parlement again tried to banish the Jesuits from the kingdom. This time the crown did not interfere. Despite the severity of the Parlement's legislation, it is apparent that not all former Jesuits left France in 1767 or in the years that followed.

The temporary exile of the Parlement in 1771 to 1773 and the more enduring suppression of the Jesuit order throughout the world in 1773, reduced the time that the Parlement could devote to the Jesuit question and the fear that even the most anti-Jesuit parlementaires felt for the Jesuits. The same events made it possible for the crown to promulgate a law which, though it did not undo the Parlement's legislation, probably mitigated its effects. After 1773, neither the Parlement nor any other institution or corporate body was seriously concerned about the Jesuit question. The few former Jesuits remaining in France during the Revolution experienced the same treatment from the Revolutionaries as other members of religious orders. The unofficial restoration of the Jesuit order in France came about without serious incident in 1814 and involved a handful of men who had been members of the Society of Jesus in 1762.
The Parlement's legislation of 1761 had implied the threat that Lavalette's creditors might confiscate Jesuit property if the Jesuits failed to satisfy the creditors. A year later, it was the Parlement of Paris that oversaw the seizure of all Jesuit property within its jurisdiction and encouraged other parlements to follow its example. In 1762 to 1763, members of the Parlement, with the crown's compliance and with the help of a few members of the Royal Council, fashioned the administration. It would hold and eventually dispose of the property which had belonged to the Jesuits in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris and of some of the Jesuits' property elsewhere in France.

The property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris was important because it was extensive and had enabled the Jesuits to be the principal teachers of young Frenchmen for more than a century. The jurisdiction included thirty-nine colleges, with nine pensionnats, and sixty-nine ecclesiastical benefices attached to colleges and constituting part of their endowment. The rest of the colleges' endowment consisted both of real property other than ecclesiastical benefices, and of securities, otherwise known as rentes. The colleges had acquired all such property during the previous two hundred or more years. It had been the gift of the crown, of other parts of the French church, and of a variety of laymen. Very little of it had been acquired recently. Over the years, the colleges had gained extensive movable property, including books, manuscripts, medal collections, astronomical instruments, ecclesiastical vestments, and sacred vessels and ornaments.

Legally within the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris because officially administered from colleges within its jurisdiction, were French and foreign missions, including the mission in Martinique, which Lavalette had made famous. The domestic and foreign missions and the
professed house in Paris made it possible for the Jesuits to carry out their pastoral functions and to make converts to Catholicism. The other Jesuit institutions of the jurisdiction of the Parlement were two noviciates and two residences. They permitted the preparation of young Jesuits, most of whom would be expected to work in Jesuit colleges, and the retirement of old Jesuits, most of whom had worked in Jesuit colleges of the five provinces of France. The professed house and the noviciates had more or less official endowments, consisting mainly of the revenues from real property and from securities. The Jesuits of the college, noviciate, and professed house of Paris also owned and used country property just outside the city of Paris.

Although extensive and although still enabling the Jesuits to educate many young Frenchmen, the Jesuits' revenues were not so vast and their property was not so valuable as members of the Parlement and other contemporaries maintained. While the evidence does not support the contention that all Jesuit colleges and other institutions were on the verge of bankruptcy in 1761, it does suggest that very few except the three largest colleges could have remained financially solvent for very many years more, even if Lavalette's bankruptcy had not caused the crisis of 1761.

While most Jesuit colleges faced financial hardship in the mid-eighteenth century, they also ceased to be the growing, popular, and highly respected institutions which they had been a century before. Their place in French life was beginning to be taken by other institutions, of which the most notable were the Jansenist petites écoles and the Oratorian colleges. The supplanting of the Jesuits in French education not only undermined their colleges but also removed the raison d'être for other Jesuit institutions. By 1762, the Jesuits and
their institutions were weaker than they had been since the temporary suppression of the order in the reign of Henri IV.

The parlementaires responsible for the confiscation either remained ignorant or chose to conceal their knowledge of the weakness of the Jesuit colleges and other institutions. As they wrested the initiative from the handful of Lavalette's creditors who had begun the legal proceedings leading to the confiscation of Jesuit property, the parlementaires concentrated most of their attention on the Jesuit colleges and the future of those colleges. Initially, the Parlement sought to re-establish the colleges as secular institutions dedicated to the promotion of a new kind of education.

At the same time, it established the principle that just as Jesuit property had traditionally provided the means by which the Jesuits had educated young people, paid the costs of that education, and the costs of supporting members of the order, so, now, it should be used to acquit the Jesuits' remaining responsibilities. The colleges and their attached property should continue to provide education, and the rest of the property would produce revenue to repay the creditors of the Jesuits and to pay the Jesuits' own subsistence allowances. To carry out these policies, the Parlement, with the help of royal authorities, created a centralized administration. All parts of the administration were in greater or lesser degree responsible to the Parlement.

The history of the confiscation began in 1761 and 1762, when the Parlement demanded information about Jesuit property from provincial officials. In the next two years, three members of the Parlement, Rolland d'Erceville, Roussel de la Tour, and de l'Averdy compiled complete descriptions of the nature and extent of Jesuit property under the jurisdiction of the Parlement. Their reports explained the way in which the colleges had been founded and had functioned, and
demonstrated the ability of most of these institutions to remain financially solvent even without the presence of the Jesuits. The reports said very little about the other Jesuit institutions or property in the jurisdiction. Some of the members of the Parlement who prepared the reports had also been instrumental in creating the system of économes séquestres who, after 23 April 1762, administered all Jesuit property of the jurisdiction until its permanent fate could be decided.

The work of all but three of the économes séquestres was finished in five years. Of the remaining three, two administered the fortunes of the Colleges of Bourges and Poitiers for two decades, and perhaps longer. The last, Edme-Louis Bronod, who was both the Econome Séquestre of Paris and the head of the whole network of économes séquestres, continued to work for the Parlement for more than two decades. But the most important aspects of even his work were concentrated into the first five years of his administration. Individual provincial économes séquestres seem to have been unsuccessful in collecting enough money to pay the local expenses caused by the confiscation. Nevertheless, the network of économes séquestres, with the Econome Séquestre of Paris at its head, remained financially successful until at least as late as 1773. If the first Econome Séquestre died bankrupt, he did so only after working very hard for the Parlement and administering Jesuit revenues to the Parlement's satisfaction for more than the first five (and most difficult) years after the seizure of Jesuit property. The volume of business he was still conducting at the time of his death and bankruptcy in 1781 was insignificant by comparison with the volume of business he had conducted successfully in 1762 to 1764. By 1767, the administration of all but two of the colleges was no longer in his or the provincial économes séquestres' hands.

By 1763, those parlementaires who had already so actively persecuted
the Jesuits, seized their property, and created the network of économes séquestres, persuaded the crown to authorize the creation of bureaux of administration to run all colleges not held by religious congregations or attached to universities. In theory, the legislation could be applied to all but the Colleges of Bourges and Poitiers. Between 1764 and 1768, the Parlement in fact encouraged the crown to authorize the suppression of four other former Jesuit colleges, which it deemed either uneconomical or superfluous. By 1777, two of the four suppressed colleges had been reestablished.

Thus, the Parlement saw the royal Edict of February 1763 applied almost immediately to thirty-three of the thirty-nine former Jesuit colleges of its jurisdiction. The business of gaining royal approval for the continued existence of the thirty-three colleges and their benefices, and of introducing legislation in the Parlement to confirm the colleges' possession of their real and movable property, lasted until 1766. In all cases in which confirmed colleges had enjoyed the revenues from ecclesiastical benefices, their enjoyment of such revenues was assured and was supposed to begin again under bureaux of administration by 1767.

Having seen to the creation of bureaux of administration for almost all the Jesuit colleges, as well as for other colleges of its jurisdiction, the parlementaires who had so actively supported the confiscation in the initial stages began to neglect the colleges. Three of the men responsible for the confiscation assumed important roles in the royal administration, and their change of emphasis may simply have been a reflection of the change in the power they held. The most active persecutor of Jesuits anddrafter of plans for the administration of Jesuit colleges after the confiscation, Rolland d'Erceville, remained in the Parlement. In 1768, he published a Plan d'Etudes
which was an interesting statement of educational thought, though it was not put into practice. After 1771, the Parlement as a whole neglected the colleges and the future of education in its jurisdiction. It turned instead to the more destructive task of undermining the crown's authority. Left to local authorities, colleges fell into disuse even before they were suppressed by the Revolutionaries.

Other parts of the administration which the Parlement and crown created in 1762 to 1763 revealed the Parlement's willingness to try to satisfy the two other claimants to Jesuit property or Jesuit revenues. In April and May 1762, the Parlement authorized the creation of a Union of Creditors. It was to be made up of all the creditors of the Jesuit order in France who could prove that their claims were legitimate. The officials in charge of the Union were the syndics and directors named by the membership of the Union. Initially these officials made minor seizures of Jesuit property in the border regions. But their first job was to identify all the creditors. It took more than a decade for the syndics and directors and the Abbé Terray in the Parlement to decide on the legal membership of the Union, but by September 1772, there were more than 1,500 legitimate creditors of the Jesuits waiting to be repaid through the agency of the officials of the Union.

A list of creditors, in order of priority, was published in 1772. By then, the Parlement had decided to confirm almost all the colleges' possession of their movable and real property and securities and had gained the crown's sanction for the continued existence of the colleges and their eventual control over the ecclesiastical benefices once attached to the colleges. This general principle was expressed in the king's lettres patentes of 2 February 1763, 21 November 1763, and 30 March 1764 which stated that the creditors might have any real and movable property and securities not specifically reserved for public
education and not in any way belonging to the colleges. In this way, the noviciate in Lyon, the Parisian noviciate and professed house, and all the property attached to or found in these institutions, including extensive country property and securities, became the property of the Union. So did the colonial property not reserved for public education. Meanwhile, *lettres patentes* of 21 November 1763 had stated the theoretical conditions in which the *économes séquestres* or bureaux of administration of the colleges would have to make small payments to the Union of Creditors. In return, they did make a payment to another agent involved in the confiscation, the *Economie Général du Clergé*.

It was one thing for the Union to have gained rights to specific property and to specific payments in an eventual set of circumstances. It was quite another to dispose of the property or to receive all the promised payments from the colleges. The syndics and directors of the Union succeeded within the first four years in selling about two million *livres*' worth of former Jesuit property under the supervision of the *Parlement*, and in repaying a considerable part of the capital owed by the Jesuits to their creditors. This operation, like that of the *économes séquestres*, was the more successful in the early stages. By 1774, the syndics had sold an additional two million *livres*' worth of Jesuit property, and had probably paid a total of three million *livres* to the creditors of the Jesuits, most of whose names were now in the definitive list of creditors.

In the next two decades, the administration of the syndics and directors of the Union, like the administration of the *Economie Séquestre* of Paris, became mainly a holding operation. The officials of the Union continued to repay what they could. By 1790, they had probably paid a total of between six and six and a half million *livres* in capital to creditors and a similar amount in interest, arrears, legal
costs, and other administrative expenses. They had been able to perform with considerable efficiency the functions with which they were charged until about 1772. Thereafter, dealing with the claims of about 1,600 creditors or would-be creditors and attempting to sell or to collect money from the sale of Jesuit property seems to have cost more money than the sales raised. By 1790, the officials of the Union were still unable to repay all the creditors of the Jesuits, and were still waiting for large payments from the crown and the city of Paris.

The other claimants to Jesuit property were the former Jesuits themselves. As early as 6 August 1762, the Parlement granted them the right to receive subsistence and travel allowances when they left their houses. These allowances, which came largely from the extensive caisse of the Econome Séquestre of Paris, were to last for the first years after the confiscation. Then, on 2 February 1763, apparently on the recommendation of the Parlement, the crown named one of its officials to perform the functions intended to produce money to pay annual pensions to Jesuits. This was the Econome Général du Clergé, Marchal de Sainscy, who had the temporary responsibility for administering the Jesuit benefices and paying Jesuit pensions. His administration of both the benefices and the pensions is sufficiently shrouded in mystery to escape satisfactory analysis. The little information on the subject that can be trusted shows that this royal official did initially receive large sums of money from the benefices and did make large payments to the Jesuits in pensions. But this arrangement did not last. By 1764, the crown had felt obliged to assume primary responsibility for providing the money for the pensions in the event that the Econome Général could not pay them, and thereafter, he seems to have received a large supplement from the crown. He also received money from the Union of Creditors, and, once the benefices
had been returned to the charge of the colleges, according to the terms of the individual lettres patentes confirming the existence of twenty-two of the colleges, he received annual payments from the colleges which had regained their benefices. Nevertheless, like the syndics and directors of the Union of Creditors, the Econome Général became very short of money by the end of the old régime and eventually went bankrupt. Nevertheless, his règlement continued to pay Jesuit pensions, with supplements from the crown until the Revolution.

The causes of the bankruptcy of the Econome Général were different from the causes of the Union's financial difficulties, however. While the officials of the Union, and the Econome Séquestre of Paris had been conscientious, and while the officials of the Union had been painstakingly slow, the Econome Général may actually have been dishonest about the presentation of his accounts. He may also have been very careless in his choice of assistants. At the same time, like the officials of the Union of Creditors, the Econome Général du Clergé was a victim of the administrative systems within which he worked. On the other hand, the officials of the Union seem to have been honest men. The Econome Général may not have been deliberately dishonest, but he had a great deal to do with men and practices that were. He was not responsible for the accounting system which encouraged him to present his accounts long after the transactions described therein had taken place. But he cannot have been unaware of the disorder in his caisse by the 1780's.

The situation had not improved with the passage of time. His receipts from one five year period to the next in the early period were constant. But although, between 1763 and 1777, he should have been able to pay a greater and greater proportion of authorized Jesuit pensions with those receipts, he seems instead to have collected most of the money
for Jesuit pensions after 1773 from the Royal Treasury. Between 1763 and 1777, he seems to have paid nearly five and a half million livres in pensions to Jesuits, but by no means all of this money can have come from Jesuit benefices. After 1786, the clergy supplemented Jesuit pensions with a grant of 40,000 livres per year, and although the Econome Général went on paying some pensions, it is difficult to determine to what extent he used money produced by the benefices to do so.

The creditors of the Jesuits did not receive the full repayment of their capital and interest during the old régime. And the Jesuit benefices never produced the necessary revenue to pay Jesuit pensions. The work of the syndics of the Union of Creditors and of the Econome Général du Clergé would have been more successful if the Parlement had developed a better means of supervising it. But the Parlement and crown either would not or could not exercise the necessary degree of supervision over the officials of the Union of Creditors or the Econome Général. Nor did they ensure that the officials of the Union had sufficient money or that the Econome Général had adequate regional administrators to enable them to make the kind of payments envisaged by the royal legislation of 1763.

The Parlement had organized the seizure of Jesuit property in 1762 and had created a rational administration to hold that property. From then on, it took less and less interest in the results of the confiscation. By 1771, it had not only neglected the creditors and the Jesuits. It had also begun to neglect the colleges which it had worked so hard to control. The entire administration set up under the aegis of the Parlement with the crown's support was weak and perhaps even in ruins when the Revolution began.

The Revolutionaries did not set about to solve the administrative
problems resulting from the confiscation of Jesuit property three decades before. But as they tried to establish a rational means of paying the old régime's debts, they became aware of the existence of the administration created in 1762 and 1763, and of the persistence of some of the problems which that administration had not been able to solve. Using the administrators established to carry out the confiscation of all church property after 1789, the Revolutionaries examined the old régime's management of Jesuit property. By the end of 1793, they had put an end to the Union of Creditors and to the work of its directorate, and they had abolished the Economats and relieved the last Econome Général of his functions. The Revolutionaries also nationalized all the Jesuit property which had not passed into private hands before 1789. By 1794, all property attached to colleges, all Jesuit benefices, and former Jesuit colleges had become biens nationaux. The Revolutionaries intended the districts and municipalities to sell most Jesuit property as biens nationaux. They did not reopen the colleges and, in their turn, were not more successful than the Parlement of Paris had been in establishing a national system of education.

Having suppressed the administrators and taken all the former Jesuit property, the Revolutionaries assumed the responsibilities which, under the Parlement of Paris, the old administrators had been supposed to fulfil. They undertook to pay Jesuit pensions and to repay Jesuit creditors. They did this in 1790 and 1798 by making both the former Jesuits and their creditors the official creditors of the French state. In this way, the Revolutionaries broke the connection between the Jesuits' property and the Jesuits' responsibilities which the parlementaires and, to a lesser degree, the crown had maintained when they used Jesuit colleges as colleges or when they ordered that Jesuit property should be used to repay the creditors of the Jesuits or to pay pensions to Jesuits.
The Revolutionaries introduced the concept of public ownership of former Jesuit property and public responsibility for the payment of Jesuit pensions and the repayment of the money owed to Jesuit creditors. Such a concept had not been present in the confiscation and administration of Jesuit property before 1789.

None of the administrators or bureaucrats ever wrote *finis* at the end of the financial business arising out of the Jesuit affair. The only men who ever considered that the suppression and confiscation of 1762 were over, were members of the restored Society of Jesus. In their official catalogue for 1814, they offered their respects to the seven French Jesuits who had survived fifty-two years of persecution and neglect. For the members of the restored Society, if not for us, in 1814 all the remaining fragments of this difficult history were truly gathered in.
Notes, Chapter I

Part I pp. 5-7

1 The most readily available description of the nature and extent of property held by the Jesuits in 1762 is to be found in ed. Pierre Delattre, Les Etablissements des Jésuites en France depuis quatre siècles...(Enghien, 1949-57), vol. I, p. 1279; vol. II, pp. 599-600, 647, 756, and 1494; and vol. IV, p. 1254. This collection is arranged in the manner of an encyclopedia, and contains, besides the general descriptions of Jesuit property just cited, an alphabetical listing of each Jesuit institution found in present-day continental France. It thus includes at least a brief description of the institutions with which this study is concerned. Delattre's description of the extent of the property appears to be based on Alexandre Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae Societatis Jesu 1762-1768 (Paris, 1899) (Bibliothèque Nationale, hereafter cited as B.N., Ld 39 1114); Louis Carrez and Alfred Hamy, Atlas Geographicus Societatis Jesu (Paris, 1900), 6 vols.; and the anonymous map entitled Carte de l'Assistance de France...(n.p., 1706 with later additions) (B.N., Ld 39 362). A copy of this map forms Appendix I of this dissertation.

2 Ignatius Loyola to Codure, May 1541, quoted in François de Dainville, La Naissance de l'humanisme moderne (Paris, 1940), vol. I, p. 19. This study, an early work of the well-known Jesuit historical geographer, is the standard and most thorough treatment of the beginning of Jesuit education available.


5 Le Jay was one of Ignatius Loyola's original companions and one of the Jesuits' first great theologians. Du Prat's work is discussed below, pp. 12-15.
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11 The establishment of the college of Billom was authorized just a few days before Ignatius's death. See below, p. 13 for a description of the founding of this, the first Jesuit college in France.

12 Institutatum S. J. (Florence, 1893), vol. II, pp. 536-7, quoted by Bailly in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. 1398. That the Formula was also a description of what was in fact to happen is apparent from reading this statement concerning the kinds of colleges held by the company in 1582, written by a rector of a college in the province of Aquitaine:

l'estat des collèges de la Compagnie de Jésus en la Province d'Aquitaine:

La première es des grandz collèges où l'on fait profession de l'escriture saintce, de la théologie scholastique, des cas de conscience, des controverses de la philosophie, de trois cours des langues hebraïque, greque et latine, et des lettres humaines à cinq ou six classes...

La seconde sorte est des médiocres [average size] où ils font profession des cas de conscience, de la philosophie à deux ou trois cours, des langues grecque et latine, et des lettres humaines à cinq classes...

La troisième est de plus peticz où l'on enseigne la rhétorique, les lettres humaines, langue grêque et latine, le tout en cinq classes et les cas de conscience....


13 Aquaviva was the third general of the Jesuit order. The standard translation of the Ratio is Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Jesu (Paris, 1892) (trans. by H. Ferté as Programme et règlements des études de la Société de Jésus) (B.N., R 17129).


15 Snyders, Pédagogie, pp. 36-41, demonstrates the reluctance of most teachers of the period to leave children alone, lest they fall into some kind of sin.

16 Snyders, Pédagogie, p. 82, summarizes the role of the prefect, as explained in the Ratio Studiorum.

17 Cf. François de Dainville, La Géographie des humanistes (Paris, 1940), which describes the nature of the geography taught in Jesuit colleges during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
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20 Snyders, Pédagogie, book I, emphasizes the similarity between the programmes of the great teachers of the period.

21 See d'Alembert's article on colleges in the Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des Sciences, des Arts, et Métiers (Paris, 1753) vol. III, pp. 634-7. D'Alembert argued that there was no further justification for studying a dead language (Latin) or for receiving instruction in Aristotelian or scholastic philosophy. Rather, young men should spend their time studying the principles of their own language. Young Frenchmen should also study other modern languages, such as Spanish and English. They might study history, modern authors, an abridgment of Locke's writings, and the Sermon on the Mount, as well. This was only one of several new programmes of study published in mid-eighteenth century France.

22 See Snyders, Pédagogie, book II, in which he describes the courants nouveaux of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

23 See below, Appendix II, for a table of known enrolments in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
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1 The lettres patentes in question were issued by Henri II in January 1551, by François II on 25 April 1560, and by Catherine de Médicis in the name of Charles IX on 23 December 1560. They are referred to in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. 1403, See also vol. II, p. 526.


3 The college, under Pierre Chanal, S. J., was opened on 26 July 1556, although the contract authorizing its foundation was not signed by Guillaume du Prat until 19 November 1558. See M. Dousse in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, pp. 702-3.


7 Delattre, Etablissements, vol. II, pp. 526-7. Delattre judged that it was the Parlement's arrêt which gave legality to the Jesuits' presence in France, and that this legality was reinforced by the publication of the lettres patentes issued by the crown in 1565, which authorized the use of the name Compagnie de Jésus; of lettres patentes of 1574, which offered the protection of law and the king to all houses of the Company, founded or yet to be founded; and of lettres patentes of 1580, which authorized the establishment of professed houses and novications.

8 Fouqueray, Histoire, vol. IV, p. 256. See also Camille de Rochemonteix, Le Père Antoine Lavalette à la Martinique, d'après beaucoup de documents inédits (Paris, 1907) p. 185 (B.N., Ln 27 53462), for a description of the kinds of foundation which Ignatius allowed the members of his Company to establish. See below, Chapter II, pp. 49-52 for a further description of the legal status of various kinds of Jesuit property.

9 See below, pp. 29-35 for a more complete description of attached property.

10 See below, Chapter II, p. 45 for a more complete description of the Jesuit procureur of the missions in 1758-63. See also, Chapter V, p. 205-7.
It is impossible to make a more precise statement about the extent of Jesuit property in the late sixteenth century than I have done here. The only available sources are highly contradictory. Jouvency, writing about the expansion of the Jesuits throughout the world in about 1710, but quoting a list supposed to date from 1600 stated that there were by the second date a total of forty-six colleges, seven noviciates, and four or five residences. See Jouvency, Historia Societatis Jesu (Rome, [1710]), part V, vol. II, pp. 351-5 in which he cites Catalogus Provenciarum Societatis Jesu (Rome, 1600), referred to in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. ii. On the other hand, Delattre's own analysis and list of Jesuit property in 1761 includes only twenty-nine colleges, one noviciate, and one residence established by 1599. His only recognized source, Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae, does not wholly support this conclusion. See Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. 1279; vol. II, pp. 599-600, 756, 1494-5; and vol. IV, p. 1254. Finally, the Carte de l'assistance de France (B.N., Ld 39 362), shows only thirty foundations for the period up to 1600. Since it omits several foundations of the later period, it is logical to assume that it omits some for the earlier one, too, and that thirty is too small a number. But there is little reason to assume that Jouvency is wholly correct, either. A comparison between his list and that of Delattre based on Vivier suggests that as many as seventeen colleges, six noviciates, and two or three residences should have been suppressed between 1599 and 1761. But I have discovered no references to the suppression of Jesuit institutions in France after 1594! Hence, it is impossible to say exactly how many houses of various kinds the Jesuits had in France at the end of the sixteenth century.

See below, Appendix II, for the dates of foundation and the nature of the foundation of all the Jesuit institutions existing in the continental jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in 1761.

Barthélemy-Gabriel Rolland d'Erceville, Compte rendu aux Chambres assemblées par M. le Président Rolland de ce qui a été fait par MM. les Commissaires nommés par les arrêts du 6 août et 7 septembre 1762 ([Paris], 1763) compte rendu of 15 March 1763 by de l'Averdy on the College of Nevers (B.N., Ld 39 939). Also Archives Nationales (henceforth cited as A.N.), X 1b 8946 compte rendu of 10 March 1764 by Roussel de la Tour on the College of Eu.

A.N., X 1b 8948 compte rendu on the Wallon College of Saint Omer given on 21 August 1764 by Roussel de la Tour and Rolland d'Erceville, Compte rendu, compte rendu on the English College of Saint Omer given on 23 August 1763 by Roussel de la Tour, and compte rendu on the professed house of Paris given by de l'Averdy on 15 June 1763 (B.N., Ld 39 939).

Delattre, Etablissements, vol. II, pp. 526-8, and Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae, pp. v-vi, refers to the foundation of the Province
of France in 1552, the Province of Aquitaine in 1564, and the Province of Lyon, 1582.


17 Fouqueray, Histoire, vol. II, p. 637. In fact, because of the opposition of the Parlement and the University of Paris, the College of Clermont was not reopened till 1618. See also Delattre, Etablissements, vol. III, pp. 1137-41.

18 The increase in the number of institutions occurred despite that part of the Edict of Rouen which expressly stated that the king's permission was required in order to establish a Jesuit college in an area not named in the Edict of Rouen. Bailly in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. 1202. Léon and Albert Mirot, Manuel de géographie historique de la France (Paris, 1947), vol. I, map XXVI, c, following p. 258, shows the borders of French and Spanish Artois after the Treaty of Nimuegen of 1678, which confirmed French possession of the larger part of that province.

19 The dates of the foundation of the pensionnats eventually attached to eight of the colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris are not in all cases available and it is not clear whether six or eight had come into existence by 1653.

20 See below, Chapter II, pp. 49-52.

21 As we have noted in connection with the foundation of the college of Billom (see above, p. 13), it is difficult to determine at precisely what moment a college or other Jesuit institution was actually founded. The process involved supplication to the crown and to Rome even after local authorities and the French Jesuits had decided to establish an institution. See de l'Averdy's compte rendu on the College of Langres of 19 March 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939).

22 De l'Averdy's compte rendu on the Jesuit institutions of Lyon of 8 March 1763 and Rolland's compte rendu on the College of Auxerre of 23 August 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b
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8943 and 8944. The other municipal foundations of the period 1603-53 were the Colleges of:

Arras 1603 (French after 1640)
Moulins 1604
Poitiers (Sainthe Marthe) 1607
Aire 1612 (French after 1678)
Bar-le-Duc 1615
Châlons-sur-Marne 1618
Aurillac 1619
Angoulême 1622
Blois 1623
Saint-Flour 1643.

23 Roussel de la Tour's compte rendu on the College of Charleville presented on 22 May 1764, in A.N., X lb 8947. Other private foundations of this period included the Colleges of:

Amiens 1604
Reims 1606
Roanne 1611
Hesdin 1613 (French after 1640)
Chaumont-en-Bassigny 1618
Béthune 1621
Sens 1623
Tours 1635
Fontenay-le-Comte 1637.

24 Rolland's compte rendu on the College of La Flèche given on 5 July 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939). Other royal foundations of this period included the Colleges of:

La Rochelle 1629
Clermont Ferrand 1634
Compiègne 1653.

See Appendix III on the financial condition of the College of La Flèche.

25 Rolland's compte rendu on the College of Orléans given on 27 August 1763 and Roussel de la Tour's compte rendu on the College of Mâcon given on 24 March 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X lb 8944 and X lb 8943.

26 The inhabitants of Pontoise would probably have preferred a Jesuit college of their own rather than a residence. See Rolland's compte rendu on the residence of Pontoise given on 11 May 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939).

27 De l'Averdy's compte rendu on the Jesuit institutions of Lyon given on 8 March 1763 and on those of Paris given on 15 June 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X lb 8943.
So far as I can determine, no compte rendu on Bapaume was ever offered. A.N., AD XVII, 20 contains a Tableau Alphabetique indicating the dates on which comptes rendus on all manner of establishments were presented in the Parlement of Paris. It shows no date for a compte rendu on this mission, although it does refer to other legislation pertaining to Bapaume. Nor have I found a compte rendu on this mission in any of the usual places. The information referred to here comes from Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. 521.


Roussel de la Tour's compte rendu on Laon of 5 August 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b 8944.

Rolland's compte rendu on Poitiers of 7 June 1764 in Barthélemy-Gabriel Rolland d'Erceville, Recueil de plusieurs des Ouvrages de M. le Président Rolland imprimé en exécution des délibérations du bureau d'administration du Collège de Louis-le-Grand des 17 janvier et 18 avril 1782 (Paris, 1783) (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122) and A.N., X 1b 8947. The Irish College was established in 1674 in imitation of the English College of Saint Omer which dated from 1593, but the young Irishmen, in contrast to the Englishmen of Saint Omer, from the very beginning received their lessons in French at the regular Jesuit college of Poitiers, the College of Sainte Marthe. The College of Puygarreau dated from 1478. It was revived in 1610 and only ceased to be a college in which courses were taught in 1687, when it was united to the College of Sainte Marthe. By the end of the seventeenth century, there were seven other pensionnats in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. They were attached to the colleges of Arras, Bourges, Clermont Ferrand, Moulins, La Flèche, Paris, and Reims.

De l'Averdy in compte rendu on La Rochelle of 22 July 1763 and on Nevers of 15 March 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b 8944 and X 1b 8943; and Rolland in compte rendu on Guéret of 11 May 1763 in A.N., X 1b 8945. The residence in Guéret served the College of Limoges, itself located outside the territory of the Parlement of Paris.

That this was indeed the attitude of the founders of the colleges is suggested in the descriptions of the establishment of the Jesuit colleges in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries in Delattre, Etablissements, vols. I-V, passim, based on monographs dealing with individual colleges; and in the comptes rendus on the colleges presented to the Parlement of Paris by its commissioners in 1763-65. See
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especially Rolland, *Compte rendu* (B.N., Ld 39 939) and *Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages* (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122) and A.N., X 1b 8943-8949, *passim*.

34 See below, pp. 29-35 for a description of the endowments of these institutions.


36 A.N., X 1b 8940 contains the *compte rendu* presented by Omer Joly de Fleury, Avocat Général of the Parlement of Paris, on 3, 4, 6, and 7 July 1761 to the Chambres assemblées of that institution on the nature and extent of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement and in France as a whole. His list of 139 Jesuit institutions scattered throughout the five Jesuit provinces includes forty-three Jesuit institutions under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. He counted two noviciates, a professed house, and forty colleges and seminaries within the jurisdiction. The discrepancy between his method of counting Jesuit colleges (and seminaries) and my own arises from one of two possible causes. Either he regarded the second college of Poitiers (Puygarreau) as a full-fledged college (and hence counted forty colleges while I have counted thirty-nine [Cf. below Appendix II]) and regarded the seminaries as part of the colleges of the town in which both were found, or he regarded the two colleges of Lyon as a single college and counted the seminaries of Nevers and Reims as separate institutions to get a total of forty colleges and seminaries. In making his calculation, he grouped all the colleges of Artois which were under the authority of the Parlement of Paris under the Jesuit province of Île de France, although several of them remained within the province of Gallo-Belgique. The importance to us of Omer Joly de Fleury’s whole exercise was that he and other parlementaires recognized that in confiscating the Jesuit property within the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris they would be dealing with property in all five French Jesuit provinces.

37 Vivier, *Status Assistentiae Galliae*, *passim*.

38 Rolland, *compte rendu* on La Flèche of 5 July 1763 in Rolland, *Compte rendu* (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b 8944.

39 See below, Chapter II, pp. 44-6 for a further description of the Jesuits’ holdings and activities in the Windward Islands.


41 The statement of the number of Jesuit students in the first three provinces comes from Bailly in Delattre, *Etablissements*, vol. I, p. 1442,
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and is undoubtedly based on reports sent to Rome by officials of these provinces in 1626-27. The figure 10,000 is my own projection based on the number of colleges in the Provinces of Lyon and Guyenne and their relative size in 1626.

42Cf. below, Appendix II, which shows the highest known enrolment in Jesuit colleges under the Parlement of Paris and the dates when that enrolment was realized.

43Once again, the figure cited is an approximation based on the reports of 1615, 1626-27, and 1640, referred to in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. 1275; vol. II, pp. 595, 738, and 1492; and vol. IV, p. 1241. It is known that in 1717 there were 2,143 Jesuits in the five provinces of France. This figure comes from Catalogus Provinciarum Societatis Jesu Dorum, Collegiorum, Residentiarum, Seminariorum et Missionum que in una quaque provincia numerabantur anno 1679 (Rome, 1679 [reissued and updated in 1717]), cited in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. iii.


45See above, pp. 16-20. See also Appendix II, and Delattre, Etablissements, vol. II, p. 529.


47See below, Appendix II, for a list of the programmes of study offered in the colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris by the eighteenth century.


49Roussel de la Tour's compte rendu on Laon of 5 August 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X lb 8944.


51Comptes rendus for all the colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and
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Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages (B.N., R 6074 or Res. R 1122), A.N. X 1b 8943-8949, and Delattre, Etablissements, vols. I-IV, articles on individual colleges.


53 A.N., X 1b 8939 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 18 April 1760, suppressed all marital congregations throughout its jurisdiction.

54 Rolland's comptes rendus on Bourges and Poitiers of 7 June 1764 in Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages (B.N., R 6074 or Res. R 1122).

55 In four or five cases, college buildings were provided directly by cathedral canons and in the remaining six or seven cases they were provided by a private donor: a bishop, a noble, a king, or simply a wealthy patron. See Delattre, Etablissements, vols. I-IV, specific articles on the thirty-nine colleges involved.

56 The architects' reports are included along with the reports of the conseils de ville in A.N., M 245-249, as well as in H. Bourde de la Rogerie, Notice sur un Recueil de plans d'édifices construites par les architectes de la Compagnie de Jésus (1607-1612) (Paris, 1904).

57 Delattre, Etablissements, vols. I-IV, specific articles on the thirty-nine colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

58 De l'Averdy's comptes rendus on Jesuit property in Paris and Lyon of 25 February and 8 March 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b 8943.

59 The property of the congregations remained in the colleges until the confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762. See above, pp. 24-5.

60 See below, pp. 29-35 for a fuller description of the benefices attached to Jesuit colleges.

61 See below, Chapter VI, pp. 262-5 for a description of the leasing of Jesuit benefices after the confiscation.


63 See below, Chapter IV, p. 143 and Chapter V, pp.169-71 for further references to the Parisian Jesuits' country property.
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64 De l'Averdy's comptes rendus on Nevers and La Rochelle given on 15 March and 22 July 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939).

65 Cf. the description of the property in Martinique in the eighteenth century in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 64-8 and passim.
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1 B.N., F.F. 1578 ff. 100-109 document dated 1582 refers to the basic need of 200 livres in the sixteenth century. Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. xiv points out the truth, which was confirmed when Jesuit pensions were granted after 1762 (see below, Chapter II, pp. 65-9. that by the mid-eighteenth century it was impossible even for a member of a religious community living in his community to survive on less than 300 livres per year. This amount included expenses relating to subsistence: food, clothing, necessary travel etc. It is interesting to compare the Jesuits' needs and allowances with the amount of the portion congrue received by most curés in the first half of the eighteenth century. The portion congrue was 300 livres during that period, but it was raised to 500 livres in 1768 and to 700 livres in 1786. See Maurice G. Hutt, "The Curés and the Third Estate: the ideas of reform in the pamphlets of the French lower clergy in the period 1787-1789", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. VIII (1957), pp. 74-83. Jacques Crétineau-Joly, Clément XIV et les Jésuites (Paris, 1847) p. 153 n. (B.N., H 13769), confirms that it cost about 300 livres per year to support a Jesuit in a Jesuit institution during the first half of the eighteenth century.

2 See below, Appendix III, for a record of the known gross and net receipts of the Jesuit institutions under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in the mid-eighteenth century.


4 The ways in which the provincials and the general could use the money they held were limited by the wishes of the original donor, who could specify exactly how his gift should be used. In such a case, neither a provincial nor the general could legally change the use made of the money. In practice, however, one alternative, besides that of appealing to a superior, was open to the heads of poor colleges. That was to appeal to the procureur général of the missions in America, who normally lived at the College of La Flèche and was responsible for administering all the property given to his missions. He apparently had vast wealth at his disposal. He sometimes lent money to heads of poor colleges, but he could not advance gifts. This practice was apparently not judged to be illegal by the Jesuit lawmakers, but it is not clear how large the sums of money involved were. Nor is it clear whether all such loans were repaid by the time of the legislation of the Parlement of Paris of 1766, which referred to them. The legislation in question is referred to by Delattre, Etablissements, vol. III, p. 184, who cites as his source Simon's Recueil par ordre de dates de tous les arrêts du Parlement de Paris ... concernant les ci-devant soi-disans Jésuites... (Paris, 1760-66). This six-volume collection is not available in the B.N., A.N., the Jesuit Archives of the Province of Paris (A.S.J.P.), or the Jansenist Bibliothèque de la Société de Port-Royal. The latter did possess a partial index, however.
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5 Cf. opening sections of all the comptes rendus in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b 8943-8949.

6 The statement of the superior of the professed house, Claude Frey, is to be found in A.N., X 1b 9695.

7 See below, Chapter IV, pp. 142-3 for further discussion of the revenues of the professed house.

8 Comptes rendus of Rolland on Pontoise and Guéret given on 11 May 1763 and 2 September 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b 8945 (for Guéret only).


11 See below, Appendix III, for a table of the known revenues of Jesuit institutions on the eve of the confiscation. Cf. also Ordre Général et Définitif des tous les créanciers des...Jésuites...(Paris, 1772) (A.N., U 983) which lists many of the original donors of capital endowments to colleges.

12 My analysis of the kinds of capital endowments enjoyed by the Jesuit institutions and my calculation of the percentage of capital invested which was received annually as rentes is based on information contained in the comptes rendus on Jesuit property prepared by the Parlement's commissioners, in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939), Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages (B.N., R 6074 or Res. R 1122), and A.N., X 1b 8943-8449. It is also based on A.N., X 1b 8945-8957 arrêts of Parlement of Paris 24 January 1764 to 18 March 1769, confirming the colleges' possession of their property after the suppression of the French Jesuits.

13 See below, Appendix IV, for a list of the benefices attached to Jesuit colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

14 A.N., X 1b 8945-8957 arrêts of Parlement of Paris confirming the colleges' possession of their property, list many such small houses.

15 Demesne. The nature of a domaine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is described in Marcel Marion, Dictionnaire des institutions de la France aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (Paris, 1968) (reimpression of the original ed. of 1923), p. 181 as one of two things. It was either
freehold property which could be used or disposed of as the owner wished or property over which the proprietor had gained the rights of a seigneur (and, in particular, the rights of a seigneur over his vassals and tenants). The term is loosely used in the documents on which this analysis is based; it conceivably meant one thing in one part of France and something else in another.

16 A small domaine.

17 A small farm rented to a métayer, or sharecropper, who paid rent in kind.

18 A kind of ecclesiastical benefice given by a canon and usually consisting just of revenue coming from real property. The recipient of such a prêbende had no title to the property itself but only to revenue which was the gift of the canon. I assume that it was because no title to the real property was involved that this was never regarded as an ecclesiastical benefice like those united to the twenty-four colleges. The prêbende préceptorale was regarded as real property held by a college but not united to it in the way that benefices were attached to it, by act of a king, bishop or pope.

19 See below, Appendix III, for a statement of the various colleges' gross and net revenue. Consider also the case of the College of Fontenay-le-Comte described in A.N., M 247.

20 De l'Averdy, compte rendu of 15 June 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and arrêt of Parlement of Paris 24 January 1764 in A.N., X 1b 8945.

21 See below, Appendix III, for a statement of the known gross and net revenue of Jesuit institutions at the time of the suppression. In the case of those colleges to which no benefices were attached (cf. Appendix IV, for list of benefices), virtually all the revenue was derived from the two kinds of capital endowments described above.

22 A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of Marchal de Sainscy, 1762-72, contain lists of all but two of the Jesuit ecclesiastical benefices in France. See below, Appendix IV, for a list and description of the benefices attached to Jesuit colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, including a statement of the gross and net revenues of the benefices in 1761-62, when known. Descriptions of many benefices are found in L. H. Cottineau, Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés (Mâcon, 1935-37), 2 vols.

23 I have discovered no record of receipts for the cure or the dependency for the period before or after the Jesuits ceased to hold the title to these benefices in 1762. The best description of a priory which
I have found is the following one of Saint Maixent de Pamproux, united, in 1606, to the Jesuit college of Poitiers. It consisted in the following:

tant en fief, terres et seigneurie, maison forte, droit de châtaignerie, haute, moyenne et basse justice, droits et emoluments de fiefs, ventes et honneurs, cens et rentes, dixmes, terrages, comptans, fines, chaumes, chasses, fours, moulins, etangs, piscines, prés...bois, vignes, terres labourables et non labourables, maisons, bastiments, granges, estables, jardins, que autres choses quelconques.


24 Delattre, Etablissements, vol. I, p. xii, says that most of the Jesuit priories had formerly belonged to the Augustinians or Benedictines. I have been able to find definite proof of this fact in only thirty-three cases. See below, Appendix IV.

25 See below, Appendix IV, which states the dates on which benefices were attached to Jesuit colleges, when these dates are known.

26 The best examples of this occurrence are the case of one of Roanne's two priories and five of Amiens' nine benefices. See below, Appendix IV.

27 Two examples will show what kinds of compensation the previous title holders might expect. The priory of Notre-Dame de Loudon was attached to the College of Poitiers in 1606-1607. It had previously been held by the Benedictines of the great Abbey of Tournus, but they ceded their rights to it in return for the Jesuits' promise to pay for the education of one monk, perhaps at the College of Poitiers, and to maintain a member of the Benedictine order, sent (presumably to preach) to the Château of Loudon by the Abbé of Tournus. On the other hand, the existing title holder of the priory of Vassy attached to the College of Reims in 1608 gave up his rights in return for a life pension. These examples are cited in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. II, p. 1465; and vol. IV, p. 313.

28 Delattre argued that benefices were attached to colleges for spiritual reasons. See Etablissements, vol. I, pp. xii-xiii. Although in possession of nine benefices described as chapels under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, the Jesuits do not seem to have performed the functions of priest in these chapels or in their cure.

29 See below, Appendix IV, for a statement of revenue known to have been derived from benefices at the time of the confiscation.
It has proved impossible to find descriptions of the benefices' productive capacity. My observation is based on a comparison of the gross and net revenues actually known to have been produced by the benefices of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in the period just before and just after the suppression. See the comptes rendus of the Parlement's commissioners in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., X 1b 8943-8949; and A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of Marchal de Sainscy, 1762-72, and V 7 78 on the revenue produced by the benefices in 1762-64.

See below, Appendix IV. Cf. the revenue of the two priories attached to the College of Roanne, the priory united to the College of Moulins, or the priory of Blancafort united to the College of Bourges or that of Pers attached to the College of Aurillac.

Cf. especially the cases of Bourges, Charleville, La Rochelle, Moulins, and Roanne. See Appendices III and IV.
Notes, Chapter I

Part IV

pp. 36-37

1 This argument runs through much of the Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques, 1758-64. Delattre refers to the impression made by the Jesuits' possession of so many priories in Établissements, vol. I, p. xiii.

2 Crépineau-Joly has normally been regarded as one of the most sympathetic non-Jesuit writers of Jesuit history. Delattre's opinion of his work is expressed in Établissements, vol. II, p. 571:

En raison de l'authenticité, de l'abondance et de la variété des documents d'archives où l'auteur a librement puisé, comme aussi du caractère indépendant et loyal de l'écrivain, en dépit d'un style vieilli [his work] conserve toute sa valeur historique.

Crétineau-Joly frequently refers to documents in the Roman Archives which have not been available to later scholars.


4 My assumption is based on the knowledge that slightly more than one-third of the Jesuit institutions and attached property in France was to be found in the territory of the Parlement of Paris.

5 See below, Appendix III.

6 It is probable that the pensionnat in Paris enjoyed a net income of about 25,000 livres, too. Unfortunately, neither the Jesuits' own records nor those of the commissioners of the Parlement shed any direct light on this matter.

7 Those institutions about which there is insufficient evidence on which to base an observation are: the Colleges of Aire, Béthune, Fontenay-le-Comte, Mâcon, and Saint Omer (both the Wallon and the English College); the seminaries in La Rochelle and Reims; and perhaps the residence in Guéret.

8 See below, Appendix III. The Jesuits' records in the Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus (A.R.S.J.) show that in the 1740's and 1750's, the foreign missions received more than 100,000 livres. The compte rendu prepared by de l'Averdy makes no mention of foreign missions but lists the gross revenue of the professed house in Paris at over 300,000 livres. Since the Jesuit official who managed the finances of the missions of the Windward Islands lived in the professed house in the 1760's (see below, Chapter II, pp. 45-61), it is likely that this otherwise inexplicable amount conceals the gross receipts for the foreign missions as well as those of the professed house itself.
The other colleges were: Amiens, Angoulême, Arras, Auxerre, Bar-le-Duc, Billom, Chaumont-en-Bassigny, Hesdin, Mauriac, Moulins, Orléans, and Sens. See Appendix III.

Cf. below, Appendix III. The colleges were those of: Aurillac, Blois, Bourges, Châlons-sur-Marne, Clermont Ferrand, Compiègne, Eu, Langres, Laon, La Rochelle, Nevers, Poitiers, Roanne, Saint Flour, and Tours.

Those colleges were: Aire, Béthune, Fontenay-le-Comte, Mâcon, and both colleges in Saint Omer.

The other colleges were: Aire, Amiens, Arras, Auxerre, Bar-le-Duc, Béthune, Billom, Bourges, Chaumont-en-Bassigny, Eu, Fontenay-le-Comte, Hesdin, Langres, Mâcon, Moulins, Orléans, Roanne, Saint Flour, the colleges of Saint Omer, Sens, and Tours.

The colleges were those of Angoulême, Aurillac, Châlons-sur-Marne, Clermont-Ferrand, Compiègne, Laon, the small college of Lyon, La Rochelle, Nevers, and Poitiers. The status of the remaining colleges is not clear.

See above, pp. 32-5. See also Appendix II, below.

See below, Appendix III.


Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, 1762, passim.

See below, Chapter III, passim, for a description of Rolland d'Erceville's role in deciding the fate of Jesuit property.


A.N., V 7 80 affairs of the Commission of the Economats for 1780's.
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"Probably the most balanced and best-known description is in H. Carre. Le Règne de Louis XV (1715-1774) (Paris, 1909), part II, pp. 319-32 (ed. E. Lavisse, Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution, vol. VIII, part II). Rochemonteix, Lavallette, passim includes invaluable descriptions of the personal and political relationships existing between members of the Jesuit order and between leading Jesuits and the king's court in this period. These descriptions are based on correspondence which has survived in the A.R.S.J. and which is reproduced at great length in Rochemonteix's footnotes. Jean Egret, "Le Procès des Jésuites devant les parlements de France (1761-1770)", Revue Historique, vol. CCIV (1950), pp. 1-27, describes the relationships between the various parlements and sovereign courts which developed in the course of the whole Jesuit affair. Egret also makes perceptive and suggestive observations about the behaviour of the Parlement of Paris and the Jesuits in the struggle he examines.

2 See above, Chapter I, pp. 12-13 on the work of Mgr. du Prat and his role in the early history of the colleges in France.

3 These pamphlets were published anonymously by Simon, the official publisher of the Parlement, and by unnamed publishers. Many are listed in the Catalogue de l'histoire de France (Paris, 1872), vol. V, and are classed in the B.N. in the Ld 39 series. Some are to be found in the B.N., Collection Joly de Fleury 1609-1611. The Le Paige collection in Bib. de Port-Royal (especially L.P. 136 and 582) contains the largest single collection, which is not surprising since the avocat Le Paige wrote some of the most significant of the pamphlets. Egret, "Procès", R.H., vol. CCIV (1950), p. 2 n. lists several of them. They include Les Jésuites criminels de lèse majesté, dans la théorie et dans la pratique (n.p., 1758), 490 pp. in-12, and Histoire générale de la naissance et des progrès de la Compagnie de Jésus et analyse de ses constitutions et privilèges (Paris, 1760 and Rouen, 1761), 4 vols. in-12. Barbier stated that Abbé Coudrette had written the "history", while Le Paige, who was the secret power behind some of the Parlement's actions in 1761-64, had written the analysis, a fact confirmed by Monsieur André Gazier of the Bib. de Port-Royal. The Jesuits and the Jansenists had also carried out a forty-year battle in the Journal des Trévoux and the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. There was plainly no lack of polemical literature on either side.
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XVIIIe siècle (1750-1782) (Paris, 1844) (B.N., Ld 39 585), and Proyart, Louis XVI détroné.


See above, Chapter I, pp. 36-40.

See above, Chapter I, pp. 12-25.

Paul Hazard, European Thought in the Eighteenth Century from Montesquieu to Lessing (New Haven, 1954) (trans. from the French by J. L. May), pp. 105-6. The most notable critic of Berruyer was apparently the Abbé Gaultier whose Lettres théologiques, dans lesquelles l'Écriture Sainte, la tradition et la foi de l'Église sont vengées contre le système impie et socinien des PP. Berruyer et Hardouin, Jésuites (n.p., 1756), vol. III, pp. 359 and ff. (posthumous work of Abbé Gaultier) was an eloquent defense of Catholic tradition. Cited in Hazard, European Thought, p. 106 n. See also R. R. Palmer, Catholics and Unbelievers in Eighteenth Century France (Princeton, 1939), pp. 64-76, for a more explicit treatment of both Jesuits. Palmer also suggests, most provocatively, that Berruyer had friends in the French hierarchy. True or not, that fact could not alter the course of the storm which his writings helped to create.
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151 pp. (B.N., Ld 39 346; also in Bib. de Port-Royal, L.P. 582). See also Mémoire à consulter pour les Jésuites de France délibéré à Paris le 10 mars 1761 (n.p., n.d.) (signed by Lherminier, Gillet, Mallard, Taboué de la Monnoye, Babile, and Thevenot d'Essaule) (B.N., Ld 39 341). There was also a Mémoire pour les Jésuites in ms. prepared by de Montigny, procureur général of the Province of Paris, which is cited in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 173 n. Note that the "Jesuits of France" were the Jesuits of the Province of Paris.

11 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 64-5.

12 The question was, nevertheless, argued by the Jesuits and their enemies until the beginning of the twentieth century or even later. Cf. Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 80, 85, 91-2, 122, and 166-7.

13 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 69-75. Lavalette had bought the original habitation from de Crésols in 1748. At that time, Crésols was anxious to return to France and accepted a pension of 6,000 livres a year from the Jesuits. The habitation produced coffee, cacao, and sugar. Until 1755, Lavalette was apparently only more and more successful in La Dominique. By 1752, he had received a royal order for the production of 40,000 pieds of wood for affûts or gun-carriages for French canon, worth 160,000 French livres. See archives Coloniales, Correspondence Générale de la Martinique, vol. LIX, cited in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 73 n.

14 The Encyclopédie defines the term lettre de change as:

une espèce de mandement qu'un banquier, marchand, ou négociant donne à quelqu'un pour faire payer dans une autre ville à celui qui sera porteur de ce mandement la somme qui y est exprisée.


15 Ordre Général et Définitif de tous les Créanciers des ci-devant sol-disant Jésuites, tant en France que dans les colonies, clos et arrêté dans l'Assemblée générale desdits Créanciers, tenue à Paris le jeudi 13 août 1772, homologué par Arrêt du Parlement de Paris du 5 septembre 1772, (Paris, 1772), pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983), contains explanations of how Lavalette's lettres de change were used. My generalizations about his use of this kind of instrument of credit are based on the descriptive notes following the names of the creditors listed in this document. Cf. below, Chapter V, pp. 205-6.

16 Dominique de Sacy, procureur des missions des Iles du Vent, 1743-62, appointed by the superior of the American missions at the College of La Flèche. See Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 83-4. De Sacy had also been Madame de Pompadour's childhood confessor, and he had officiated at her first communion. Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 193.
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18 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 169. The Lioncy brothers had been Lavalette's principal correspondents since 1752, when de Sacy began to find the volume of Lavalette's lettres de change overwhelming.

19 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 156.

20 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 136-7.

21 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 169 and 283, and see below, Appendix VIII, on Lavalette's creditors.

22 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 143-4 and 148.


24 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 172-6 and 179. The Veuve Grou and son were négociants in Nantes.

25 The lawyer Benoît charged:

que toutes les maisons des Jésuites du Royaume fussent condamnées solidairement part toutes les voies dûs et raisonnables au paiement de la somme de trente mille livres....

From Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, 23 April 1760, p. 82.

26 The sentence of 30 January 1760 stated:

Nous, après avoir oui lesdites parties comparantes...avons donné et donnnons acte des déclarations respectives des parties; et attendu que le Père de Sacy comparant est convenu que l'administration du temporel de tout l'ordre est subordonné à l'autorité d'un supérieur général, les défendeurs condamnées et icceu condamnons solidairement à payer aux dits demandeurs la somme de 30,000 livres; avec les profits et intérêts de la dite somme raison d'ordonnance....

From Mémoire à consulter, cited in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 176.


28 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 178.
29. *Mémoire sur des demandes formées contre le général* (B.N., Ld 39 339) refers to the judgment of the Paris Consuls of 14 April 1760 in favour of the Dlle Fouque and Cazotte. They would later have their cases pleaded at the same time in the Parlement of Paris.


31. The superiors of the Province of France held a council on 1 May 1760 and decided to appeal to the *Parlement* of Paris. They did not consult their Jesuit friends at court. Rochemonteix, *Lavalette*, p. 198. It is impossible to determine just who decided to appeal to the *Parlement* rather than to the king's council. Rochemonteix says Frey, the provincial of the Province of Paris, made the decision in the honest belief that it did not matter which of the two authorities were appealed to, since both were made up of judges who had been "our pupils". Quoted in *Lavalette*, p. 199. Cf. Griffet's letter to General Ricci, of 7 July 1761 in *A.R.S.J.*, quoted in *Lavalette*, p. 202. Griffet and other court Jesuits accused Frey of having *jeté dans le précipice toute la société en France*. It is also possible that by appealing to the *Parlement* Frey and his brother, de Neuville, were making sure that if the Jesuits were condemned, the *Parlement* of Paris would make all five French Jesuit provinces responsible, whereas the *Grand'Conseil* might have charged only the Province of Paris.

32. Rochemonteix, *Lavalette*, p. 197. Even Carré admitted as much: ...les magistrats étaient ravis de montrer leur puissance, en engageant cette lutte sans l'agrément ou même contre l'agrément du Roi, et de recevoir l'applaudissement du public. Leurs traditions, leur esprit de corps, leurs opinions, leurs croyances, leur intérêt se rencontraient dans cette affaire. Carré, *Louis XV*, part II, p. 320. And Ernest-Désiré Glasson, *Le Parlement de Paris. Son Rôle politique depuis le règne de Charles VII jusqu'à la Révolution* (Paris, 1901), vol. II, p. 266 (B.N., Lf 25 251), states that at this time "the Jesuits had opposed to them the Parlement, the government, public opinion, and the Marquise de Pompadour". On the question of the complicity or inspiration of Mme. de Pompadour and Choiseul in the Jesuit affair, Carré stated: Si le Roi a consenti à la "destruction" des Jésuites, c'est que tout le monde a donné contre eux, Parlementaires, Philosophes, courtisans. L'opinion ne leur était d'ailleurs pas moins hostile à l'étranger, par exemple en Portugal et dans les Etats bourguignons d'Espagne, de Naples et de Parme, qu'en France. Est-il vrai que Mme de Pompadour ait voulu, en prenant parti contre eux, se venger de l'opposition qu'ils lui firent quand elle prétendit devenir dame d'honneur de la Reine? et que Choiseul l'ait assistée pour lui plaire, et pour flatter le Philosophes et les Parlements? Il semble bien que Choiseul et la marquise aient laissé faire les choses,
et que tout au plus ils y aient aidé. Le Parlement n'avait pas besoin d'être excité contre des religieux dont il était depuis longtemps l'adversaire et l'ennemi.

Carré, Louis XV, part II, p. 326. This seems to be an accurate summation of the various parties' responsibility for the Jesuit affair.

33. Nouvelles Écclesiastiques, 4 September 1761, pp. 141-56. The Veuve Grou had apparently not yet been repaid. Her name appeared in the Ordre Général et Définitif of 1772 (A.N., U 983). By then she had received 10,000 livres of her capital and was authorized to receive the remaining 20,000 livres and interest and charges.

34. The argument is contained in Mémoire pour les Jésuites des Provinces de Champagne, Guyenne, Toulouse et Lyon (B.N., Ld 39 343).

35. The exceptional kind of foundation was the professed house. Cf. above, Chapter I, pp. 30-1.


42. A.N., X 1b 8940 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 17 April 1761 and note of 21 April 1761. The constitutions in question were published in Prague in 1757.


44. Plaidoyer pour les créanciers des Sieurs Lioncy frères et Gouffre (B.N., Ld 39 345).
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45 Arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 8 May 1761 (B.N., F 47109 (29)). The case of Dlle Fouque and Cazotte being the same, this arrêt in the Lioncys' favour apparently provided the necessary precedent to force the Jesuits to repay them as well. The significant part of the text of the arrêt is as follows:

le supérieur général et la société demeurent tenus, garants et responsables des intérêts tels que de droit et de frais de toutes poursuites; sinon, en vertu du présent arrêt et sans qu'il en soit besoin d'autre, permet aux parties de se pourvoir pour le payment des condamnations, sur les biens appartenant à la Société des Jésuites dans le Royaume.

46 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 209-11.

47 Gilbert de Voisins was probably the Pierre-Paul-Alexandre Gilbert de Voisins, who later published the Procédure contre l'Institut et les constitutions des Jésuites suivie au Parlement de Paris sur l'appel comme d'abus interjeté par le procureur général du roi, recueillie par un membre du Parlement et publiée par M. Gilbert de Voisins, membre de la Chambre des députés (Paris, 1823), 336 pp. (B.N., Ld 39 608). Feydeau de Brou was keeper of the seals until 1763. The other members of the commission were Aguesseau de Fresnes, Camus de Pontcarré de Viarme, de la Bourdonnais, Abbé Bertin, and de Flesselles. Aguesseau appears also to have served on the Commission of the Economats (Cf. A.N., V 7 78-80) and Bertin became Controller General of Finances. De Flesselles acted as rapporteur for the commission. The list of men making up the king's commission appeared in Nouvelles Eclesiastiques, September 1761, p. 183. Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 214 lists five of the six counsellors and Flesselles. He omits the Abbé Bertin.


49 Otherwise known as the Parquet, the Gens du Roi were the official representatives of the king's interests in the Parlement. They were the Procureur Général, his substitutes, and the Avocats Généraux, of whom there were normally three after 1690. For most of the early period of the Jesuit affair, the brothers Guillaume and Omer Joly de Fleury were Procureur Général and Avocat Général. Cf. Monique Langlois, "Parlement de Paris" in Michel Antoine et al., Guide des recherches dans les fonds judiciaires de l'Ancien Régime (Paris, 1958), pp. 71-2.

50 A.N., X lb 8940 compte rendu of Omer Joly de Fleury, 3, 4, 6, and 7 July 1761.
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52 Bib. de Port Royal, L.P. 582 contains a note in Le Paige's own writing which follows Omer Joly de Fleury's compte rendu of 3-7 July 1761. The note is Le Paige's own suggestions for reforming the order. Even so stern a critic as Le Paige apparently seriously considered an alternative to destroying the order.

53 A.N., X 1b 8940 compte rendu of Abbé Chauvelin, 8 July 1761.

54 Gilbert de Voisins, Procédure, pp. 41-52, and Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 214.

55 Carré, Louis XV, part II, p. 322.

56 A.N., X 1b 8940 declaration of the king, 2 August 1761.

57 A.N., X 1b 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 16 February 1762 contains reference to the Declaration of 2 August and to the fact that the Parlement was considering the Jesuits' titles to their property. See below, Chapter III, p. 89 Camille de Rochemonteix, Un Collège des Jésuites au XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles: le Collège Henri IV de La Flèche (Le Mans, 1889), vol. IV, pp. 304-5 (B.N., R 9518), says the arrêt of 16 February 1762 was more far-reaching. He says it ordered that an inventory of Jesuit property be made, but this is doubtful.

58 Gilbert de Voisins, Procédure, pp. 41-52 and Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 214-17.

59 The arrêt is in A.N., X 1b 8940 and B.N., F 23674. In legal language, what happened was that the Parlement received the Procureur Général, appellant comme d'abus the papal bulls of 1540, 1543, 1550 and 1552 which dealt with the establishment of the Jesuits in France; and all bulls, briefs, apostolic letters, or other letters which the pope had sent to France. An appeal comme d'abus was a complaint that an ecclesiastical official had exceeded his authority. Cf. Shennan, Parlement of Paris, p. 336.

60 A.N., X 1b 8940 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1761.

61 A kind of sodality. See above, Chapter I, pp. 24-5, for fuller definition of the term. Jesuit congregations had been suppressed since 1760.

62 See below, Chapter IV, pp. 124-7 on reports sent to the Parlement.

63 A.N., X 1b 8941 contains the third arrêt of 6 August 1761 which ordered the Jesuits to send the statements just described. Both Egret,
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"Procès", R.H., CCIV (1950), p. 4 and Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 216 refer to only two arrêts and say nothing of the terms of the third. The Parlement issued so many demands for comptes rendus, états etc. in 1761-63 that it must have been difficult even for contemporaries to know which order was being carried out at any time.

64 A.N., X lb 8941 minute of 7 August 1761 and Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 216.

65 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 216.

66 Gilbert de Voisins, Procédure, pp. 80-123. See below, Chapter III, p. 82 for a further reference to the position of Rolland and Roussel de la Tour.


68 A.N., X lb 8941 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 15 and 19 February 1762.


70 The document is quoted in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 224-5.

71 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 220.

72 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 217.


75 The same man, Jarente, was the prelate in charge of the Economats. See below, Chapter VI, p. 251.

76 de la Croix to General Ricci, 5 January 1762, cited in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 231-2.

77 Carré. Louis XV, part II, p. 323.

79 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1619 and Bib. de Port Royal, L.P. 583 refer to it; the latter calls it an edict.


In short, the closing of the colleges on 1 April 1762 speeded up the destruction of the Jesuit order in France.

82 It is practically impossible to say how many Jesuits left their houses on or about 1 April and how many remained in them. Certainly, in all cases some Jesuits (normally the superiors and administrators) remained behind and waited at least long enough to hand over the property to legally appointed authorities, as is amply shown in the états which they prepared in April and May 1762, which are found in A.N., M 245-249. But we do not know how many lesser Jesuits left. Rochemonteix, La Flèche, vol. IV, p. 305 says most of the Jesuits of La Flèche left on horseback on the night of 1 April 1762, but he was relying on an earlier source, Jules Clère, Histoire de l'Ecole de La Flèche, which was probably more Jesuit apology than serious history.

83 See above, pp. 45-8, and Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 240-1.

84 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 244.

85 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 244-6. See above, Chapter I, pp. 36, 40 on the general poverty of the Assistancy of France. Choiseul was apparently aware that the French Jesuits had very little money and wanted to speed up their financial ruin. Cf. Ravignan, Clément XIII et Clément XIV, vol. II, p. 20, in which he cites a letter of the Duke of Choiseul to Aubeterre, the French Ambassador to Rome, 22 August 17671.

86 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 272-4.

87 Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 246 and 273. Nevertheless, General Ricci wrote to Gatin in 1765 to ask how the task was at that time
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proceeding, and Ordre Général et Définitif of 1772 (A.N., U 983) contains a reference to payments made after 23 April 1762.

88 See below, Chapter III, p. 90 for a further reference to the lists prepared by the Jesuits at this time.


90 See below, Chapter IV, pp. 133-4. It is clear that the Parlement's économies séquestres frequently did make payments to Jesuits.


92 The rules from which they were dispensed were an interesting lot. On the one hand, they were now dispensed from obeying the third vow taken after profession, which had forbidden them to seek bishoprics or other ecclesiastical dignities. And, on the other, the law which had forbidden them to play cards, and particularly to play cards for money was now indefinitely suspended. The first provision was the work of the pope, the second the work of the general.

93 Laurent Ricci to Jesuit Pères of the Assistancy of France, Rome, 19 May 1762. A copy of this letter was to be found at the turn of the century in the Bibliothèque de Caen among the papers of Père André. N o 155, in that library. It is cited in Rochemonteix, La Flèche, vol. IV, pp. 312-14.

94 B.N., F 47110 (6) contains the three arrêts of 6 August 1762, and so does A.N., X 1b 8942. The three arrêts are foreshortened and appear combined as one in Isambert, Recueil, vol. XXII, pp. 328-86.

95 Lorraine, of course, was not completely integrated into the kingdom of France until 1768. The legislation passed by the Parlement of Paris was extended to that part of the kingdom on 1 September 1768, however. See Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae, p. xxi. The magistrates of Flanders, Franche-Comté, Alsace, and Artois tried to avoid pursuing the Jesuits. The Parlement of Paris had authority over the Conseil of Artois, with the result that the provision of the Parlement's legislation were eventually extended to this part of the kingdom, too, despite the protests of the Conseil. On the other hand, the Parlement of Rouen had suppressed the order in its jurisdiction on 12 February 1762, and so it is literally true that the Parlement of Paris followed its lead. Nevertheless, it was the fact that the Parlement of Paris had suppressed the Jesuit order which encouraged other parlements to do so on the following dates: Aix on 5 June 1762, by a provisional arrêt (not unlike the
Parlement of Paris's legislation of 6 August 1761) and definitively on 28 January 1763; Rennes, after the work of La Chalotais, on 27 May 1762; the Conseil Souverain of Roussillon on 12 June 1762; Bordeaux on 18 August 1762; Metz on 1 October 1762; Grenoble in January 1763, an action confirmed by an arrêt of 29 August 1763 which, nevertheless, was not very stringent. Pau suppressed the Jesuits on 13 April 1764. Needless to say, in Besançon the opponents of the Jesuits could not get a majority, in Flanders only one member of the Parlement opposed the Jesuits; and in Alsace the question was never mentioned. Cf. Carré. Louis XV, part II, p. 325, and Egret, "Procès", R.H., vol. CCIV (1950), pp. 16-21.

My estimate of 3,250 Jesuits is based on Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae (the official Jesuit catalogues of 1761); the triennial reports sent to Rome by the superiors of French houses in 1740-60, in the A.R.S.J.; and on the figures given for Flanders in Delattre, Etablissements, vol. II, pp. 458, and 647. Vivier analysed the official catalogues of the order and concluded that in 1761 there were 3,191 Jesuits in France and the French missions. His reckoning did not include the Jesuits of Gallo-Belgique who were not officially in the Assistancy of France but were in the French kingdom. My estimate allows for an additional fifty or sixty Jesuits in Flanders in 1761 and is based on the figures given in Etablissements. Other sources do bear on this subject but are not particularly reliable. An unsigned document in B.N., Nouvelles Acquisitions Latines 1579 and F.F. 10.568 apparently dating from 1761 states that there were 3,350 Jesuits in France in that year. But since the document is identical to the official catalogue for 1750 (Catalogus Provinciarum, Collegiorum Residentiarum...Societatis Jesu (B.N., H 1083)), it seems unlikely that it really deals with 1761 at all. It would be logical to assume that as many as 100 Jesuits withdrew from France or died between 1750 and 1761. Similarly, it is likely that the crisis of 1759-61 resulted in a sharp decline in French Jesuit vocations. It is not unlikely that there were 3,350 French Jesuits in 1750 and 3,250 French Jesuits in 1761. The number 1,200 was cited by Omer Joly de Fleury in his report of 8 May 1767 and is found in A.N., X lb 8953 minutes and arrêt of 8-9 May 1767. The total listed by the parlementaires in 1763 was 1,112. Cf. A.N., X lb 8942 Etat dressé en exécution de l'arrêt rendu en la cour...le 22 Février 1762...de tous les Frères...et autres de la...société...de Jésus [who presented their requests for pensions] and A.N., X lb 8944 Etats [of July 1763 of all those Jesuits listed in the états and procès-verbaux prepared in consequence of the arrêts of 6 August 1761, 23 April and 6 August 1762, with the exception of those who had requested a pension before 4 February 1763]. The lists do not seem to have included the Jesuits in the missions under the authority of the Parlement and may have omitted some of the Jesuits who were under thirty-three in 1762. Thus, Omer Joly de Fleury's reckoning of the number of Jesuits in the jurisdiction of the Parlement was probably correct.

See below, Chapter VI, pp. 271-87 for a discussion of the Econome Général du Clergé's payment of pensions to French Jesuits.

A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762, also found in B.N., F 47110 (6). An arrêt of 7 September 1762 in A.N., X lb 8942 and B.N., F 47110 gave bishops the right to name former Jesuits to benefices but apparently no other churchmen (including curés and members of cathedral chapters) could name former Jesuits to ecclesiastical positions. Cf. another arrêt of the Parlement, 7 September 1762 in A.N., X lb 8942 and B.N., F 47110, which forbade curés to allow former Jesuits to carry out parish functions and yet another arrêt of the same day which:
fait défense à tous marquillers, fabriciens, chapitres, présidents de chapitres ou collégiales, supérieurs de communauté et à toutes personnes ayant droit de nomination, présentation ou admission aux stations, prédications, ou dessertes dans les églises de nommer ou présenter aux dites stations ceux qui étaient ci-devant Jésuites.

In B.N., F 23674 (496).

4 Omer Joly de Fleury in A.N., X 1b 8953 minutes of Parlement of Paris, 8 May 1767.

5 This figure is not cited in any of the documents I have seen. I have arrived at it by assuming Joly de Fleury's figures offered in 1767 to be correct, and by subtracting 150 from 1,200.


8 A.N., X 1b 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762. Also in A.N., A D XVII, 20. After reaching the age of thirty-three, members of religious orders were "despoiled of their patrimony" or, in other words, ineligible to inherit property.

9 A.N., X 1b 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 13 August 1762.

10 A.N., X 1b 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 11 August 1762. See below, Chapter IV, for a further description of the économes séquestres' activities.

11 A.N., X 1b 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762. See also Isambert, Recueil, vol. XXII, pp. 328–78.

12 The creditors of the Jesuits initially had to present their statements of the money which the order owed them by this date, too. A.N., X 1b 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762 told the creditors to submit their claims by 3 February 1763. In fact, they continued to make claims for several more years. See below, Chapter V, pp. 207–9.

13 A.N., X 1b 8942 État of 22 February 1763.

14 A.N., X 1b 8944 États of 22 July 1763.

15 Lettres patentes of the king, 2 February 1763, in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (127)). See below, Chapter III, pp. 85–8, and Chapter VI, pp. 255–7 for a further discussion of this legislation.
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16 See below, Chapter VI, pp. 242-54.

17 The legislation of 2 February 1763 charged him with the responsibility for the benefices after 31 December 1762. In fact, he did receive money from the harvests of 1762. Cf. A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of Marchal de Sainscy for 1763. That the Econome Général began to pay pensions in 1763 is obvious from a note in A.N., F 4 2680. This unsigned, undated document includes a record of the money Marchal de Sainscy spent on pensions for Jesuits in 1763-64, and the amount shown for that year is one and a half times the amount shown for successive years, thus suggesting that he made payments for only one half of 1763. Since the payments authorized by the Parlement of Paris on 6 August 1762 were intended to last a full year, it seems likely that Marchal de Sainscy began making his payments only in the second half of 1763.

18 Their pensions were to be paid by their provincial assemblies. Cf. A.N., G 8 219 undated document.

19 Lettres patentes of the king, 2 February 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (127)); arrêt du conseil d'état du roi of 18 August 1773; and B.N., Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises 9375 Copie de la lettre écrite le 23 Xbre 178 [sic] par M. de Marville à M. de Castries, followed by a note of 26 March 1770. All suggest that 400 livres and 200 livres were the standard pensions for Jesuits with no other resources in the first decade after the suppression of the order. Brothers who served in the missions may have received 300 livres per year. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1619 ff. 64-68 Marchal de Sainscy to Procureur Général, 13 April 1769 confirms that pensions were indeed paid in advance.

20 A.N., F 4 2680 unsigned, undated record of the amounts of money Marchal paid to Jesuits in pensions each year. With the knowledge that throughout France approximately fifty-three percent of all Jesuits had been priests and forty-seven percent had been brothers or novices (who qualified by age or service for a pension), based on information contained in the sources cited in note 1 above, and with the knowledge that priests normally received 400 livres p. a., while other Jesuits normally received 200 livres p. a., I have calculated that about 1,470 former Jesuits received pensions in the years 1763-68. I have arrived at this conclusion by the following method:

\[
\begin{align*}
450,000 \text{ livres} &= \text{average amount spent on pensions each year } 1763-68 \\
200 \text{ livres} &= \text{normal amount given each year to 47\% of former Jesuits (brothers or juniors etc.)} \\
400 \text{ livres} &= \text{normal amount given to 53\% of former Jesuits (priests)}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus:
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If \( x \) is the number of pensioners:

\[ 0.47x \times 200 + 0.53x \times 400 = 450,000 \]

\( x = 1470 \)


23 See above, p. 60.

24 A.N., X lb 8944 *Etat* of 22 July 1763.


26 De l'Averdy was Controller General of Finances from 13 December 1763 to September 1768. Rolland, *Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages*, p. 6 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122).

27 A.N., X lb 8945 *arrêt* of Parlement of Paris, 22 February 1764. See above, p. 65 for reference to the oath required on 6 August 1762.

28 A.N., X lb 8945 *arrêt* of Parlement of Paris, 9 March 1764 contains a preamble which lists twenty-five Jesuits who did take the oath, and it seems to have been a definitive list.

29 A.N., X lb 8945 *arrêt* of Parlement of Paris, 9 March 1764.

30 A.N., X lb 8946–8947 papers of Parlement of Paris, April and May 1764.

31 The Parlement of Aix banished the Jesuits who had not taken the oath prescribed by that parlement from Aix and Marseille on 18 January 1764; the Parlement of Rouen banished them on 9 April, and that of Pau on 13 April 1764. See Egret, "Procès", R.H., vol. CCIV (1950), p. 22.

32 Declaration of the king 2 April 1764 in *Actes Royaux* (B.N., F 23627 (254)). See below, Chapter VI, pp. 259–61.

33 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1619 ff. 64–68, Marchal de Sainscy to Procureur Général, 13 April 1769 lays down this principle very firmly and asserts that it had been followed ever since the crown had taken over the payment of pensions.
34 A.N., X lb 8946 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 13 April 1764 makes it clear that one reason for the Declaration of 2 April 1764 was to ensure that the former Jesuits had enough money to pay their expenses if they left the kingdom in execution of the Parlement's arrêt of 9 March 1764.


37 Edict of the king, November 1764 in Actes Royaux (B.N. F 23627 (351)) and Isambert, Recueil, vol. XXII, p. 424. It was applied to Lorraine in 1768.


40 See above, p. 66.

41 Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae, pp. 75-101.

42 Neither A.N., X lb 8939-8961 nor B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1612-1629, 1631, 1691 provides any information on this matter.

43 Armaud-Th. de Miromesnil to de l'Averdy, 15 December 1764 in Correspondance politique et administrative de Miromesnil, Premier Président du Parlement de Normandie... (Rouen, 1903), vol. III, p. 416.

44 Cf. A.N., X lb 8941-8961 which contain references to the theological debate of 1761-64 and of 1767, but include no such references for 1764-67. Cf. below, Chapter IV for a discussion of the administrative and economic affairs which did preoccupy the Parlement in this time.

45 Archives de la Seine DC 6 19f° 289 v° and Fichier: noms de personnes, sèries autres que l'Etat Civil. Chauvelin (1714-70) is listed as the conseiller of the Parlement qui fit bannir les Jésuites le 9 mai 1767.

46 A.N. X lb 8953 minutes and arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 8 and 9 May 1767.


48 A.N., H 2180 Compte de la régie des biens des Jésuites pour 1776...
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Lorraine] refers to lettres patentes of the king 5 August 1768.


52 A.N., A D XVII, 23 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 13 May 1768.

53 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1617-1628 passim, contain many of the reports submitted by the local officials after 15 May 1767, but do not indicate the results of the legislation of 1767-68.

54 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1617-1628 includes a number of tragic stories about Jesuits whose behaviour became irrational after the suppression. Example: Coll. Joly de Fleury 1617 f. 131 ff. regarding Jesuits who had experienced hallucinations or become violent and offered as an excuse for their conduct the loss of the way of life which their religious houses had provided. There were also some instances in which Jesuits took the oath against their Institute, retracted it, and then took it again. Cf. Coll. Joly de Fleury 1626 ff. 23-45.

55 Lorraine was fully integrated into France by 1768, after the death of Stanislaw Leczinski of Poland in 1766. The Parlement of Flanders and other Jesuit sympathizers in that part of France ceased to enjoy any support from the Spanish king after the Jesuits had been expelled from Spain in April 1767.


57 Alain Guillermou, Les Jésuites (Paris, 1961) (Que Sais-Je series no. 936), pp. 74-5, or any other standard history of the order. Thaddeus Brzozowski remained the unofficial general of the Society of Jesus until he died in 1820.
58. Regarding the period after 1773, Carré. *Louis XV*, part II, p. 402 n. states:

Bien qu'officiellement supprimés, les Jésuites continuèrent à être employés aux missions dans les provinces, et même un des leurs, le Père Lenfant, prêcha l'avent de 1774 à Versailles.

These impressions are confirmed in B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1617–1628 passim.

59. Guillermou, *Jésuites*, pp. 74–5. As John W. Padberg explains in his *Colleges in Controversy the Jesuit Schools in France from Revival to Suppression 1815–1880* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), p. 2 n., the Papal Bull *Dominus ac Redemptor* of 1773, which suppressed the Jesuit order, could take effect in a particular place only when promulgated by the local Catholic bishop in a Jesuit house. In Prussia and Russia, neither Frederick the Great nor Catherine the Great permitted the bull to be promulgated. In Prussia, the Jesuits continued to exist legally until 1786, but in Russia they survived until 1820. Padberg adds that the Holy See was aware of this state of affairs from the beginning and gradually came to accept and even encourage and approve of it. Until the restoration of the Jesuit order in 1814 and afterwards, a vicar-general was elected in White Russia. Thus, it was Thaddeus Brzozowski who, from Russia, was to commission the re-establishment of the Jesuit order in France in 1814. Cf. Guillermou, *Jésuites*, pp. 74–8. The standard history of the Jesuits in Russia in the period of the suppression is Stanislas Zalenski, S. J., *Les Jésuites de la Russie Blanche* (trans. by Alexandre Vivier) (Paris, 1886), cited by Padberg in *Colleges*, p. 3 n.

60. A.N., A D XVII, 23 arrêt du conseil d'État, 18 August 1773.

61. A.N., G 8 219 decision of the General Assembly of the Clergy, 9 September 1786.


66. B.N., F. F. 10.568 *Etat des anciens Jésuites* [1788] and A.N., G 8 219 lists of Jesuits receiving supplements from the clergy after 1786. Hamy,
Chronologie, makes it clear that over a hundred former Jesuits of the Province of Lyon died in the last decade before the Revolution, and we would expect the same mortality rate to characterize the rest of the kingdom.

67 A.N., G 9 47 accounts of Econome Général dated 1789, show that Marchal continued to pay over 200,000 livres in pensions as late as 1788. The Clergy paid more than 40,000 livres in supplement by 1787. Cf. A.N., G 8 210, 219, and 617. Except for the brief interlude of 1777, there seems to have been no more embittered discussion of the evils of the Jesuit order after 1773.
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1. See above, Chapter II, pp. 47-55 for a discussion of the legal proceedings against the Jesuits in 1759 to August 1761.

2. See above, Chapter II, pp. 57-60 for a description of the roles they played in 1761.

3. The Abbé Henri-Philippe Chauvelin (1714-70) was one of the first attackers of the Jesuits. He gave impressive anti-Jesuit speeches in the Grand'Chambre on 17 April and 8 July 1761 and on 29 April and 9 May 1767, and was known as the man responsible for banishing the Jesuits in March 1767. Cf. Arch. de la Seine DC 6 19° 289°, and ed. J.-F. Michaud, Biographie universelle (Paris, 1845) 1st ed. vol. VIII, pp. 55-6.

4. The Abbé Joseph-Marie Terray (1715-78) was associated with Chauvelin in the early stages of the Jesuit affair. Besides acting frequently as rapporteur and receiving oaths from Jesuit creditors in the late 1760's (see below, Chapter V, pp. 207-9) he also frequently acted as the spokesman for the Econome Séquestre of Paris, although the Econome had his own attorney in the Parlement. Cf. A.N., X lb 8941 passim. Terray became Controller General of Finances in 1769 and was implicated in the Famine Plot. See Michaud, Biographie universelle, vol. XLV, pp. 175-90.

5. Clément-François de l'Averdy (1723-93), conseiller in the Parlement, who became Controller General of Finances on 13 December 1763 and remained in that office until 1768. He was apparently honest and powerless, and, in the end, went to the scaffold for his assumed involvement in the Famine Plot. See Michaud, Biographie universelle, vol. III, pp. 112-13. On the other hand, he did try in 1764-71 to carry out a reform of municipal government. See Jean Egret, Louis XV et l'Opposition parlementaire 1715-1774 (Paris, 1970), pp. 207-8.


7. Barthélemy-Gabriel Rolland d'Erceville (1734-94) was Président à Mortier in the Chambre des Enquêtes when the Jesuit affair began. He remained throughout his life (in contrast to Terray, Maupou, and other lesser parlementaires) a constant advocate of the Parlement's power and authority. See Michaud, Biographie universelle, vol. XXXVIII, pp. 474-6.

8. Roussel de la Tour was a conseiller in the Parlement as early as 1739. He was one of the writers of Extrait des assertions dangereuses of 1761. Cf. above, Chapter II, p. 60, and Michaud, Biographie universelle, vol. XXXVII, pp. 235-6. And in 1763 he published a brochure entitled Richesse de l'Etat, which was a proposal for a considerable tax reform. See Egret, Louis XV et l'Opposition, p. 94. Barbier remarked...
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pp. 82-85

in June 1763 that everyone was reading the pamphlet on tax reform.
Barbier, *Chronique*, vol. VIII, p. 77.

9See below, pp. 102 and 111.

10Rolland, *Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages*, pp. 162-70, and 632 (B.N. R 6074 and Res. R 1122). Mathieu-François Molé was Premier Président of the *Parlement* in 1757-63. He was succeeded by René-Nicolas-Charles-Augustin de Maupéou in 1763 and he by Etienne-François d'Aligre in 1768.

11Charles-Antoine de la Roche-Aymon was Archbishop of Narbonne in 1762-63 and subsequently of Reims. He was known as a dévot and was named a cardinal by the pope who suppressed the Jesuit order, Clement XIV, in 1772. He died in 1777. Louis Sextius de Jarente was in 1762 and subsequent years the Bishop of Orléans charged with the *Feuille des Bénéfices* and with full responsibility for the *Economats*. See below, Chapter VI, pp. 251-71, for a reference to his activities as head of the *Economats*. See also Rolland, *Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages*, pp. 162-70 (B.N., R 6074 and Res R 1122) for a full description of how the *parlementaires* and members of the Royal Council worked together to prepare royal legislation.

12Cf., above, Chapter II, p. 60.


14See below, Chapter IV, pp. 141-57, for a full description of this official's activities.

15A.N., X lb 8941 and printed copy in B.N., F 47110 (2) *arrêt* of *Parlement* of Paris, 30 April 1762.

16A.N., X lb 8941 *arrêt* of *Parlement* of Paris, 5 May 1762.

17One *arrêt* created both the network of *économes séquestrés* in the provinces and the Union of Creditors. An original copy is found in A.N., X lb 8941 *arrêt* of *Parlement* of Paris, 23 April 1762; a printed copy is in B.N., F 47110 (1).

18See below, Chapter V, pp. 158-62 on the officials of the Union of Creditors and their *procureur* in the *Parlement* of Paris.
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19 See below, Chapter V, pp. 158 and 207-9 on Terray's part in recognizing legitimate creditors of the Jesuits. The declarations of several hundreds of creditors, all "made before the Abbé Terray" are in A.N., X lb 9696. Terray continued to receive such declarations until 1770 or 1771.

20 A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 19 May 1762. A printed copy of the arrêt is in B.N., F 23674 (238).

21 See above, p. 82.

22 See below, pp. 92-5 and 98.

23 Edict of the king February 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (117)).


25 See below, Chapter VI, pp. 255-61 on the new duties of the Econome Général du Clergé.

26 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1613 ff. 16-20 an exchange of letters between the Procureur Général and the Bishop of Orléans (Jarente), 6 and 8 February 1763.

27 Lettres patentes of the king, 2 February 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (125)).

28 Lettres patentes of the king, 5 March 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (154)).

29 See below, Chapter V, p. 171. In fact, there is only one instance in which a member of the Parlement actually acquired Jesuit property for himself at this time, and it appears to have been insignificant.

30 Lettres patentes of the king, 2 February 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (125)).

31 Lettres patentes of the king, 3 June 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (158)).

32 The Econome Général was responsible to his superior, Jarente, Bishop of Orléans and to the Commission des Economats, which, in 1762-63 included d'Aguesseau, with whom the Parlement's commissioners were in
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33 Clearly, the benefices posed a serious problem for anyone bent, as the parlementaires seem to have been, on confiscating the Jesuits' property. They were ecclesiastical property belonging to the French church. The Jesuits had enjoyed their revenues only at the pleasure of the pope, a prelate or another religious order, and with the sanction of the king. Over them, the Parlement could never expect to attain rights of alienation. They could never be sold, and, to judge from what the commissioners of the Parlement found out about them, they would never be a source of great profit. Cf. Appendix IV, below.
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1Cf. above, Chapter II, passim. The arrêt of 6 August repeated the king's instructions to Jesuit superiors and required that they hand over the titles of their establishments, lists of members of the Society, and lists of property found in or attached to Jesuit houses to the Parlement. On 13 February 1762, Montigny, the procureur of the Jesuit province of France presented a procès verbal on the Jesuits of his province to the Parlement and on 23 March 1762, the Gens du Roi presented a thorough compte rendu on the state of the mémoires etc. submitted to the court in execution of the arrêt of 6 August 1761. See A.N., X lb 8940. After that, the Parlement did what it could to force recalcitrant Jesuit superiors to hand over the required information before abandoning their houses. The arrêt of 23 April 1762 repeated this requirement. B.N., F 47110 (1) arrêt of 23 April 1762.

2The actual decision embodying this principle is contained in the arrêt of 20 March 1762 in A.N., X lb 8940, but the legislation of February and March 1762, also in A.N., X lb 8940, in which the court instructed local officials to name new masters to replace the Jesuits, was based on the same assumption. I have found no reference to this principle in the Parlement's papers before February 1762 and did not expect to find any. As it was, the arrêt of 20 March 1762 preceded by ten days the Jesuits' closing of their colleges.

3A series of arrêts of the Parlement in A.N., X lb 8940.

4B.N., F 47110 (1) and A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 April 1762. See above, Chapter II, pp. 62-6 on the departure of the Jesuits from their religious houses. Many of the statements they prepared before leaving are found in A.N., M 245-249.

5See above, Chapter II, pp. 52-4.

6A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 19 May 1762. A printed copy is in B.N., F 23674 (238).

7A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762.

8A.N., X lb 8942 another arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762.

9A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 7 September 1762.

10B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1691 f. 34 and F 23674 (485) and A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 3 September 1762.

11See below, Appendix V, part I for an indication of the way in which the towns having Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement were divided between the three commissioners. See also Rolland, Compte rendu, pp. 4-11 (B.N., Ld 39 939).
See below, Appendix V, part II for a list of the dates on which specific commissioners presented their *comptes rendus*. See below, pp. 102-5, for a description of the *comptes rendus*.

The letter is contained in Rolland, *Compte rendu*, pp. 4-11 (B.N., Ld 39 939).

The questionnaire consisted of five *états* bearing the following titles:

- *Etat des soi-disans Jésuites suivant le Procès verbal du 1762*, sauf à vérifier sur les Extraits Baptistaires,
- *Extraits de Vœux, Déclarations de Pèrûle et certificats de Domicile actuel qui seront présentés avec leur Requêtes avant le 3 Février 1763*;
- *Etat des Biens attachés audit Collège avant et depuis l'année Époque de l'introduction de la ci-devant Société dans ladite Maison*;
- *Etat des charges foncières, Fondations et Entretiens annuels des Biens, Honoraires des nouveaux Maîtres, Frais de rège et administration et Gages de Domestiques*; and

Each *état* included a list of very precise questions about the names of people, amounts of money and titles of property involved, and the paper on which each *état* was printed provided enough space in which to answer them. An example of a blank *état* is found in Rolland, *Compte rendu*, facing p. 6 (B.N., Ld 39 939). It is unfortunate that no completed *états* seem to have survived.

A.N., X lb 9695 clarifies the situation in Paris in 1762.

It was, of course, normal to sing a *Te Deum* at a public celebration in the eighteenth century, though perhaps not quite so usual as in the period of Louis XIV, who used religious ceremony frequently and with great effect. See John B. Wolf, *Louis XIV* (New York, 1968), pp. 60-6. The papers of the *Conseil Secret* of the *Parlement* of Paris for 1761-71 (A.N., X lb 8939-8961) make it clear that *Te Deums* were sung at the ceremonial openings of that court, when the peers (*pairs*) were present. The last reference to the singing of a *Te Deum* in the course of the events studied in this thesis which I have found is in Amédée Vialay, *La Vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution française* (Paris, 1908), p. 2. A *Te Deum* was sung after the night of 4 August 1789.

It is possible and even likely that the source of this narrative, which is printed in *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, 7 December 1762, pp. 195-6 and reproduced in Rolland, *Compte rendu*, pp. 11-30 (B.N., Ld 39 939), was de l'Averdy himself. Cf. Bib. de Port-Royal, L.P. 583, no. 51 and François Bluche, *Les Magistrats du Parlement de Paris au XVIIIe siècle* (1715-1771) (Paris, 1960), pp. 286 and 299.
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19. The College of Beauvais replaced it, according to the *lettres patentes* of 7 April 1764. See Rolland, *Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages*, p. 264 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). The *lettres patentes* contradicted an *arrêt* of the Parlement of Paris of 12 March 1764 which had divided the buildings of the old College of Louis-le-Grand between the re-established College of Louis-le-Grand and the College of Lisieux. See A.N., X 1b 8946.

20. We do, however, have a number of the reports made by local officials in the spring of 1762. They are to be found principally in A.N., M 245-249. A description of the making of *procès verbaux* and other reports in provincial towns in that spring is to be found in B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1613 ff. 41-99.

21. My assumption is based on the fact that none of the *comptes rendus* later produced by the commissioners is nearly so complete as it could have been if all the questions had been systematically answered. The argument that the commissioners may simply have chosen not to include endless detail in their accounts seems invalid since the *comptes rendus* do include a great deal of detail about some matters, but not consistently the same matters in successive *comptes rendus* prepared by the same commissioner. Cf. below, pp. 102-5 on the nature of the *comptes rendus*.

22. See below, Appendix V, part III for list of dates on which such *lettres patentes* were granted.


24. The Procureur Général du Roi informed the court on 18 January 1763 that the crown made no claims on the Jesuit property in Paris and the court passed an *arrêt* recognizing that fact. See A.N., X 1b 8942 and Rolland, *Compte rendu* (B.N., Ld 39 939).

25. See above, pp. 85-7. The legislation is in *Actes Royaux* (B.N., F 23627 (117), (125), and 127). Edict of February 1763 and *lettres patentes* of the king 2 February 1763.

26. *Actes Royaux* (B.N., F 23627 (125)).

27. See above, p. 86-7, and below, p. 108-11.
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28 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (117)).

29 See above, p. 93-5. The letter is in Rolland, Compte rendu, pp. 4-11 (B.N., Ld 39 939).

And in this instance we see the problem of using the questionnaire, even in eighteenth century France. Should the reference in the letter of 27 September 1762 to the suggestion of some provincial officials be regarded as the commissioners' attempt to seek "public support" for a policy they had already decided to follow? This interpretation is the likely one, but I cannot prove it.

The precedent, alluded to in the preambule of the Edict, was the establishment of bureaux d'administration of hospitals on 12 December 1698.

32 Lettres patentes of the king 2 February 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (127)). See below, pp. 106-8 for a description of the granting of lettres patentes pertaining to specific colleges. These lettres patentes about the colleges stated only when the administration of the Econome Général should end. In most cases it was expected to end in 1766 or 1767.

The commissioners apparently had a hand in making this decision, just as in drafting the lettres patentes of 2 February 1763, although it was Jarente and Joly de Fleury who succeeded in making the final arrangements for this new régie to be established and it was the same two men who gained Molé's support for the selection of Marchal de Sainscy for the position. Cf. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1613 ff. 16-20, exchange of letters between the Bishop of Orléans and the Procureur Général du Roi, 6 and 8 February 1763, makes clear the role of Jarente and Joly de Fleury in the events of February 1763.

A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 11 February 1763.

The first record of the commissioners' attendance of a meeting of the bureau of administration of the College of Louis-le-Grand is in A.N., X lb 8946, minutes of 27 March 1764, extract of the deliberations of the bureau of Louis-le-Grand, apparently of that day. Clearly Roussel de la Tour, Terray, and Rolland had been at that meeting, and apparently at others preceeding it. It therefore seems likely that the commissioners of the Parlement had attended the meetings of that bureau since its inception in 1763. In doing so, they had been acting according to the terms of the Edict of February which they had helped to prepare.

B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1613 f. 32. The état to be filled out in accordance with the Edict of February resembled the five états which
the commissioners had sent to the provinces in September 1762. The opening questions pertained to the foundation of the college and the lettres patentes which had originally confirmed its existence. These questions were followed by others on the college's revenues and particularly on receipts from benefices, rentes, leases, endowments etc. After the "receipts" was to follow a description of normal expenditures, including the charges on real estate, the cost of domestics' wages and salaries for the new masters etc. The Modèle de l'état qui sera envoyé par les Bureaux des Collèges [to the court] en exécution de l'Édit de Février 1763 is all that is available in B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1613 f. 32.

I have found no evidence to support the conviction of some twentieth century Jesuit historians, including Delattre in Etablissements, vol. II, p. 573, that the commissioners collaborated with local officials in deliberately distorting the truth about the financial history of the colleges when they presented their comptes rendus. Nor does it seem at all likely that they wanted to own the Jesuits' property for themselves or their supporters, as has been suggested by Delattre in Etablissements, vol. I, p. xiii, and in a private conversation I had with Le Père François de Dainville, S.J., in April 1967. All the evidence suggests that the four commissioners sought and obtained the right to control Jesuit and other colleges in France in 1763-64. The distinction between owning lands such as those attached to a benefice (or owning the rights to lease a benefice) and controlling education through the Jesuit and non-Jesuit colleges is a significant one. All the evidence I have found suggests that the commissioners would have liked to control education, not to own or even control property.


Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 166 and 932 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). It seems likely that from the beginning they shared the responsibility for investigating the affairs of and reporting on the state of non-Jesuit colleges (though never their particular responsibilities for the Jesuit ones) with the Abbé Terray. Cf. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1691 f. 127 list of non-Jesuit colleges and their commissioners dating from 1783 but refering to the period after February 1763. Also Coll. Joly de Fleury 1613 f. 32 letter of 27 April 1763 signed by Terray, Rolland, Roussel de la Tour, and de l'Averdy, which ordered the bailliages and sénéchaussées to execute the Edict of February 1763. Cf. also perhaps the strongest evidence: Coll. Joly de Fleury 1613 f. 38 Répartition entre Mes. les Commissaires nommés... 6 Août 1762 et 24 Mars 1763 and including the names of Roussel de la Tour, Rolland d'Erceville, de l'Averdy, and Terray.

It is quite pointless to try to equate the number of comptes rendus with the number of Jesuit institutions or the number of towns in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris which had Jesuit institutions.
In some cases, comptes rendus dealt with several institutions in a single town (eg.: Paris, Lyon, Nevers, La Rochelle), but, in others (notably the towns of Artois, Aurillac and Mauriac, and Clermont-Ferrand and Billom) a single compte rendu dealt with Jesuit institutions and property in several towns. See below, Appendix V, part II for further clarification of this point.

Original copies of all the comptes rendus are in A.N., X lb 8943-8949. The order in which, and the date on which the comptes rendus were read to the court are indicated in Appendix V, part II, below. Printed copies of almost all the comptes rendus are in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages (B.N., R 6074 or Res. R 1122), and in A.N., A D XVII 19-25, passim.

Cf. the suggestion made by the commissioners in their letter to provincial officials of 27 September 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu, pp. 4-11 (B.N., Ld 39 939).

See above, Chapter II, pp. 49-53.

It will be remembered that there were no tuition fees charged at Jesuit colleges in the eighteenth century, but if there were a pensionnat, charges were made for the right to live and to eat there.

See below, Appendix III, which indicates, among other amounts, what the commissioners stated as the colleges' gross and net revenues, assets and liabilities, in the comptes rendus.

Cf. below, Appendix V, part III.

An arrêt of the Parlement of Paris of 18 April 1760 had suppressed the congrégations. See A.N., X lb 8939. Their property nevertheless was discussed in 1762-64.

The comptes rendus on Paris were presented by de l'Averdy on 14 and 15 January, 25 February, and 15 June 1763. Printed copies are in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and A.N., A D XVII, 20. Original copies are in A.N., X lb 8942 and X lb 8943.

A printed copy of the compte rendu on Lyon, given by de l'Averdy on 8 March 1763 is found in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939), and a manuscript copy is in A.N., X lb 8943. Those for Nevers and La Rochelle, given by de l'Averdy on 15 March and 22 July 1763 are in Rolland, Compte rendu and A.N., X lb 8943 and X lb 8944.

The comptes rendus for Clermont-Ferrand and La Flèche, given by
Rolland on 15 July and 5 July 1763 are in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939). Manuscript copies are in A.N., X lb 8944. His compte rendu on Poitiers of 7 June 1763 is in A.N., X lb 8947. De l'Averdy's on La Rochelle of 22 July 1763 is in X lb 8944.

51 The comptes rendus for Pontoise and Guéret, read on 11 May and 2 September 1763 by Rolland, are in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939).

52 See below, Chapter V, pp. 163-204 on what became of the creditors' property.

53 The six establishments were the Colleges of Arras and Dunkerque, the Wallon College of Saint-Omer, and the Colleges of Aire, Béthune, and Hesdin. The English College at Saint-Omer had been the subject of a compte rendu given the previous year. For some reason which is not clear, the Colleges of Arras and Dunkerque were discussed together in the compte rendu of 3 August 1764 given by Roussel de la Tour, but the College of Dunkerque is not mentioned elsewhere in the references to Artois in the papers of the Parlement (although Dunkerque was, of course, very clearly within its jurisdiction, and there was a college there), and I have not been able to discover its fate after 1764. The comptes rendus on the six establishments were all given by Roussel de la Tour in August 1764 or February 1765 and are found in A.N., X lb 8948 and X lb 8949. Cf. below, Appendix V, part II for the precise date on which each compte rendu was presented to the Parlement.

54 The compte rendu for Reims was presented on 24 January 1764 by Roussel de la Tour and is found in A.N. A D XVII, 22. He also presented that of Eu on 10 March 1764 and that of Charleville on 22 May 1764 and they are in A.N., X lb 8946 and X lb 8947. Rolland presented the comptes rendus of Bourges and Poitiers on 7 June 1764; they are in A.N., X lb 8947 and Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 429-508 and 585-700 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). It will be remembered that although the two other establishments at Poitiers (the College of Puygarreau and the Irish College) traditionally bore the names of colleges, they were in fact residences or pensionnats for the College of Sainte Marthe at Poitiers, and have been treated as such throughout this dissertation.

55 Cf. A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 May 1762.

56 Cf. A.N., X lb 8947 compte rendu on Charleville presented by Roussel de la Tour.

57 See below, Appendix V, part III. The only change in comptes rendus which occurred in the period was that issued after the publication of the Lettres patentes of the king of 21 November 1763 (see below, pp. 108-9) no longer contained lists of property which could be "abandoned to the creditors".
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58 See above, p. 82. See also Chapter II, p. 54, above.

59 The rapporteurs of this commission were, over the years: Taboureau until 1764; Esmangard until 1766; de Crosne until 1771 (helped by Gueau de Reverseau after 1769); Gueau de Reverseau until 1778; and thereafter, Camus de Neville. Cf. membership in the Commission des Economats over the years as indicated in the papers of that commission in A.N., V 778 and V 779. All but de Crosne seem to have had a hand in overseeing the affairs of the Economats in the period 1763-89, too.

60 The only case in which the two groups of men failed to agree was in the matter of assigning regulars to teach in colleges formerly held by the Jesuits. In the case of the lettres patentes of 29 April 1763, which handed over the College of La Trinité of Lyon to the Oratorians, the royal commission had its way. The legislation is reproduced in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939).

61 Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 164-6 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122).

62 See below, Appendix V, part III, for a list of dates on which lettres patentes were granted. The lettres patentes are most readily available in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627).

63 See above, p. 89.

64 A.N., A D XVII, 23 lettres patentes of the king, 4 September 1764.

65 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (818) and (819) ) edicts of the king, September 1768.

66 See below, Appendix V, part III.

67 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 passim) for the years 1763-68.

68 See below, Appendix V, part III.

69 Reims' benefices were divided between the Collège des Bons-Enfants of Reims and the College of Châlons-sur-Marne. See A.N., A D XVII, 23 lettres patentes of 4 September.

70 Roussel de la Tour in Rolland, Compte rendu, pp. 203-4, reference to his report of 24 March 1763.

71 See below, Chapter VI, pp. 268-71 for a discussion of how this provision worked in practice.
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72 Cf. all the lettres patentes confirming colleges in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627).

73 See above, p. 98.

74 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (158) and (162)) lettres patentes of the king, 3 and 14 June 1763.

75 Lettres patentes of the king, 21 November 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., 23627 (200)). In one sense, the payments which the colleges might one day have to make to the creditors were counterbalanced by the 150,000 livres which the Union of Creditors immediately had to be prepared to lend to the colleges, by way of the Econome Général for repairs to college benefices. Cf. Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (199)) lettres patentes of the king, 21 November 1763. As it happened, the Union of Creditors apparently never lent the full amount to the Econome Général, who did not repay the Union, either. See below, Chapter V, p. 174 and Chapter VI, p. 272.

76 Lettres patentes of the king, 30 March 1764 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (252)). See below, Chapter V on the creditors, for a fuller description of the whole matter. The best example of a judgment by the Parlement of this kind of problem is that found in A.N., X lb 8951 arrêt of 3 February 1766, given in response to the request of the former recteur of the College of Louis-le-Grand. The court thereby ordered Duchaffon, a marchand of Paris who had bought Jesuit country property attached to the college in an auction organized on the creditors' behalf on 31 August 1763 to pay what he owed. The creditors seem to have received the first payments, but in 1766, the court told Duchaffon to pay the remaining 26,000 livres to the college.

77 See below, Appendix V, part III for a list of these arrêts of the Parlement. They are in A.N., X lb 8945-8957.

78 See above, p. 102. As a commissioner, Terray did not assume responsibility for deciding anything about the Jesuit colleges, but he was concerned with the future of the "colleges not served by the Jesuits". He remained the court's rapporteur in other matters concerning the property. Cf. below, Chapter V, passim.

79 The report was entitled Compte Rendu sur les collèges non-desservoient par les Jésuites and was read in the Parlement on 26 August 1763. It may be found in A.N., X lb 8944.

80 Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, p. 163 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122).

81 Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, p. 163 (B.N., R 6074 and
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Res. R 1122).

82 De l'Averdy became Controller General on 13 December 1763 and on 15 December Henry Cochin replaced him as commissioner. See A.N., X 1b 8945 papers of Parlement of Paris, 15 December 1763.

83 Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, passim. (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). Before de l'Averdy went to the Contrôle Général, Rolland did not take a noticeably more active part than other commissioners. After December 1763, he was active in all the matters over which the commissioners had any control. His Recueil is his testimony to his increased activity.

84 A.N., X 1b 8945 decisions of the Parlement of Paris, 16 December 1763 and 11 January 1764. Cf. also A.N., X 1b 8949 arrêt of 29 January 1765, which reiterated this principle.


86 Rolland explained in the Plan that none of the provincial universities (which included those of Reims, Orléans, Angers, Bourges, and Poitiers) had said anything the University of Paris had not said. Cf. Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 5-6 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122), and references in A.N., X 1b 8940 passim. See Rolland, Compte rendu aux Chambres assemblées par M. Rolland, des différents Mémoires envoyés par les Universités...relativement au Plan d'Étude à suivre dans les Collèges non dépendans des Universités (Paris, 1769) (B.N., Lf 25 65), for the Plan.

87 Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 5-6 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122) and A.N., X 1b 8955. The report was prepared in 1767 and read by Rolland on 13 May 1768. As early as 1761, the University of Paris had apparently also submitted a memorandum similar to the ones on which Rolland's Plan was based. Cf. B.N., Coll. Le Senne 8481 Mémoire de l'Université [par M. de Combalusier] sur les moyens de pourvoir à l'Instruction de la Jeunesse et de la perfection.

88 Lettres patentes of the king 20 August 1767, referred to in B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1691 ff. 133v-134. There were arrêts of the Parlement of Paris such as that of 4 December 1769 which approved the Projet de Règlement pour le Collège de Louis-le-Grand concerning the boursiers of that college and another of 12 February 1770, which regulated the degree of consanguinity permitted among members of the bureaux of administration. This legislation is in A.N., X 1b 8958 and 8959. But no legislation introduced in the Parlement or sponsored by the crown attempted to create a new system of education such as the commissioners had in mind.
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89 See below, Appendix V, part III for a description of the Parlement's and the crown's legislation which officially determined the future of the colleges.

90 The lettres patentes and edicts of 1763-68 had confirmed the continued existence of all of the thirty-nine former Jesuit colleges except the Colleges of Reims, Aire, Hesdin, and Bethune. Later, Bethune and Aire were reopened. Cf. Appendix V, part III.

91 So far as I know, this is the task upon which Mr. C. R. Bailey is presently at work. In a letter to me dated 3 April 1970, he wrote that he was working on "the disposition of the former Jesuit colleges within the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris until 1790". His Ph. D. dissertation accepted by the University of Chicago in August, 1968 deals with the Collège of Moulins in 1761-80. Charles Randall Bailey, "The Collège at Moulins (1761-1780). An Example of the Former Jesuit Colleges outside Paris but within the Jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation) (Chicago, 1968), 189 pp.

91a One connection between the parlementaires and the subsequent history of the bureau of administration of the College of Louis-le-Grand does deserve note, however. In February 1767, the bureau obtained permission to sell a small ferme to the Premier Président of the Parlement, Mole. The Parlement granted this right on the grounds (or excuse!) that it was a profitable sale for the college to make and that it was in accordance with the lettres patentes of 21 November 1763, which had confirmed the existence of the college. It would be fair to ask whether the Parlement was merely trying to satisfy the Président Mole. But even if this was the case, it is a unique case. There is no other suggestion that members of the Parlement of Paris acquired any of the Jesuits' property. The arrêt approving the sale dates from 19 February 1767 and is in A.N., X 1b 8953.

92 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1691 ff. 133-134v. This document is apparently the text of an address which Lamoignon delivered to the Parlement on 1 April 1783. This is the only document emanating from the Parlement and connected with the Jesuit affair in which I have found the word "citizen" used and the concept of a public opinion which could be pleased or displeased mentioned.

93 Adrien Lefevre d'Amécourt was a conseiller of the Parlement.

94 Gabriel Tandeau de Marsac was a conseiller-clerc in the Grand' Chambre of the Parlement.

95 Jean-Baptiste Auguste Le Rebours (fils) was a Président à Mortier of the Troisième Chambre des Enquêtes.
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96 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1691 ff. 122-130. Unfortunately, the document is undated, but internal evidence places it no earlier than 1777 and probably as late as 1783.

97 The twenty colleges were those of: Amiens, Angoulême, Aurillac, Bar-le-Duc, Billom, Blois, Charleville, Châlons-sur-Marne, Chaumont-en-Bassigny, Clermont-Ferrand, Eu, Fontenay-le-Comte, Langres, La Rochelle, Mâcon, Mauriac, Nevers, Orléans, Saint Flour, and Sens. The list also included the Collège des Bons Enfants of Reims, which was not originally a Jesuit college but which received benefices from the Jesuit College of Reims when the latter was suppressed.

98 The three colleges were the two in Lyon and that of Roanne. Although Lyon had had two colleges, their administration was combined by the lettres patentes of 29 April 1763 which confirmed the colleges' existence. Mâcon had been given regulars briefly after 1763, but by 1769 was in the hands of seculars under a bureau of administration.

99 The eight colleges which had been confirmed in 1763-65 and which by 1783 were in the hands of regulars and no longer governed by bureaux of administration were the Colleges of Compiègne, Arras (there was no mention of the College of Dunkerque), Auxerre, La Flèche, Laon, Moulins, Saint-Omer (the Wallon College), and Tours. The two colleges which were re-established in 1777-83 were the Colleges of Aire and Béthune. The Colleges of Auxerre and La Flèche were by 1783 well established official preparatory schools for the Ecole Militaire. Cf. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1691 ff. 173-174 and 178-221.

100 The colleges in question were, of course, those of Poitiers and Bourges.

101 The colleges not in the list of c. 1783 were the College of Louis-le-Grand of Paris, which was in the hands of seculars under a bureau of administration; the English College of Saint-Omer, which had remained under English secular priests since 1762; and the Colleges of Reims and Hesdin which had been permanently suppressed in 1764 and 1768. See Gustave Dupont-Ferrier, La Vie quotidienne d'un Collège pendant plus de trois cent cinquante ans: du Collège de Clermont au Lycée Louis-le-Grand (1563-1920) (Paris, 192), vol. I, pp. 306-92, and Delattre, Établissements, vol. IV, pp. 880 and 909. A.N., X lb 8950-8961 passim contains many references to the bureau of administration of Louis-le-Grand, too.

102 Cf. for example: Joseph Delfour, Les Jésuites à Poitiers 1604-1762 (Paris, 1902); Georges Guittton, Les Jésuites à Lyon sous Louis XIV et Louis XV Activité, lutte, suppression 1640-1768 (Lyon, 1954); Albert de Massouges, Les Jésuites à Angoulême (1516-1792) (Angoulême, 1880) (B.N., Ld 39 1039); Rolland d'Erceville, Mémoire sur l'administration du Collège de Louis-le-Grand et collèges y réunis depuis le moment de la
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Réunion jusqu'au ler janvier 1771 (Paris, 1778) (B.N., Res. R 1121). The best lists of general histories of the colleges, including histories of the colleges between 1762 and 1814, are in Delattre, Etablissements, vols. I-IV, the bibliographical sections following each geographical listing.

Notes, Chapter IV

Part I  pp. 118-122

1 See below, Appendix V, part III.

2 The only departmental archives which I was able to consult were those of the Département of the Seine, Arch. de la Seine. Cf. below, Bibliography.

3 The exceptions to this general rule are the case of the Économe Général du Clergé whose financial statements are to be found in the papers of the Commission of the Économats in A.N., V 7 78 and in the papers of the Financial Administration in A.N., F 4 1935; and the case of the Économe Séquestre of Paris whose major set of extant accounts are to be found in the A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville.

4 The richness of departmental and municipal holdings pertaining to Jesuit property varies enormously, according to the Jesuit scholars who have used these depositories. Cf. Delattre, Etablissements, vols. I-IV, the bibliographies following each encyclopedic listing of Jesuit establishments.

5 See above, Chapter III, p. 84 for an earlier reference to the creation of these officials.

6 See above, Chapter III, p. 84.


9 A.N., X lb 8941 and printed copy in B.N., F 47110 (2) arrêt of Parlement of Paris 30 April 1762.

10 Examples of "controlling institutions": colleges, to which all kinds of property, including ecclesiastical benefices, country property and missions were attached; and novicatures or professed houses to which country property or retreat houses were officially or unofficially attached. There were several instances in which a benefice, mission, or country house was located in a bailliage or sénéchaussée different from the one in which its "controlling house" was found. Sometimes such lines of ownership transcended the boundaries of two or more parlements' jurisdictions. Cf. below, p. 144.

11 A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 May 1762 appointed Brousse to be Bronod's attorney; one of 18 January 1763 charged him
with the responsibility for judging the provincial économes' accounts. The second arrêt is referred to in A.N., X lb 8947 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 June 1764.

12 A.N., X lb 8941 contains a record of the protest lodged by the Controlleur aux Saisies Réelles on 7 May 1762.

13 A.N., X lb 8946 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 19 March 1764 indicates the considerable cost of saisies réelles.
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1 If not since 17 April 1761. See above, Chapter II, pp. 52-3.

2 These requests were made in arrêts of the Parlement of Paris in February and March 1762 in A.N., X 1b 8940 passim, 6 August 1762 in A.N., X 1b 8942, and in the letter written by the commissioners of the Parlement of 27 September 1762 in Rolland, Compte rendu, pp. 4-11 (B.N., Ld 39 939).

3 The arrêts of the Parlement of Paris in question are those of 24 January, 22 May, and 7 July 1764; and 18 April 1766. They are in A.N., X 1b 8945, 8947, and 8951. They form the basis of Appendix VI, part I.

4 There, instead of the regular bishop and appointees from the bailliage or sénéchaussée, the bureaux of administration consisted of municipal officials.

5 In fact, this category of specialist was rare. The Parlement was not normally prepared to entrust the cataloguing of books to any but its own men, such as Chauvelin (and later Roussel de la Tour) or to trustworthy members of sympathetic religious orders, such as the Religieux de S. Germain des Près, whose orthodoxy was assured. See A.N., X 1b 8944 arrêt of 5 July 1763 which charged members of this order to catalogue manuscripts and books of the libraries of the College of Louis-le-Grand, the professed house, and the noviciate in Paris. One of the tasks of the makers of inventories of Jesuit libraries was to root out the pernicious or heretical books which the Jesuits in 1761 had been accused of writing or of treasuring. Cf. above, Chapter II, p. 56, which refers to the Parlement's destruction of the Jesuits' pernicious books.

6 In at least one case, the Parlement did not use an architect per se to perform these functions. In Amiens, the professor of physics prepared fourteen plans of the college after the confiscation. See A.N., X 1b 8947 arrêt of 7 July 1764. Apparently at least one of his plans is in A.N., M 245.

7 Cf. Appendix VI, part I. Unfortunately, the information contained in my sources (cf. above, note 3) did not allow me to separate the amounts spent on the making of inventories from amounts spent on other functions, although it did reveal that in the case of the highest-ranking officials, most of their time (and hence their salaries) had been spent in the preparation of inventories.

8 See A.N., X 1b 8943 papers of the Parlement, March 1763 passim for several references to gardiens, including at least one whose responsibility extended to protecting an ever diminishing supply of wine in a Paris country house.

Cf. below, Chapter V, pp. 169-71.

Needless to say, these men were doctors from Saint-Omer which, in the matter of Jesuit debts or of money owed for or to the Jesuits was always a remarkable case. See below, Chapter V, pp. 216 and 219.

Total derived from amounts cited in arrêts of the Parlement of Paris 24 January, 22 May, and 7 July 1764; and 18 April 1766, in A.N., X 1b 8945, 8947, and 8951. See below, Appendix VI, part I.

There is certainly no record of disputes between the two kinds of officials. There were probably two reasons why such disputes were avoided. The économos séquestres' functions, like those of other provincial officials, were sufficiently defined so that their work should not have overlapped, and the Parlement did take steps to prevent any économos séquestre from having responsibilities that were too scattered.

See below, Appendix VI, part II based on arrêts of Parlement of Paris 5 June 1764 and 15 April 1766 in A.N., X 1b 8947 and 8951.

Lettres patentes of the king of 3 June 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (158)).

So far as I can tell, only libraries containing what the parlementaires judged to be possible "pernicious" books and buildings having guardians appointed by bailliages and sénéchaussées were actually excluded from their control in those first ten months.

A.N., X 1b 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 27 May 1762. On 7 September 1762 an arrêt of the Parlement ruled that local bishops should make appointments to benefices attached to Jesuit colleges. See A.N., X 1b 8942.

A.N., X 1b 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 27 May 1762. Cf. below, Appendix VI, part II. The man was still the économos séquestre in 1764.

A.N., X 1b 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 27 May 1762.
21 A.N., X lb 8941 and 8942 contain the texts of numerous arrêts which regulated this problem. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1618 ff. 72-73 also deals with it. A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement, 28 August 1762 ordered the general implementation of this principle.

22 See below, Appendix VI, part II. The list of payments to provincial économes séquestres reveals that in most demonstrable cases the largest salary went to officials of the colleges.

A.N., X lb 8941 contains the text of the legislation, dated 30 July 1762, pertaining to La Flèche, and A.N., X lb 8942 contains the text, dated 25 February 1763, of that pertaining to Bourges. Rolland explained the significance of this legislation in his Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 499-503 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). He also referred to and cited most of the legislation, dated 17 April 1765, pertaining to Poitiers. See his Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 619-20.


25 See A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762.

26 A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 11 August 1762.

27 A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 31 August 1762.

28 A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 3 June 1763.

29 See above, Chapter III, p. 100 on the February legislation.

30 A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 13 August 1763.

31 See below, Chapter V, pp. 167-204 for a description of how this legislation worked in practice.

32 Actually, an arrêt of 6 August 1762 in A.N., X lb 8942 had already established the Union of Creditors' rights to these forms of property not used for education, and the lettres patentes of June 1763 merely reinforced that legislation.

33 See above, Chapter III, pp. 109-10.

34 A.N., X lb 8941-8946 passim, for innumerable instances in which Bronod was ordered by the Parlement to send necessary money to the provincial économes séquestres.
Notes, Chapter IV

Part II

35 See below, Appendix VII on the accounts of Edme-Louis Bronod, based on A.N., X 1b 8945, 8947, and 8957 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763, 5 June 1764, 18 March 1767, and, for the later period on A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, Bronod's accounts of 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773. Part I of the appendix bears on the present subject.

36 A.N., X 1b 8941-8950 passim, arrêts of Parlement of Paris. See also Appendix VII, part I. In any case, the total of 73,914 livres cited here is arrived at by assuming that the provincial économes séquestres had nothing to do with the approximately 350,000 livres raised from the sale of Jesuit property in the provinces and Paris during the period and that they did not handle any of the other more than one million livres which Bronod received from a variety of largely unspecified sources in 1762-65.

37 See Appendix VII, part I and A.N., X 1b 8945, 8947, and 8957 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763, 5 June 1764, and 18 March 1769. Unfortunately, it is impossible always to separate the money Bronod sent to the provinces or back to the provinces from what he spent in Paris.

38 A.N., X 1b 8947 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 June 1764, on which most of Appendix VI, part II is based.

39 See above, Chapter III, pp. 99-101 for a full discussion of the Edict of February. Appendix V, part III explains the order in which former Jesuit colleges with bureaux of administration were confirmed.

40 An arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 18 January 1763, referred to in A.N., X 1b 8947 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 June 1764, preambule, gave Brousse this responsibility. He had been Bronod's attorney since May 1762, and his very appointment implied that he had the right to oversee any of Bronod's affairs.

41 See above, Chapter II and Chapter III, passim for a description of the various roles of the three commissioners, Rolland d'Erceville, Roussel de la Tour, and de l'Averdy. These men, and de l'Averdy's successor, Cochin, may be said to have had a hand in all aspects of the confiscation in 1762-64 or even up to 1766. Cf. below, Bibliography for a list of the printed works of Rolland, which demonstrates his continued interest in the affair of the Jesuit property.

42 See below, Chapter V, pp. 167-8 and 175.

43 A.N., X 1b 8947 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 June 1764.
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44 Cf. A.N., X lb 8941-8950 passim for numerous arrêts by which the Parlement ordered Bronod to supplement local receipts and enable provincial économies to fulfil their financial responsibilities.

45 See below, Appendix III.

46 See below, Appendix VII, Bronod's accounts.

47 A.N., X lb 8951 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 18 April 1766.

48 See above, p. 136. By laying down that the provincial économies séquestrées should receive an annual salary or, more often, an annual commission, the arrêt of 5 June 1764 established the basis for permitting économies séquestrées to continue to be paid for services they rendered after that date and before bureaux of administration took over the services the économies had performed. The preamble of the arrêt of 18 April 1766 in A.N., X lb 8951 states that that arrêt was providing for the payment of local officials which till that time had not been provided for, thereby suggesting that all the économies séquestrées not mentioned in the arrêt of 1766 had been paid for all their services.

49 Neither the B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1617-1628 (Jesuits: Local affairs) nor the papers of the Parlement of Paris in A.N., X lb 8940-8959 are particularly enlightening on this subject. In fact, I have found no reference to dissatisfaction among displaced économies séquestrées, and no references to the replacement of économies séquestrées by men appointed by bureaux of administration. In short, the later history of the provincial économies séquestrées is not traceable in the existant documents of the Parlement retained in Paris. It is probable that their history could be traced in provincial archives if any of the documents which the Parlement ordered to be returned from Paris to the bureaux of administration of the colleges have survived. Cf. A.N., X lb 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 22 July 1763 which ordered that all titles and papers regarding the colleges of the jurisdiction of that court which had been submitted by provincial authorities to the Parlement's commissioners and other authorities should be returned to the bureaux of administration. It is likely that any reports on the ending of the économies séquestrées' services were returned to the college archives.

50 Cf. comptes rendus given by Rolland on the Colleges of Bourges and Poitiers to be found in A.N., X lb 8947 papers of 7 June 1764 and Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 585-700 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). Maigreau had been named on 30 May 1762 to replace François Dumont, the original nominee of the Baillage of Bourges for the College of Bourges. Cf. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1619 f. 172.

51 Examples of many such orders: A.N., X lb 8942 add 8950, arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 7 September 1762 and 9 July 1765 pertaining to Poitiers and A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris of 7 July
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52 A.N., X 1b 8942 and 8951 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 4 February 1763 and 29 April 1766 pertaining to Bourges and Poitiers respectively.

53 Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, pp. 463-6 and 499-500 n. (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122), quotes legislation of September 1763 and 25 February 1763 on this matter and shows how it was resolved in Maigreau's favour. The same information may be found in the earlier, handwritten copy of Rolland's compte rendu of the College of Bourges in A.N., X 1b 8947 papers of the Parlement of Paris 7 June 1764.

54 See below, Appendix VII, Bronod's accounts. See also A.N., X 1b 8947, X 1b 8951 and 8952 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 7 July 1764, 25 January 1766, and 5 August 1766.


57 The legislation of 22 July 1763 ordering the return of significant papers to the archives of the colleges did not apply to those colleges not having bureaux of administration.

58 A.N., X 1b 8957 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 18 May 1769 and M 248 contain Coulland's accounts for 1762-66. They show that his total receipts were 106,940 livres 1 sol 1 denier and his total expenditures were 105,330 livres 1 sol 8 deniers. His receipts thus exceeded his expenditures in this period by 1,610 livres 9 sols 5 deniers. These figures pertain to all college property in Poitiers and thus conceal the fact that his expenditures for the Irish residence there (sometimes called the Collège Irlandais, though it was no more than a residence) were 1,184 livres 15 sols 6 deniers less than his expenditures for that institution. On the other hand, A.N., X 1b 8960 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 9 July 1770 shows that Maigreau's receipts for Bourges in 1767-68 were 82,588 livres 11 sols 7 deniers and his expenditures were 62,925 livres 3 sols 4 deniers. Thus his receipts exceeded his expenditures by 19,663 livres 8 sols 4 deniers in these years.

59 A.N., X 2a 1389 papers of the Parlement of Paris for 10 May and 19 August 1780 contain requests of the Parlement for the accounts of the économe séquestre of Bourges for 1779 and for Coulland's accounts for
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Poitiers for the period after 1768 and for 1778.
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1. The usual spelling in both handwritten and printed documents of the period is Bronod. Hence, I have used this spelling when I have referred to this official.

2. See above, Chapter III, p. 84. The arrêt is in A.N., X lb 8941 and B.N., F 47110 (2).

3. A.N., Salle des Inventaires 10 18/1 and 18/2 A.-A. Thomas, Notariats du département de la Seine (Paris, [1862]) indicates that Edme-Louis Bronod replaced his father as a notaire in the Châtelet in 1753 and became a syndic of the Châtelet in 1779.

4. A.N., Y 15084 documents dating from 30 January 1781 to 3 February 1781 pertaining to the placing of seals on Bronod's effects in his mother's home in the Marais, rue de Bracque. Also A.N., Y 15093 documents dating from 7 May to 17 August 1785 pertaining to the placing of seals on Bronod's mother's effects. In both cases, an inventory of sorts is included with other documents pertaining to the death and succession of the two principals. Although Bronod's mother apparently owned considerable personal property at the time of her death (it included 180 bottles of wine and 56 bottles of brandy), Bronod's property was not extensive. He had far less property than Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy had at the time of his bankruptcy in 1787. Cf. below, Chapter VI, p. 280. See A.N., V 7 80 papers of 1787-89 for a lengthy description of Marchal's extensive property.

5. I have found little evidence to support any point of view on this question. It is natural to assume that one or all of the original commissioners or drafters of legislation selected him. Either Rolland, de l'Averdy, Roussel de la Tour, Chauvelin, or Terray, or all five of them, may have chosen him. A.N., X lb 9696 contains procès-verbaux of the supporting evidence which Bronod submitted with his first and second sets of accounts. They are dated 8 March 1769 and 13 February 1770 and signed by Rolland. It is possible that Terray and Rolland, who had the most to do with Bronod after he became Économe Séquestre, also appointed him.

6. Brousse became Bronod's attorney in the Parlement on 5 May 1762, apparently on Bronod's own request. The arrêt naming Brousse is found in A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 May 1762. Terray signed the approval of Bronod's accounts and often made requests resulting in the court's ordering Bronod to send necessary money to the provinces. Cf. A.N., X lb 8941-8960 passim. Rolland supervised the presentation of Bronod's accounts. Cf. A.N., X lb 9696 procès-verbaux of 8 March 1769 and 13 February 1776.

7. See Appendices II, III, and IV for descriptions of Jesuit institutions and their attached property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement. Cf. above, Chapter I on Jesuit property.
As we have already noted, Chapter I, pp. 30-1 professed houses were supposed to be supported by alms alone, and not to have any fixed source of wealth.

Cf. compte rendu on Jesuit property in Paris presented 18 January, 25 February, and 15 June 1763 by de l'Averdy in Rolland, compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) for a complete list of all Parisian Jesuit property discovered by the commissioner and other functionaries of the Parlement.

See above, Chapter II, pp. 45-6.

de l'Averdy in compte rendu of 13 June 1763 in A.N., X lb 8943.

See below, Chapter V, pp. 169-71 for a description of the sale of this property.

A.N., X lb 8941 and B.N., F 47110 (2) arrêt of Parlement of Paris 30 April 1762.

A.N., X lb 8942 report of Omer Joly de Fleury of 20 August 1762 said that by this time all Jesuits in Paris had carried out the court's arrêts of 6, 11, 13 and 18 August 1762 and had officially abandoned their property.

Cf. especially A.N., X lb 9696 papers pertaining to the preparation of various procès verbaux on Jesuit institutions in Paris 1762-63. Although Bronod was absent from the making of seizures and the preparation of various inventories, he was responsible for paying the various huissiers, greffiers, architects, masons etc. who took part in such affairs.

A.N., Xlb 9696 shows that on 1 December 1763, Bronod was authorized by the Parlement to pay about 3,000 livres to various functionaries, including himself, Griveau, an architect, another huissier and two greffiers for the preparation of the procès verbal of Louis-le-Grand.

A.N., X lb 8941 contains frequent references to états des biens deposited with the greffe of the Parlement by de Montigny in February and March 1762. On 3 July 1762, the court ordered Bronod to pay 1,200 livres for his various expenses. See A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 3 July 1762.

See above, Chapter III, pp. 95-7.

See below, Chapter V, pp. 159-60 on Ponchon's appointment as a servant of the creditors.
20 A.N., X lb 8945 preambule of arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763, by which the Parlement approved Bronod's accounts of the first year of his administration. See also A.N., X lb 9696 papers on the making of the procès verbal of the College of Louis-le-Grand, dated 1 December 1763.

21 A.N., X lb 8945 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763 approving Bronod's first annual accounts. Also A.N., X lb 9696 passim.

22 See above, p. 130 for reference to this particular problem and its resolution.

23 See Appendix VII, which is a recapitulation of Bronod's accounts 1762-65 and 1767-73.

24 A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 30 April 1763. By this legislation, the Parlement decided that the money, owed by the négociant Rey to the Jesuit Gatin (cf. above, Chapter II, p. 47) should be sent to Bronod in Paris and that the creditors of the Jesuits in Marseille had no right to it.

25 See below, Appendix VII. Also A.N., X lb 8945 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763.

26 A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, Bronod's accounts 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773.

27 The legislation naming Bronod to be Econome Séquestre in A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 30 April 1762, made it quite clear that he was not authorized to have major repairs undertaken without first gaining the Parlement's approval.

28 See Appendix VII, which presents what we know of Bronod's accounts for the whole period. The papers of the Parlement in A.N., X lb 8941-8960 passim demonstrate that the Parlement did specifically order Bronod to spend money for these various purposes in Paris. So do other papers of the Parlement in A.N., X lb 9696, which refer to the payment of Jesuit allowances and new masters' salaries. While Bronod's accounts for 1762-65 and 1767-73 reveal that he did all these things, they do not differentiate sufficiently between Paris and the provinces to permit any hypothesis to be made about the amount of money Bronod spent in Paris.

29 Rolland, Compte rendu, legislation pertaining to the bourse allotted to Hardevilliers (B.N., Ld 39 939). Consider also A.N., X lb 8945 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 24 January 1764 quoting arrêt of the same
court of 20 July 1763 saying that the Procureur Général had ordered the College of Louis-le-Grand to take possession of all its property and to acquit the bourses due to be paid by the college.

30 Lettres patentes of the king, 21 November 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (197)).

31 A.N., X lb 8946 extract of deliberations of the bureau of administration of the College of Louis-le-Grand 24 March 1764 not only makes it clear that Bronod did not attend the meetings of the bureau (as Roussel de la Tour, Rolland, and Terray did), but also includes the name of the économie of the college: Nouri.

32 A.N., X lb 8960 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 9 July 1770.

33 Receipts: 177,014; Expenditure: 181,546 livres. Difference: 4,533 livres, which were owed to Bronod. Cf. below, p. 152, for the Parlement's opinion of Bronod's administration a decade later, however.

34 Lettres patentes of the king, 21 November 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (199)).

35 See above, Chapter III, pp. 85 and 91-3. The arrêt is in A.N., X lb 8942.

36 See below, Chapter V, pp. 163-204 for a description of the great difficulty with which the Union of Creditors disposed of the property to which it was entitled.

37 See below, Appendix VII, part II.


39 See below, Appendix VII, part I. Also A.N., X lb 8945 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763 approving Bronod's accounts for the first year of his administration.

40 A.N., X lb 8945 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763.

41 See below, Appendix VII, part II. Also A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, Bronod's accounts 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773.
42 See above, pp. 135-8.

43 See below, Appendix VII, part II. It is impossible to tell whether most of the money was spent in Paris or in the provinces. In the period under review, we know that the Parlement authorized Bronod to pay 6,000 livres to the Jesuits of Paris.

44 See below, Appendix VII. The papers of the Parlement also contain several arrêts instructing Bronod to send money to the provinces to pay for repairs to Jesuit property. Example: A.N., X lb 8949 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 21 May 1765 for repairs to houses and buildings depending on Jesuit property or A.N., X lb 8953 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 27 March 1767 for repairs to the College of Amiens (as well as for the payment of masters there).

45 See below, Appendix VII, especially part II. The papers of the Parlement are also filled with numerous arrêts on this subject. Cf. A.N., X lb 8947-8952 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 7 July 1764, 21 August 1764, 20 December 1765, 25 January 1766, and 5 August 1766.

46 See below, Chapter V, p. 166. See also below, Appendix VII, part I.

47 Examples of individual pieces of legislation drawn from A.N., X lb 8943: arrêts of 5 September 1763 ordered Bronod to send 1,563 livres for the new masters at Poitiers; 1,500 livres for the new masters at Moulins; 1,100 livres for the new masters at Sens. Arrêts of 12 November 1763 ordered Bronod to send 1,363 livres to Auxerre for the new masters; 2,000 livres to Blois for the new masters; and 2,800 livres to Amiens for the new masters.

48 See below, Appendix VII.

49 See below, Appendix VII, part II.

50 Arrêts passed in the Parlement on the request of an interested party such as a Jesuit, a creditor, a debtor of the Jesuits, a holder of a scholarship formerly paid by the Jesuits, the Econome Général du Clergé, a leaseholder of Jesuit property etc. cost anything from six livres to about 100 livres each, depending, in all probability, on the time it took the Parlement to reach a decision on a contentious matter. Cf. A.N., X lb 8940-8960. In many cases the cost of the arrêt was noted on the document itself, but it is not clear that it was always paid by the party for whom the arrêt was granted. Clearly, Bronod paid a lot of these costs. The cost of an arrêt was different from the cost of the papier timbré on which arrêts were first handwritten. The latter cost was apparently a tax on the business transacted by the Parlement.
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The money derived from the papier timbré may have been intended not for the Parlement but for the crown.

51 See above, pp. 135-7. See also Appendix VI, on the known cost of the seizure of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

52 Lettres patentes of the king, 21 November 1763 and 30 March 1764 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (199) and (252)). See also Appendices VII and IX.

53 A.N., X lb 8945 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763 by which the court approved Bronod's accounts of 30 April 1762 to 30 April 1763.

54 A.N., X lb 8947 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 June 1764 by which the Parlement approved Bronod's accounts of 23 April 1763 to 23 April 1764.

55 A.N., X lb 8957 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 18 March 1769 by which the court approved Bronod's accounts for 1 May 1764 to 30 April 1765.

56 A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, Bronod's accounts for 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773. This 91 pp. document would appear to be a copy of the actual accounts submitted by Bronod to the Parlement. It bears the note that Bronod's and Ponchon's salaries were authorized, so it would seem that the Parlement had approved the accounts. Unfortunately, the date on which the Parlement gave its approval is not stated in the document.

57 Bronod died bankrupt. See below p. 152. The papers of the Parlement for the period after November 1773 (cf. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1617-1628 provincial affairs and Coll. Joly de Fleury 1609-1611 legislation) say nothing about Bronod in the period after 1773 until the time of his death in 1781. A.N., X la 4749 ff. 132-133v. reveals that in 1774 he was involved in settling the affairs of someone who did not apparently have anything to do with the Jesuit property in Bronod's care.

58 Cf. Egret, Louis XV, passim.

59 The dates on which the first three sets of accounts were judged were 20 December 1763, 5 June 1764, and 18 March 1769. The legislation in question is found in A.N., X lb 8945, 8947, and 8957.

60 A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, Bronod's accounts 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773. They bear no date on which the Parlement approved them. My assumption that there was a lapse of time between
Their presentation and approval is based on the knowledge that it was only in 1773 that the Parlement returned from its longest and most serious exile of the eighteenth century. Thereafter, it was deeply involved in its last struggle with the crown, and it seems to have had little time for matters such as the one I have just discussed.

Bronod's salary for the first year, April 1762 to April 1763, was 30,000 livres, which, as the Procureur Général remarked when it was awarded, was less than the Econome Général du Clergé would get for his services during the first year after 2 February 1763. Moreover, from this amount, Bronod had to pay 4,500 livres to the Curateur, Ponchon, for the services which Ponchon had performed for Bronod. Bronod would also pay a further 6,000 livres to Ponchon for the work Ponchon had done for the commissioners of the Parlement and 2,700 livres for work which Moisy had done for the court. The last two amounts would not come from Bronod's own salary but from Bronod's surplus left over after the first year of his administration, however. For his second year's work, of which the volume had been considerably more than half that of the first year, Bronod received only 9,000 livres, from which he was to pay 3,000 livres to Ponchon. He would pay 1,000 livres to Moisy, too, but it would come from the excess of revenue over expenditures. When, in 1769, the court judged Bronod's third set of accounts (for the year 1 May 1764 to 30 April 1765), the Procureur Général observed that the volume of business now carried on by Bronod had become comparatively insignificant, but recommended that Bronod should receive the same salary for the third year as he had received for the second. We may assume that, in this way, Bronod received 9,000 livres for his third year's work. By the time Bronod was authorized to pay his own salary for the third year, Ponchon had ceased to be the Curateur of Jesuit property and it is not clear whether Ponchon's salary for the third year would be paid from Bronod's own salary or from Bronod's surplus. Finally, we know that both Bronod and Ponchon (but not, apparently, Ponchon's successor Hélo, who succeeded Ponchon in 1768) were to be paid for all their services rendered in 1767-73, and that they were to be paid whatever they had received in 1765-67, for which there is no record. See A.N., X 1b 8945, 8947, and 8957, arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763, 5 June 1764, and 18 March 1769. Also A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, Bronod's accounts 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773.

See below, Chapter VI, pp. 275-9.

B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1609-1628 legislation and correspondence on Jesuit affairs and A.N., X 1b 8960-8975 and X 1b 9695-9697 say nothing of Bronod. A.N., X 1a 4749 ff. 132-143v. arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 30 August 1774 shows that he was still paying scholarships to Irish students who had been entitled to them under the Jesuits. A.N., X 1a 4749 arrêt of Parlement, 30 August 1774 also suggests that Bronod was involved in the dévolution of estates other than Jesuit property in this period, as well.
A.N., Y 15084 Information au sujet de la morte subite de M. Bronod 30 January 1781 and A.N., Y 15093 papers dated 7 May 1785. I have assumed that Bronod was comparatively young because his mother outlived him by five years, and because of everyone's, and especially his valet's, shock at the fact of his death. If Bronod had been more than sixty or sixty-five, it is doubtful that the universal shock at the suddenness of his death would have been quite so great.

The cause of the death was described as a coup de sang, and the medical report included reference to a probable cerebral haemorrhage. Cf. A.N., Y 15084 Information....

A.N., Y 15084 contains an entire dossier on the placing of the seals on Bronod's property on the day of his death, 30 January 1781. It also contains the description of his death and the list of the creditors who syndicated against his estate, and other miscellaneous papers.

A.N., X 1b 8975 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 6 February 1781.


B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 531. ff. 227-228 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 24 July 1781. Also in A.N., X 1b 8976. The seals which remained on Bronod's property at this time were to be lifted in the presence of a representative of the Union of Creditors and a notary, Andrelle, who apparently represented the Econome Général du Clergé. Cf. arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 1 June 1781 in B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 531. f. 222.

A.N., Y 15084 documents describing the placing of seals on Bronod's effects on 30 January 1781 are followed by claims by the Union of Creditors of 1 February 1781.

B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 531. f. 218 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 30 April 1781. The Union of Creditors of Bronod was actually formed on 27 or 28 April 1781. See also Coll. Joly de Fleury 531. f. 229.

A.N., X 1b 8975 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 21 February 1781. It has proved impossible to trace Florent-Jacques Le Pot d'Auteuil in the papers of the Parlement or in the Minutier Central of the A.N. The latter contains an étude (étude LIII) for a Florent-Jules Le Pot d'Auteuil, who was a Paris notary in 1759-83. The répertoire of his minutes from
January to May 1781 contains no references to Bronod or the Jesuit affair.

My estimate that even if Le Pot d'Auteuil did continue to administer the remains of the Jesuit property, his receipts and expenditures cannot have been more than 20,000 livres in each case, is based on my knowledge of the extent of Bronod's administration in 1773 and the fact that some of the property was probably returned to the still existing colleges in the interim. On the other hand, it seems unlikely that, having kept them so long, the régie or its administrators would return some of the more bizarre rentes or cease to perform some of the duties outlined in Bronod's accounts of 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773. See below, Appendix VII. Cf. also Chapter V, pp. 186-203 on receipts from the colonies. It is strange that the Revolutionaries, who investigated Bronod's affairs, said nothing about Le Pot. Cf. below, Chapter VII, pp. 301-3.

If it is permitted to regret the absence of evidence on one subject more than the absence of evidence on any other, then it is on the matter of Bronod's suspected bankruptcy that I most deeply regret the lack of information and conclusive evidence. Although I have discovered literally hundreds of references to Bronod, and although I have read very carefully nearly 100 pp. of his accounts, and although I have read the reports of his death, I have never gained more than the merest impression of his character. Perhaps the readers of this dissertation will understand the impatience with which I have had to record my lack of knowledge about Edme-Louis Bronod the younger.

A.N., Y 10616-10619 dealing with proceedings in the Grand'Criminel of the Châtelet against bankrupt persons in the years 1781-89 contain no reference to Bronod or legal proceedings against Bronod.

A.N., X lb 8976 papers of the Parlement of Paris show that Bronod's affairs continued to be discussed throughout the summer of 1781, but later records contain no further mention of the subject.


See below, Chapter VII, p. 317.

Cf. Jean Egret, Louis XV, passim.

See below, Appendix VII.

Cf. above, pp. 119-22.
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The arrêt of 8 May 1761 allowed the Jesuit order in France one year in which to repay the principal, interest, and charges on Lavalette's debts to the Lioncy brothers and Gouffre, and established a precedent for dealing with Lavalette's other debts. The arrêt is in B.N., F 47109 (29). See above, Chapter II, pp. 52-3. The Jesuits did pay the interest and charges on the debt within the allotted time, but not the principal sum.

1 Quoted in Délibération, p. 4 (A.N., U 983).


4 Délibération, (A.N., U 983), pp. 4-5.

5 B.N., Coll. Le Senne 8481 and F 47110 (1) arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 April 1762.

6 B.N., F 23674 (438) and F 47100 (5) and A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 19 May 1762.

7 See above, Chapter II, pp. 46-53 for more information about the Lioncy brothers.

8 Ordre Général et Définitif, pp. 94, 123, 130, and 131 (A.N., U 983). Trochereau is also referred to in Délibération, p. 34 (A.N., U 983). The reference to p. 123 is to the widow of Famin, who I assume to be the wife of the original syndic. Otherwise, neither Famin nor Prépaud appears in the Ordre Général et Définitif. They are, however, both shown in the list of creditors of the Jesuits made on 8 May 1762 and accompanying the arrêt of the Parlement of Paris of 19 May 1762 in A.N., X lb 8941. Prépaud's sons later played a part in the Union's affairs. See below, p. 201-3.

9 Ordre Général et Définitif, p. 131 (A.N., U 983). Cazotte's biography also appears in Michaud, Biographie, vol. VII, pp. 287-90. It was Prépaud who may not have been a creditor of Lavalette.

10 B.N., F 23674 (438) and F 47100 (5) and A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 19 May 1762 lists the officers of the Union.

11 Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983) lists 1,680 creditors or would-be creditors of the Jesuits and recognizes about 1,500 of them.
Notes, Chapter V

Part I pp. 159-160

It is probable that not all the names of the provincial creditors or creditors who were repaid before about 1765 appeared in the final list. Otherwise, in order to be repaid, a creditor living anywhere in France or the colonies except Flanders, Franche-Comté, or Lorraine, was supposed, after June 1763, to present his claim to a syndic of the Union in Paris or to a provincial syndic. The syndic was supposed then to include his name in the list from which the Ordre Général et Définitif was made. In theory, every recognized creditor was or would be a member of the Union, although those living in the border regions would be repaid by the local authority. See below, pp. 222-30 for a discussion of the repayment of provincial creditors.

12 A.N., X lb 9675 the adjudication of Montrouge, 17 August 1763 refers to Ponchon's appointment as Curateur on 19 March 1763.

13 A.N., X lb 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 August 1763. The lettres patentes are in Actes Royaux, lettres patentes of the king, 14 June 1763 (B.N., F 23627 (162)).

14 Ordre Général et Définitif, pp. 112, 114, 132, and 264; 106, 119, 338, and 339 (A.N., U 983). They are also referred to in the many documents of 1765-66 in A.N., X lb 9696 which are statements of cautions offered in those years. The one dated 11 June 1766 pertaining to Jacques-François Lioncy includes the names of the following syndics: J.-F. Lioncy, le Fèbvre de Givry, Prépaud, Famin, Trochereau de la Berlière, Cazotte, le Vacher, and Tiran.

15 Ordre Général et Définitif, pp. 179; 118, 128, and 334; and 132, and 136 (A.N., U 983).

16 Délibération, p. 34 (A.N., U 983). The extrait of the Parlement's registers of 5 September 1772, calls them all créanciers et syndics de l'union, although, on the same page, Tassin, Morel, and Provost were referred to as "other creditors" when they signed the Délibération of 13 August 1772.

17 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 46 (B.N., Ld 39 591). Lioncy's name is not on this document, although he is still referred to in the Revolutionary correspondence.

18 A.N., U 983 Ordre Général et Définitif, p. 268 (A.N., U 983).

19 A.N., X lb 9675 the adjudication of Montrouge, 17 August 1763, bearing a note of October 1763, is the last reference I have found to Morisse as Notaire Sécouste, and A.N., X lb 9675 the adjudication of a house on the rue S. Honoré of 1 September 1764 is the first reference I have found to Doillot as Notaire Sécouste. Doillot's functions during the Revolution are described in the Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10
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312=5664, papers from the years 1790-1809.

20 A.N., X 1b 8956 arrêt of the Parlement of Paris 13 June 1768 says Hélo was named Curateur by an arrêt of 9 March 1768. A.N., V 7 79 Transaction between Sartine and the syndics of the Union of 22 April 1777 says Bouclier replaced Hélo on 26 January 1776, after the latter's death. V 7 79 papers of 8 February 1781 contain the last reference I have found to Bouclier.

21 Target and Carré are referred to in Délibération des Syndics généraux des Créanciers des cy-devant soi-disant Jésuites... of 13 January 1768, approved by the Parlement of Paris 16 January 1768 (Paris, 1768), p. 11 (B.N., Ld 39 546). Also A.N., A D XVII, 23 Délibération des Syndics généraux des Créanciers des cy-devant soi-disans Jésuites... of 1 September 1769, approved by the Parlement of Paris 4 September 1769, p. 6 (A.N., A D XVII 23). Carré alone is referred to in Délibération of August 1772, p. 34 (A.N., U 983).

22 Rouhette is referred to as the Union's counsel and is quoted as its spokesman for the whole period 1762-90. Cf. A.N., X 1b 8941, the arrêt of 19 May 1762; the papers in A.N., X 1b 9696 for 1765-66; A.N., G 9 47 Délibération des syndics... of 8 March 1780. It is he who delivered the final address on behalf of the syndics in mid or late 1790, before the National Assembly. See Mémoire (B.N., Ld 39 591).

23 Lambert's appointment is noted in the legislation of 19 May 1762 and the Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 312-5664, papers from 1790-1802, refer to his role during the Revolution.

24 Délibération of 13 August 1772 (A.N., U 983) which is also a recapitulation of the Union's affairs during the previous decade, makes no reference to general assemblies of all the members of the Union. It is very clear, however, that a general assembly was held on 13 August 1772.

25 See below, pp. 187 and 193 for a more detailed description of the royal legislation of June and July 1763.

26 A.N., X 1b 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 August 1763.

27 A.N., X 1b 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 August 1763.

28 Cf. A.N., V 7 79-80 papers and judgments of the Commission of the Economats of the 1780's. The commissioners "judged" the affairs of the Union in the colonies and the Controlleur des Bons d'Etat often gave his opinion as well.
Notes, Chapter V

Part II

1 See above, p. 158.

2 B.N., 8°Z Le Senne 8481 and F 47110 (1) arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 April 1762. See above, Chapter IV, pp. 119-21.

3 See above, Chapter IV, pp. 121 and 141-57.

4 A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 July 1762.

5 See above, Chapter II, pp. 47 and 61-2, and below, pp. 205-9 for a description of the Jesuits' attempts to repay their creditors and thus save the order.

6 A.N., X lb 8941 minutes of the Parlement of Paris, 16 July 1762.

7 See below, pp. 177-9, 182, 184 and 194.


10 I have found no reference to the legal ramifications of the syndics' working outside the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in this instance. It was clear that in many ways that Parlement did have the authority to interfere elsewhere, and in this particular question, Bronod certainly was to administer property well outside the ressort. See below, Appendix VII, part II for list of property he administered in 1767-73.

11 A.N., X lb 8945 and X lb 8957 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 20 December 1763 and 5 June 1764 approving Bronod's accounts for the years 1762-63 show that he paid the expenses of the syndics in the border regions. In 1762 and early 1763, Bronod was clearly acting as a treasurer for the Parlement's officials holding confiscated Jesuit property and for the Union of Creditors. See above, p. 163-4. Cf. also Chapter IV, above.

12 A.N., X lb 8942 arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 7 September and 17 December 1762.

13 A.N., X lb 8941, X lb 8942, X lb 8943, and X lb 8944 arrêts of the Parlement of Paris, 13 July 1762, 7 September 1762, 17 December 1762, 14 July 1763, and 8 August 1763.
14 Cf. below, Appendix VII, based on the accounts of the Econome Séquestre of Paris. See also Chapter IV, p. 148.

15 See above, Chapter III, pp. 91-2.

16 A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement d'Paris, 6 August 1762.

17 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (125)) lettres patentes of the king, 2 February 1763.

18 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (134)) lettres patentes of the king, 5 March 1763.

19 This part of the lettres patentes of 14 June 1763 was modelled on the lettres patentes of 3 June 1763 which had dealt with the colonies. See below, p. 187 for a description of the lettres patentes of 3 June 1763.

20 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (134)) lettres patentes of the king, 5 March 1763.

21 See above, Chapter IV, pp. 124-40.

22 See above, Chapter III, pp. 99-101 and 106-13. See also below, Chapter VI, pp. 255-87, passim.

23 Cf. Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (134)) lettres patentes of the king, 5 March 1763 and A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 11 March 1763.

24 Lettres patentes of the king 5 March 1763, in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (134)) and A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 11 March 1763.

25 De l'Averdy made it very clear that the Domaine Royal had renounced its rights on 18 January 1763. See his compte rendu of 25 February 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939).

26 Cf. above, Chapter I, p. 28 and Chapter IV, pp. 141-3, for a list of the Jesuit property in Paris.
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28 The sales which Bronod's men had already carried out are described in various arrêts of the Parlement of Paris; A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of 19 March 1763, authorized sales of precious stones from Paris houses to take place, but does not refer to the Union of Creditors. A.N., X lb 8943 arrêts of 24 March 1763 ordered a reduction of the number of guardians at the professed house and of 14 June 1763 ordered a reduction of the number of guardians at the noviciate. In both cases, the reduction was possible because the Parlement's officials had already disposed of most of the mobilier. A.N., X lb 8943 arrêts of 14 May 1763 show that the library of the noviciate and the collection of medals at the professed house (as well as that of the College of Louis-le-Grand) were about to be sold on Bronod's authority. Again, the creditors were not mentioned. Moreover, the arrêt of 22 April 1763 in A.N., X lb 8943 authorized Bronod to receive money from the sale of Dame Langlois's property found in a Jesuit house of the rue S. Antoine, a house which the Jesuits of the professed house had administered. On the other hand, the lettres patentes of 5 March 1763 and the arrêts of 9 and 11 March 1763 in A.N., X lb 8943 indicate that Bronod was supposed to turn such money over to the creditors. A.N., X lb 9695 the adjudication of Montrouge, 17 August 1763 told Bronod to hand at least some of the revenue from the sale of the mobilier to the professed house and noviciate over to the creditors. Bronod's accounts contain no mention of his carrying out this transaction and he probably did not do so. This would explain why, in 1790, Rouhette described Bronod as the Sequestre General des biens des Jesuites and why the Union claimed a great deal of money from Bronod's estate when he died. Cf. Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 14 (B.N., Ld 39 591). The Union apparently did receive much of the money it claimed. See below, pp. 182-3.

29 A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 11 March 1763. In 1763 all these places were still in the country. They have since been incorporated into the city or suburbs of Paris. The property of Montlouis is now the famous Cemetery of Père Lachaise.

30 A.N., X lb 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 August 1763.

31 It is not stated whether the property at Charonne and Belleville was sold at the same time.

32 See above, p. 167-70, for references to the lettres patentes of the king, 2 February and 14 June 1763, which explained the method of sale.

33 A.N., X lb 9675 the adjudication of Montrouge, 17 August 1763.

34 Ecuyer, conseiller secrétaire du roi, Maison couronne de France et de ses finances greffier en chef de la chambre des Comptes is the description of him given in A.N., Xlb 9675 adjudication dated 7 September 1763. Delattre in Etablissements, vol. III, p. 613 says the property at
Montrouge was sold for 25,000 livres to Parceval, a fermier général who owned it until the Revolution. Delattre provides no supporting evidence and he appears to be mistaken.

35 A.N., X lb 9675 the adjudication of Gentilly, 31 August 1763. The totals come from the adjudication of 7 September 1763. This and the case of the sale of a ferme to the Président Molé in 1767 were the only instances I have discovered in which members of the Parlement of Paris obtained Jesuit property.

36 Marion, Dictionnaire des institutions, p. 166 described the décret volontaire as the decree gained by the acquirer of real property either on himself or on the seller of the property to gain release from any mortgages or other charges due to be paid on the property or which anyone else might claim were due to be paid on the property. Marion adds that it was a costly procedure made illegal in 1771.

37 A.N., X lb 9675 the adjudication of Montrouge, 17 August 1763 carries a note stating that Ducornet and Trepagne made such a payment in October.

38 I assume that the Union did eventually receive the money to which it was entitled because it is not referred to in Rouhette's list of unsold property and unsettled accounts in Mémoire, pp. 21-46 (B.N., Ld 39 591). A.N., X lb 8951 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 3 February 1766 was the court's approval of a request made by the administrators of the College of Louis-le-Grand for the 26,000 livres which Duchaffon still owed of the original 77,000 livres due on 31 August 1763. The payment of the unacquitted balance may have been diverted to the College of Louis-le-Grand by the lettres patentes of the king of 21 November 1763 which gave the colleges rights to all property then attached to the colleges.


40 Preambule to lettres patentes of the king, 21 November 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (200)).

41 Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 2-3 (B.N., Ld 39 591), and Délibération, pp. 12-14 (A.N., U 983).

42 Lettres patentes of the king 21 November 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (200)). See below, Chapter VI, pp. 268-70 for an explanation of the outcome of this legislation. Needless to say, none of the major colleges paid their assessments.

43 See below, Chapter VI, p. 259.
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44 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (199)) Lettres patentes of the king, 21 November 1763.

45 See below, Chapter VI, pp. 259 and 272. Cf. legislation of the Parlement approving the creditors' loans to Marchal de Sainscy: A.N., X lb 8949, X lb 8954, X lb 8955, X la 4678: arrêts of 11 February 1765, 21 July 1767, 13 May 1768, and 26 May 1770. The last arrêt ordered Marchal to give account to the creditors for the money they had lent him. See also Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 43 (B.N., Ld 39 591). In 1790 Rouhette stated that the creditors were still owed the 88,282 livres which they had given the Economats in accordance with the legislation of 21 November 1763.

46 Lettres patentes of the king, 30 March 1764 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (252))

47 See above, Chapter IV, p. 149. Cf. A.N., X lb 8943-8947 which contain frequent references to Bronod's being ordered to make such payments.

48 The best example of this state of affairs is the case of the College of Auxerre in 1763-67. Bronod lent some 8,000 livres to this college in 1763 or 1764 to pay the honoraria of the new principal and professors. The college spent about 2,000 livres on the Jesuits' allowances, but as late as 1767 still owed the difference of about 6,000 livres not to Bronod but to the Union of Creditors. See Rolland, Compte rendu, pp. 561-2 (B.N., Ld 39 939); A.N., X lb 8949 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 29 January 1765 by which the Parlement confirmed the college's possession of its property; and A.N., X lb 8953 arrêt of Parlement of Paris by which the Parlement authorized the college administrators to borrow money in order to repay the Union of Creditors. We do not know whether the college finally did that. The 6,000 livres in question may have been a part of the 400,000 livres which the Union received in private sales and reimbursements by 1769. See below, p. 181.

49 A.S.J.P., Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, Bronod's accounts for 30 April 1767 to 11 November 1773.

50 See below, p. 182-3.

51 A.N., X lb 8943-8947 contain references to Bronod's being ordered to make such payments. Cf. above, Chapter IV, pp. 147-9. See also Appendix VII, part II.

52 Ordre Général et Definitif (A.N., U 983) list of creditors sent to the bureaux of administration of the colleges to be repaid on p. 349 contains a reference to an arrêt of December 1764 which made such
creditors the responsibility of the colleges. Unfortunately, we do not know whether the legislation emanated from the crown or the Parlement.

53 Délibération, pp. 19-20 (A.N., U 983) Lorraine and Bar had only come under the jurisdiction of the French crown in 1768 on the death of Stanislas Leczinski. The specific legislation pertaining to each of these regions was: A.N., A D XVII, 23 edict of the king June 1769 for Lorraine and Bar, registered in Conseil Souverain of Nancy 24 August 1769; lettres patentes of the king 25 February 1765, registered in Parlement of Douai 8 March 1765; lettres patentes of the king 31 July 1766, registered in the Parlement of Besançon on 26 August 1766; and lettres patentes of the king 28 October 1768, registered in Venaissin 8 November 1768. The legislation is referred to in Délibération, pp. 19-20 (A.N., U 983) unless otherwise indicated.

54 I have found no further mention of such conflicts in the papers of the Parlement of Paris for the next decade or more.

55 A.N., X lb 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 August 1763.

56 A.N., X lb 8946 three arrêts of Parlement of Paris, 10 March 1764 list all the property belonging to these houses which the creditors might now have sold at the bar of the court. The lists are the same as those of 25 February and 15 June 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939).

57 My calculation is based on the amounts shown in the arrêts of 10 March 1764 and the comptes rendus of 25 February and 15 June 1763 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939). I have added together all the rentes (interest) received and have multiplied by twenty (the denier vingt) to estimate the probable amount of capital involved. It appears to have been normal to draw a five per cent interest on most capital investments yielding rentes. Cf. Marion, Dictionnaire des institutions, pp. 167-8, and Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983) especially Classes II and III, listing rentes and capital which members of the Union claimed.

58 Lettres patentes of the king, 29 May 1764 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (274)). Unfortunately, the phrasing of these lettres patentes is vague and while they refer to "all the rentes" belonging to the Jesuits, the only logical explanation is that they applied to all the rentes once belonging to the Jesuits and now in the creditors' hands. The creditors never had control over the rentes belonging to the colleges. Cf. innumerable arrêts of the Parlement of Paris in A.N., X lb 8945-8957 confirming the property of the former Jesuit colleges in the possession of the bureaux and listing rentes of all kinds among the colleges' most important property.
Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 3 (B.N., Ld 39 591). Moreover, considering the probable capital value of the rentes, it is unlikely that Rouhette would have made no mention of unsold contracts or unredeemed capital in his report of 1790 if the Union had not succeeded in selling or otherwise disposing of them. Rouhette's summation of the unredeemed claims which might still yield three million livres contains no mention of these rentes. See Mémoire, pp. 21-46.

E.g. A.N., X lb 8975 the adjudication of the house of the rue S. Honore, 1 September 1764 shows that the house was sold for 7,400 livres, of which 3,700 livres were paid immediately by the buyers, Charles Premial, marchand épice of Paris and Marguerite Guerton. The methods of sale had been decided by the lettres patentes of 2 February and 14 June 1763.


I have arrived at this figure by adding together all the amounts cited in the text as the Union's receipts. In 1790, Rouhette was to say that over the years the Union had received nearly a million livres more than he specifically accounted for at that time, so the total given here is an estimate of the minimum. See Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 21 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

B.N., F 21293 (66) and F 23674 (751) and A.N., A D XVIII, 23 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 3 September 1764.

A.N., X lb 8956 arrêt of 13 June 1768 says the king got the professed house and all the buildings and land around it by a Déclaration of 23 May 1767. In Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 22 and 26 (B.N., Ld 39 591), Rouhette said the professed house was sold to the crown on 19 April 1768 and the noviciate to the city of Paris by an Edict of August 1767. Délibération, p. 25 (A.N., U 983) says the fate of the noviciate was indicated in lettres patentes of 23 May 1767. Obviously the statements are not irreconcilable and sales were probably preceded by declarations of intent. Bib. de Port-Royal, L.P. 586 contains the text of the lettres patentes of 23 May 1767, by which the crown took the Augustins' priory for a market place and gave them the professed house in return.


Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 24 (B.N., Ld 39 591). Rouhette mentioned the minister of finance, but presumably he meant the Controller General.

Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 25-7 (B.N., Ld 39 591).
The creditors were apparently not entitled to the mission at Bapaume (Cf. Appendix V; Bapaume was the only Jesuit institution for which no legislation was passed, and whose fate it has proved impossible to follow). Rolland explained the general principle applied to the confiscation of missions in his *Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages*, pp. 621-32 (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). Since the mission at Bapaume had been established by a founder for specific educational purposes, it was apparently in the same category as the Jesuit colleges. It is not clear whether it continued to function as an independent mission.

A.N., X lb 8948 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 7 September 1764 and X lb 8958 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 31 August 1769.

A.N., X lb 8958 arrêt of 31 August 1769 also refers to an earlier arrêt of the Parlement by which it gave permission to the town of Lyon to house prisoners in the noviciate.

Rouhette, *Mémoire*, p. 8 (B.N., Ld 39 591). The sum of 224,000 livres was ponctuellement acquittée.

A.N., X lb 8942 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 18 January 1763 and X lb 8943 arrêts of 11 March and 29 April 1763 on the sale of linges, ornements, and effets.


Rouhette, *Mémoire*, pp. 14, and 43-4 (B.N., Ld 39 591); and B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 531 ff. 231-232 ff. Rouhette claimed at least 166,000 livres from the estate and in the *Mémoire*, pp. 43-4 said the Union was still owed 90,000 livres from Bronod's estate in 1790.

See below, Chapter VII, p. 301.

See above, pp. 159, 168 and 177.
81 See above, pp. 168 and 176.

82 A.N., V 7 79-80 papers left by the Commission of the Economats of 1762 to about 1785 contain several references to the provincial syndics. The Commission does not appear to have been active in directing the officials of the Union of Creditors in Paris, so long as they were involved only in continental affairs. (See below, p. 198 for a reference to the Commission's role in their colonial affairs).

83 See above, p. 164.


85 A.N., V 7 80 minute of 23 January 1783.

86 A.N., V 7 80 minute of 20 March 1783.

87 Rouhette in Mémoire, p. 19 (B.N., Ld 39 591) said Provence had raised enough money to pay half its creditors. Ordre Général et Définitif pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983) shows that the creditors listed in the Ordre and from the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Aix claimed capital worth about 317,000 livres. Unfortunately, we do not know whether Rouhette was referring just to capital (in which case we may surmise that the syndics of Aix received just over 150,000 livres) or to capital and interest (which, by 1790, would have amounted to 300,000 livres or more. Rouhette also noted that these syndics sent no money to Paris.

88 In the case of Brittany, Rouhette noted in his Mémoire, p. 19 (B.N., Ld 39 591) that the syndics had paid their creditors and then handed over money to the Séquestre in Paris. The Ordre Général et Définitif shows that the creditors of Brittany claimed about 100,000 livres in capital. With interest and costs, this would have been at least 150,000 livres by 1790. The statement about Burgundy is also based on Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 19.

89 A.N., V 7 80 minute of 23 August 1782.


92 See above, pp. 173-3. All the small colleges might one day be required to pay one year's revenue to the Union of Creditors.
Again, since Rouhette did not list it in his list of unpaid accounts, we assume this amount was paid. Cf. Mémoire, pp. 21-46 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

The sum of amounts cited in the text is as follows:

180,000
184,000
1,700,000
625,900
89,876
400,000
200,000

3,379,776 livres collected by 1772.

10,000
102,117
224,000
76,000

3,791,893 livres collected by 1790 from the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris

218,942
66,808
74,000
59,268
100,000

4,310,911 livres collected by the Séquestre in Paris for the whole of France.

To the total of 4,310,911 livres collected by the Séquestre in Paris is to be added:

150,000
100,000
61,500
40,000
333,192

Hence, 4,995,603 livres were collected by the Union in France. It will be noted that in the cases in which I have estimated the amount received, I have taken the lower of the two amounts noted in the text. We may, I believe, assume that the Union received at least five million livres in cash and contracts from the transactions just studied.

See above, pp. 177-8.

The more one studies the eighteenth century, the more one finds that administrators were normally reluctant to present what we would regard as a complete statement of their receipts and expenditures. Cf. the case of the Econome Général, below Chapter VI, 262-87, and Appendix IX, below. Bronod presented complete accounts, but even he never explained what he did with the enormous reliquat carried over from one
year to the next in the early years of his administration. See Chapter IV above, pp. 141-57 and Appendix VII, below.

Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 1-46 (B.N., Ld 39 591). The chief counsel's statement about the Union's affairs made in 1790 offers no specific statement of the Union's receipts for continental France. It does, however, include a statement of the total receipts in specie and contracts from France and the colonies which reached the Séquestre of the Union in Paris by July 1790. The total is 6,706,250 livres en espèces and 1,749,141 livres in contracts. Since Rouhette accounted very precisely for the receipts from the colonies, it is an easy matter to deduct this second category of receipts from the grand total, and probably accurate to assume that the unaccounted for receipts were all from continental France.

I have found no other estimates of provincial receipts besides those on which my statements on pp. 183-4 are based.

See above, Chapter II, p. 63-4 and above, p. 166.

Déliberation, p. 9 (A.N., U 983) and Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 2-3 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 3 (B.N., Ld 39 591) makes it clear that so far as the Parlement was concerned, only the syndics of the Union or their representatives could carry out confiscations and sales in the colonies. In other words, only the official Union had any right to send men to the colonies. Provincial syndics had no such rights.

The Jesuit heads of the missions lived either at the professed house in Paris (which explained why so many rentes bought for the missions were unofficially connected to that house by 1762) or at the College of La Flèche. See above, Chapter II, pp. 45-7, and 61.

Déliberation, p. 10 (A.N., U 983) says this is the only possible interpretation of this legislation.

Déliberation, p. 10 (A.N., U 983).

Lettres patentes of the king, 3 June 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (158)).

A.N., X 1b 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 23 August 1763. See above, p. 165.

See below, Chapter VI, pp. 262-86, passim on the work of the Commission of the Economats and its relationship to the Economé Général.
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A.N., V 7 79 contains the arrêts du conseil of 27 October 1774 and 8 February 1775 which evoked contentious matters to the Royal Council and sent them to be judged by the Commission.


110 The account which follows is based on A.N., V 7 79 Transactions entre les syndics de l'union des créanciers des Jésuites et M. de Sartine 22 April 1777, 22 pp., unless otherwise indicated.

111 By which they unquestionably meant the commissioners appointed on 6 August 1762 and 24 March 1763. See above, Chapter III, pp. 85, 103, and 111.

112 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 10 (B.N., Ld 39 591) cites this amount; B.N., N.A.F. 9375 Mémoire, f. 176 says "over a million livres" and so does A.N., V 7 79 Transaction.


114 I have been unable to discover who Pitois was or what he had done before being sent to India.

115 The amount cited may be erroneous. In 1768, when the Union sent a man to S. Domingue, they allowed him about 10,000 livres for his expenses. It would thus seem likely that Pitois was allowed 15,000 livres rather than 1,500. Cf. description of Lambert de Crouilly's mission to S. Domingue below, pp. 199-201.

116 The inventory is to be found in A.N., V 7 79 Transaction. It is entitled "Jesuit property in India 1777", although clearly Pitois had made it at an earlier date.


119 Cf. lettres patentes of the king, 29 May 1764. See above, p. 178.

120 Cf. lettres patentes of the king, 3 June 1763. See above, pp. 187.

121 See below, pp. 193-203 on the work of the Union in the American colonies.
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122 See above, Chapter II, pp. 42-7.

123 See above, pp. 172-5.

124 A.N., V 7 79-80.

125 The amount to be given to the missions was 460,065 livres 4 sols 2 deniers.

126 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 12 (B.N., Ld 39 591) says 124,958 livres 8 sols.


128 See above, pp. 187 for a description of the lettres patentes of 3 June 1763.

129 A.N., U 983 Délivrance, p. 16.

130 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (232)) lettres patentes of the king, 11 February 1764.

131 Ordre Général et Définitif, pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983) refers to no creditors from Louisiana. See below, pp. 209-25, for a description of the Ordre.

132 A.N., X lb 9697 Registre de correspondance avec les Conseil et Syndics des Créanciers des ci-devant Jésuites, Mission St. Domingue années 1768, 1769, et 1770. ..., which is Lambert de Crouilly's register of his affairs in the colony of S. Domingue (see below, pp. 199-201) contains several references to the fact that he sent copies of transactions or pièces justificatives to his brother in Paris. Since Lambert was the Procureur of the Union in the Parlement of Paris, it is sensible to assume that it was to him that Lambert de Crouilly sent these documents, and that he was Lambert de Crouilly's brother.

133 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 6. My reckoning of the probable capital involved is based on the assumption that the amount paid as rente each year represented about five percent of the capital. See above, note 57. By this method or reckoning, rentes of 35,215 livres would be produced by a capital of 704,300 livres. A.N., Z 1 f 13, pp. 141-219 lists of rentes for l'Union des créanciers des cy-devant Jésuites on printed forms dated 19 and 26 December 1769 confirms my assumption. Signed by Doillot, the forms refer to about seven hundred rentes of 25 livres each on capital sums of 500 livres. Assuming these to be the rentes referred to by Rouhette, it is clear that half the rentes
constituted on the money raised by sales in Louisiana had an annual value of five percent of the capital. Presumably the other half had the same value.

134 It is not certain whether this was the same as a décret volontaire. Cf. Marion, Dictionnaire des Institutions, p. 166.

135 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (319)), lettres patentes of the king, 1 August 1764 applied to Cayenne and Guyanne; F 23627 (349) 27 October 1764 applied to S. Domingue; and F 23627 (447) 20 July 1765, applied to Martinique and Guadeloupe. See below, pp. 210-13 regarding the lists of colonial creditors.

136 Cf. above, pp. 188-92.

137 A.N., V 7 80 minutes of 23 August 1782 says they were named on 14 August 1765.

138 A.N., V 7 79 judgment of 12 July 1781 refers to this arrêt.

139 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 32 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

140 A.N., V 7 79 judgment of 12 July 1781 refers to this arrêt.

141 A.N., V 7 80 arrêt 9 March 1782.

142 A.N., V 7 80 minutes of 2 September 1783. See above, p. 191-2 for a discussion of a similar argument regarding India.

143 A.N., V 7 80 minutes of 8 January and 10 September 1785.

144 Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 36-9 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

145 A.N., V 7 79 minutes of 21 August 1781 and A.N., X la 4672 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 28 March 1770.

146 A.N., X la 4672 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 28 March 1770 says the sale took place on 16 March 1770; Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 6 (B.N., Ld 39 591) says it took place on 6 March 1770. It seems likely that the arrêt, having been prepared just a few days after the sale, contains the correct statement.

147 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 6 (B.N., Ld 39 591).
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148 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 6 (B.N., Ld 39 591).


150 A.N., V 7 80 minutes of 23 August 1782.

151 A.N., V 7 80 minutes of 25 September 1790.


152 Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 5-6 (B.N., Ld 39 591).


155 A.N., X 1b 9697 Registre de Lambert, Lambert to Bougarde, Intendant of S. Domingue, Cap, 14 June 1768. The words "market place" are a translation of the French halles.

156 A.N., X 1b 9697 Registre de Lambert, Lambert to Rouhette, Cap, 14 June 1770. Lambert's accounts have been lost; the Registre contains a full report on them, however.

157 A.N., V 7 79 Délibération de l'Union, 26 March 1778 and ff.

158 A.N., V 7 79 Délibération de l'Union.

159 A.N., V 7 79 minutes of 30 August 1776 refer to the arrêt of 1 September 1773.

160 A.N., V 7 79 Délibération de l'Union, 26 March 1778 and ff.

161 A.N., V 7 79 minutes of 8 February 1781.

162 I have not taken into account the two payments (of 10,000 livres and 2,400 livres) made to Lambert de Crouilly.

163 The entire account of the sale of property in Cayenne comes from Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 15-18 (B.N., Ld 39 591). The papers of the Commission of the Economats contain no references to this property. Nor do they or the Mémoire mention the sale of Jesuit property in Guyanne. It is sensible to assume that the lettres patentes of 1 August 1764 were applied to that colony as a matter of form, but that there was no Jesuit property to be sold there.
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164 See below, pp. 205 ff. on the repayment of the creditors.

165 The sum is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Livres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>739,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,644,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sum of the two totals is 2,934,017 livres.


167 Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 21-2 (B.N., Ld 39 591). In this chapter as a whole, I have explained the source of all receipts except for 1,105,523 livres in cash and 140,940 livres in contracts. Rouhette offered no explanation for these receipts, either, but included them in his total.

168 See above, p. 183-5 on the money raised by provincial syndics.

169 See above, pp. 179-80.

170 A.N., G 9 47 délibération of the syndics of the Union of 8 March 1780, which lists objects on which contracts and déléguations have been created. We are already familiar with the contracts on the Cie des Indes and the existence of rentes on tailles and aides and gabelles because Rouhette referred to them in his statement of 1790, Mémoire, passim (B.N., Ld 39 591). But Rouhette regarded the 600,000 livres owed by the crown to the Union as an outstanding debt to the Union (which it was) and apparently regarded the déléguations on this amount which were issued to several creditors as expenses for which the Union was responsible. Thus, if the crown ever paid the 600,000 livres, it would pay it to the Union and the Union would pay it to holders of déléguations. It was the crown that paid a four per cent per annum interest on these déléguations. See below, pp. 231-6 on the use of déléguations, which are referred to in those pages by their English equivalent: promissory notes.
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1Ordre Général et Définitif, approved by the Union of Creditors on 13 August 1772 and by the Parlement of Paris on 5 September 1772 (Paris, 1772) (A.N., U 983). As we have noted, the Ordre is a 396 pp. document preceded by a 40 pp. introduction entitled Délibération. Rouhette said in the Délibération, p. 3, that the preparation of the Ordre had been the syndics' and directors' chief task (for the first ten years of the Union's life).

2See above, Chapter II, pp. 45-54.

3Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 57, 69 and ff. The summary of Lavalette's activities in 1753-62 which follows is drawn from this book. Cf. above, Chapter II, pp. 44-54 in which the same story is told, but with a different end in mind.

4The missions of the Windward Islands came under the jurisdiction of the Province of Paris (or the Province of France), one of the five provinces of the Assistancy of France. Lavalette was thus under the authority of the provincial of this province, who, in 1752-56 was Forestier and after 1756, Claude Frey. Lavalette was more directly responsible to the procureur of missions, de Sacy, however. De Sacy was responsible to the provincial and to the general of the order. See Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 92 and 144-6.

5Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 283. Cf. Appendix VIII on the creditors of Lavalette. Column I represents the original debts incurred by Lavalette up to April 1762, and Column II represents his debts in 1762-63, after some money had been repaid by de Sacy or Gatin or Lamarche. Part of the difference between the totals of the two columns is accounted for by the 800,000 livres of payments made by de Sacy.

6Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 137.

7Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 144.

8Lavalette to the general, 4 June 1760, cited in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 240.


10Gatin wrote, Cu causa cecidit Assistentia Galliae, videntur debita Patris Lavalette, tum in Galliâ, tum in Martinica, circiter ad librarum gallicarum quatuor milliones cum fimidio pervenisse.... His letter is in the A.R.S.J. and is cited in Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 241.
De Sacy said he had used the same policy. See Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 145.

Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 244-6.

Rochemonteix, Lavalette, pp. 241-4. Cf. Appendix VIII on Lavalette's creditors. The difference between Lavalette's total debts contracted 1756-62 (Column I) and the amounts owed to his creditors in about 1764 when the Parlement tried to expell the Jesuits from its jurisdiction (and as recorded in the Ordre of 1772; cf. Column III) is approximately two million livres (or 1,932,318 livres, to be precise). As Sacy had repaid 800,000 livres, we may assume that Gatin and Lamarche paid the remaining approximately 1,200,000 livres. The references to Gatin's and Lamarche's work in Ordre Général et Définitif, passim (A.N., U 983) suggest that they made most of their recognitions of Lavalette's debts by August 1762.

Of the six creditors who are listed in A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 19 May 1762 in Terray's list but not as Lavalette's creditors in Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983) two were definitely creditors of Jesuit institutions in France. The other four may have been creditors of the Jesuits in France, or they may have been creditors of Lavalette; we have no means of knowing. The fact that one of the four in question was Prépaud, the only original syndic not known to be a creditor of Lavalette and the fact that his sons later acted on behalf of the Union in the Windward Islands suggest that Prépaud himself may have been a creditor of Lavalette. But there is no stronger evidence to support this conclusion and I have not included his name or claims with those of the known creditors of Lavalette.

A.N., X lb 8941 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 19 May 1762. Here and henceforth, when the amount of a claim or claims is cited, it will be the principal amount. All creditors also claimed interest and costs, and Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983) recognized all creditors' rights to both from the time the claim was made until the whole claim was repaid. It is impossible to reckon the interest and costs as no indication of the rate of interest or normal allowance for costs is given.

A.N., X lb 8942 the original arrêt of the Parlement of Paris, 6 August 1762, told the creditors to submit their claims by 3 February 1763, the same deadline as it gave to the Jesuits for submitting their claims for pensions. Then other legislation extended the period in which creditors in France and the colonies might make their claims. See Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (125) ) lettres patentes of the king, 2 February 1763, A.N., X lb 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 August 1763, and A.N., X lb 8954 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 1 December 1767.
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pp. 208-209


18. Ricci wrote to Gatin as late as the spring of 1765 to ask how much progress he had made in repaying the creditors of the society. Ricci to Gatin, [Rome], 10 March 1765, cited in Rochemonteix, *Lavalette*, p. 246. *Ordre Général et Définitif* (A.N., U 983) contains only one reference to a payment made by Gatin in 1764. All the other references are to payments made in 1761-62. The *Parlement* of Paris tried to banish the members of the Jesuit order in November 1764, and it is doubtful whether the Jesuits were still sufficiently organized to make payments after that date. Cf. above, Chapter II, pp. 70-3.


20. *Délibération*, p. 30 (A.N., U 983)

21. The use of the date 13 or 23 April 1762 may cause confusion. The syndics of the Union, like Gatin and lamarche, required proof that an individual debt had been contracted before the confiscation of Jesuit property and, indirectly the Jesuits' bankruptcy had been declared on 23 April 1762, by the *Parlement* of Paris. In some of the other parts of the kingdom, the parlements required that the debt had been contracted at least ten days before the failure of the society, or by 13 April 1762. We should appreciate the fact that although the syndics required proof that the debt dated from before 13 or 23 April 1762, they did not list the amount due on that day in the *Ordre Général et Définitif*. Rather, they listed the amount due after Gatin and Lamarche had made payments to creditors. Hence, an entry in the *Ordre* normally indicates the date before 13 or 23 April 1762 on which the debt was contracted and also, in the case of Lavalette's debts, the date on which Gatin or Lamarche recognized the debt. It also indicates how much remained to be paid after Gatin and Lamarche had made whatever payment they made to the creditor. The final amount shown in the *Ordre* was thus the one which the syndics recognized it was their responsibility to pay. See *Ordre Général et Définitif* pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983).

22. The syndics held their first distribution of money to the creditors in August 1765 and ff. At that time, they used the list they were preparing for the jurisdiction of the *Parlement* of Paris to determine who should be repaid and in what order. See below, pp. 225-6 for a description of the first distribution. The *Ordre Général et Définitif* of 1772 (A.N., U 983) was based on the early *ordres* prepared by various parlements, of 1765 or, for that matter, the distribution of 1768 or 1769. See below, pp. 226-9. Thus, particularly for the jurisdiction of the *Parlement* of Paris, the *Ordre Général et Définitif* is not a
statement of money owed to creditors in 1772, when the document was published, but of money owed after the Jesuits had given up trying to satisfy the creditors in about 1764.

23 Cf. Appendix VIII. It is probable that Bourdon and Prépaud, who appear in the list of 1762 but not in that of 1772, had been completely repaid before 1772. In the case of the latter, it is also possible that in 1772 the syndics refused to repay the heirs of Prépaud who had represented the Union's interest so badly in the Windward Islands. See above, pp. 201-3.

24 Ordre Général et Définitif p. 167 (A.N., U 983) reference to the Englishman George Bryant who claimed principal of 38,578 pounds sterling for money he had lent Griffet and Gatin on 20 March 1762. The syndics would not recognize this claim because, they said, he had already been repaid from the English seizures and sale of Lavalette's goods in the little island of La Dominique.

25 Lavalette himself died in 1767. The list of 1772 included heirs of Desjardins, Belouche, and Dlle Beuvron, and the cessionnaires of Montigny, as well as other substitutes. See Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983).

26 See above, pp. 159-60. De Bompar was apparently never a syndic. He was governor of Martinique when Lavalette was made superior of the missions and was replaced by de la Rivière in 1760. See Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 134.

27 The Dlle Beuvron was the sister of the Chevallier d'Harcourt, who had married the daughter of Rouillé, Minister of the Marine through much of this period. She lent Lavalette principal sums amounting to 110,000 livres during the years after the Lioncys' bankruptcy and was repaid half this amount by 1762. I have not been able to discover whether she lived permanently in Paris or sometimes in Martinique. Rochemonteix, Lavalette, p. 69.

28 See Appendix VIII. The totals in this section are all based on the documents and individual claims cited there.

29 We can assume that anyone, and especially any firm, discounting lettres de change on a large scale was a négociant unless he was described as something else or was said to have another profession. Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983) shows the profession and place of residence of slightly more than half the creditors.

30 See Appendix VIII, and especially the note on the creditors of the Lioncys. In 1761-62, the Lioncys claimed over one and a half million livres, and by 1772, their own creditors were members of the Union, so
that the smallness of the Lioncys' claim makes it look as though more of
the original claim had been paid than was the case.

31 All the information concerning the claims which follows is drawn
from *Ordre Général et Définitif*, pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983). Except when it
is feasible to do so, I have not attempted to cite the individual pages
referring to the groups I have identified.

32 The reference is, of course, only to the principal lent or the
principal recognized by Sacy, Gatin, or Lamarche. At no time in this
chapter are principal, interest, and costs cited, although in the case
of the *rentes perpetuelles*, since the interest rate is known, it is
possible to evaluate the principal and interest, and this has been done.
See below, pp. 214-15 and 223-4. Both lists of claims in A.N., X 1b
8941 arrêt of 19 May 1762 and *Ordre Général et Définitif* of 1772
(A.N., U 983) refer with certainty only to principal sums in all cases
except those of the *rentes*.

33 Lavalette's French creditors included all his creditors except
those who had been his associates in the Windward Islands and except
the Dlle Beuvron, whose association with Lavalette may have developed
in Martinique.

34 See totals in Appendix VIII.

35 Besides the claim of the Englishman George Bryant, who the syndics
maintained had been repaid from the seizure of Jesuit property in La
Dominique, the syndics rejected only one would-be claim against Lavalette.
It was placed by Boussé and Dangirard, for 55,000 *livres* lent on 3
March 1762. The syndics said that Boussé and Dangirard presented
insufficient proof that the debt had been legally contracted. Cf.
*Ordre Général et Définitif* (A.N., U 983).

36 Most of the nine were people who had rendered services to Jesuit
institutions in the colonies and had not been paid for these services.
Three were holders of *rentes* drawn on Jesuit establishments there.
They were owed a total of 23,597 *livres*.

37 See above, p. 160-2 and 186-7.

38 The French Jesuits had, of course, been aware for some time,
especially since the expulsion of their order from Portugal in particu-
larly humiliating circumstances in 1757-58, of their growing unpopu-
larity. See Guillermou, *Les Jesuites*, p. 71. Their general response
to this state of affairs had been to appeal to the crown and to hope for
the support of the *Assemblée Générale du Clergé*, not to calculate and try
to repay their debts in France! Except for the possible case of Lyon
(see below, note 58), I have found little evidence that the Jesuit superiors considered the financial implications of the possible suppression of the order. Another possible exception is the case of the administrators of the College of La Flèche. It appears to have had no creditors in 1762, and any creditors there were seem to have been satisfied before this date. See A.N., M 248 Etat des revenus et des charges du Collège Royal des Jésuites de la Flèche...octobre 1761, prepared by the Jesuits, the compte rendu prepared by the commissioners of the Parlement in A.N., X 1b 8944 compte rendu of 5 July 1763 and Ordre Général et Définitif, pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983), which contain no references to creditors of this institution. Similarly, the Jesuit institutions of Bapaume, Bar-le-Duc, Charleville, Châlons-sur-Marne, Chaumont-en-Bassigny, Gueret, Laon, Mauriac, Moulins, Pontoise, and Roanne had no creditors whose names appear in the Ordre Général et Définitif, and it is possible that their administrators prepared for the confiscation by repaying their creditors. But it remains true that in the major institutions of Paris, where most of the leadership of the order in France was concentrated, no one seems to have given any thought to the possibility that creditors might soon be appearing from all of France to demand payment of all manner of debts.


40 Neither the crown nor the parlements ever recognized the right of "founders" of Jesuit institutions to be creditors of the Jesuits after 1762, although they did hand the Jesuits' colleges over to local authorities. Nor did they recognize the claims of people whose ancestors had endowed Jesuit institutions. Cf. the legal argument in Chapter II, pp. 49-53. Hence, no such people are listed in Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983).

41 No rente perpetuelle dates from before 1648. There was no particular increase in the creation of rentes in the two or three years before the suppression, either.

42 The amount 350,766 livres is less than eighteen percent of the total 1,977,825 livres, which was the total capital value of all the rentes perpetuelles in France.

43 See above, pp. 168-9 and 171-6. The arrêts of the Parlement of Paris which confirmed the colleges' possession of their property list many rentes which continued to belong to the colleges and a comparison with the comptes rendus and Jesuits' own records suggests that most if not all the rentes owned by the Jesuits remained the property of the colleges after 1763.

44 The rentes viagères are listed in the fourth class of the Ordre.
See *Ordre Général et Définitif*, pp. 372-96 (A.N., U 983). In contrast to the case of the creditors of Lavalette or the holders of *rentes* perpetuelles, the *Ordre* is most imprecise about the capital owed to holders of *rentes viagères*. In some cases, it lists the original principal investment and in some the annual payment that the creditor should have received in his lifetime. Since the annual payment in this case was not always the same percentage of the capital, it is almost impossible to estimate the value of the *rentes viagères*. The 265,058 livres cited is the total of the sixty-two principal sums which are listed. Forty principal sums are not listed. My estimate of the possible value of the principal sums claimed by this class of creditor is based on the obvious assumption that if sixty percent of the whole amounts to 265,058 livres, the whole must be between 400,000 and 450,000 livres.

45 Twenty-four such creditors claimed capital of 67,300 livres. The capital investment of the other eleven is not listed, but if it were on the same order as that of the first twenty-four, we may assume that it would have amounted to a further 30,000 livres, or so. Hence, my assumption that the total of the capital involved in the thirty-five claims was approximately 100,000 livres.

46 Cf. A.N., X lb 8945-8957 passim, various arrêts of the Parlement of Paris confirming the individual biens of the colleges include many of this sort of *rentes*.

47 The first total is the sum of the known capital claims, and the second the sum of the known capital claims and assumed capital claims, rounded off to the nearest thousand.

48 It was the butcher and the baker who normally made the largest claims against Jesuit institutions. It was they, we may assume, who had provided the Jesuits with most of their daily food, and it was perhaps because the Jesuits were such regular customers that their accounts with these merchants were left outstanding for months at a time, as a matter of course.

49 Example: the Paris butcher who claimed 26,500 livres and interest for meat supplied in 1761-62. Many tradespeople made claims for thirty or forty livres. See *Ordre Général et Définitif* p. 1 for information about the butcher and pp. 1-396 passim on the lesser claims (A.N., U 983).

50 Seven claims against the Jesuits of Saint-Omer were in florins, and several were for indeterminate amounts. We cannot guess their value in French money.

51 One hundred and seventy-four creditors from the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris claimed a total of 113,548 livres principal, but we
do not know how much the remaining twenty-five creditors for whom no principal is shown claimed. The twenty-five included several butchers and bakers, who normally made large claims. The average claim for the 174 creditors being 655 livres, it is probable that the remaining twenty-five claimants were owed twenty-five times this much, or approximately 16,375 livres. The sum of the two amounts is nearly 130,000 livres.

52 The first figure is the sum of the known claims in this group and the second is the rounded off approximate one. The second is a conservative estimate based on my knowledge of the situation in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, and the fact that there were fewer creditors in this group with unstate claims in the rest of France than in the jurisdiction of the Parlement.

53 Ordre Général et Définitif, pp. 158-70, and 348-60 (A.N., U 983) contain a list of 151 creditors claiming more than 100,000 livres in capital who were sent to the bureaux of administration of the colleges to be provided for. It also includes the names of about a dozen women who had given money to help to build the retreat house in Nantes who could only be repaid from the sale of that house itself. The principles laid down in the legislation of 1763 and 1764 seem to have been followed in the case of those creditors whose money maintained or improved Jesuit buildings. See above, pp. 175-6.

54 See above, p. 158.

55 The exception is the seminary at Nevers, which had borrowed about 4,000 livres in this way. It will be recalled that most of the administration of the seminary was in the hands of the diocese.

56 It was, of course, the colleges of Saint-Omer which also owed more than 15,347 livres to their tradespeople and merchants. They were thus the most indebted of all the small Jesuit colleges by 1762.

57 The colleges of Saint-Omer and Arras had never been very wealthy, and Artois as a whole was poor, a fact that probably explained the suppression of several colleges in Artois after 1762. See above, Chapter III, p. 106. Cf. Appendix V, below.

58 The fact that most of the sums thus borrowed are small, and the fact that the lender would thus not be seriously hurt by the Jesuits' failure to repay the debt, and the fact that the Jesuits of Lyon left almost no tradesmen or merchants unpaid both suggest that the Jesuits were preparing for the suppression in a not wholly unscrupulous way. Some of the 66,000 livres may have been used to pay the local creditors and the rest may have been used to help the Jesuits of Lyon survive
when the suppression occurred. This is, of course, a hypothesis only, but one which is supported by the fact that many Jesuits stayed incognito in the Province of Lyon after the suppression. Cf. Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae, and Hamy, Chronologie. See above, Chapter II, p. 76. There is, of course, no necessary connection between the debts and the habits of the Jesuits after the suppression. Guitton, Les Jésuites à Lyon sheds no light on this matter.

59 My estimate is based on the assumption that all other things being equal, if thirteen creditors in this group demanded principal of 1,838 livres, the other twenty-five probably demanded nearly twice as much. I have then revised the estimate downwards when it was clear that a creditor in this group was claiming feudal dues of very little value: eg. 60 sols every other year and a pair of capons. This estimate of between 4,000 and 5,000 livres is thus only a most approximate one.

60 See above, Chapter III, p. 110.

61 Seven of the eight claims add up to 40,595 livres. The eighth is not listed but was obviously appreciable. If we add to 40,595 livres 5,800 livres (the average of the first seven claims), we may be near the truth. Clearly this kind of induction has severe limitations.

62 The figure 6,830,682 livres was arrived at by adding all the known totals of the six kinds of claims described above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,072,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,242,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,830,682 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63 A.N., V 7 79 arrêt du conseil 27 October 1774. The council repeated this estimate in legislation of February 1775, also in A.N., V 7 79.


66 See above, p. 204.

description of how the *Ordre Général et Définitif* was supposed to work is based on Savary des Bruslons, *Dictionnaire du commerce*, vol. II, pp. 98-9 and 407-9.

68 *Délivération*, p. 30 (A.N., U 983).

69 Savary des Bruslons, *Dictionnaire du commerce*, vol. II, pp. 407-9 refers only to three classes of creditors, the first three. It is very difficult to compare the technical aspects of the work performed by the syndics of the Union I have studied with the work of the syndics of other unions of creditors. The bankruptcy of the Jesuits and the resulting legal process and attempts to repay the Jesuits' creditors are unlike other bankruptcies and their results of the same period. The Jesuit one was no much larger in all ways; it involved more people and more money than any other I have discovered. It is possible that this "quantitative difference" also led to a qualitative one.

70 *Ordre Général et Définitif* pp. 1-25 (A.N., U 983). The capital claimed by a number of members of this class is not listed.

71 Neither the first, nor the second, nor the third class included any holders of *rentes viageres*. Such creditors were all grouped in the fourth class.

72 *Ordre Général et Définitif* pp. 30-158 (A.N., U 983). None of the hypothèques dated from later than 23 April 1762, although some which dated from early in the eighteenth century had been recognized as legal after 23 April 1762.

73 Their claims were normally *créances fondées sur un titre sous signature privée qui n'emporte point d'hypothèque*. Cf. Savary des Bruslons, *Dictionnaire du commerce*, vol. II, p. 407. Many claims in this class refer to contracts made sous signature privée. To be certain that such claims were genuine, the syndics often relied on the written proof of the creditor and the records of the Jesuit institutions. It is not certain whether those claims which could not be verified in the Jesuits' records were rejected, but they may well have been. This class was listed in *Ordre Général et Définitif*, pp. 171-348 (A.N., U 983).

74 *Délivération*, p. 5 (B.N., Ld 39 546), and *Délivération* (A.N., U 983).

75 A.N., U 983 *Ordre Général*, pp. 372-96.

76 See above, p. 214.
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pp. 224-228

78 See above, p. 220.

79 Délibération, pp. 21-2 (A.N., U 983) contains the text of the decision of 21 August 1765.

80 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 3 (B.N., Ld 39 591).


82 Délibération, p. 21 (A.N., U 983).

83 In short, it was probably the list which the crown and the Parlement had, in the summer of 1763, instructed the syndics to prepare. Cf. above, pp. 161 and 209.

84 A.N., X 1b 9696 contains the texts of 160 documents by which creditors wishing to be repaid by the terms of the Délibération of 21 August 1765 offered their necessary cautions. This usually meant that they offered security of the same value as they payment they were about to receive, and, so far as I can determine, a creditor usually found a solvent and important friend to stand caution for him. Cf. the case of Jacques-François Lioncy of 11 June 1766. It was Ange Didier (also a creditor of Lavalette and the Lioncys) who stood caution for Lioncy.

85 Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 5 and 8 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

86 Délibération, pp. 3 and 10 (B.N., Ld 39 546).

87 Délibération, p. 3 (B.N., Ld 39 546).


89 Délibération of 13 January 1768 determined the nature of the second Distribution (B.N., Ld 39 546).

90 Délibération, p. 23 (A.N., U 983)

91 Lettres patentes of 31 August 1767 registered in Parlement of Paris 1 December 1767, cited in Délibération, p. 23 (A.N., U 983).

Although lists were still to be sent to Paris from the Parlements of Normandy, Brittany, and Dauphiné, and from Metz, Pau, and Avignon, the list of creditors attached to the Délibération of 1 September 1769, and which has since been lost, would have included most of the creditors who claimed large amounts of money. The text of the Délibération which determined the nature of the third Distribution is in A.N., A D XVII, 23 Délibération des syndics généraux des créanciers... of 1 September 1769, approved by arrêt of Parlement of Paris 4 September 1769 (Paris, 1769).

Délibération, p. 24 (A.N., U 983).

Délibération, p. 25 (A.N., U 983).

Délibération, p. 30, Article I of the preambule to the Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983).

The creditors in the border regions were either the responsibility of their own parlements or sovereign councils or creditors of the society as a whole, and, in the latter case, included in the list made by the syndics of the Parlement of Paris and finding their way into the Ordre Général et Définitif (A.N., U 983). Most of the creditors of the order as a whole came from the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris or from the colonies. Cf. above, pp. 213 and 216.

Cf. below, p. 234.

Délibération is followed by the Ordre Général et Définitif 396 pp. (A.N., U 983).

Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 1-7 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 18-20 (B.N., Ld 39 591). The provincial syndics appear to have raised about 700,000 livres which they spent locally and to have sent over 519,000 livres to Paris. I have not been able to discover when this money was raised, and I refer to both amounts here. See above, pp. 184-5.

Délibération, p. 27 (A.N., U 983) and Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 6-7 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

A.N., G 9 47 Délibérations des syndics généraux [of the Union] of 8 March 1780 (Paris, 1780), and the Etat de la liquidation de la créance [de Plumard de Rieux] in A.N., G 9 47. Contracts and délégation were recognized as instruments of credit and bona fide means of payment. The Union of Creditors in Paris kept two caisses: one for deniers (money) and the other for contracts and délégations. Cf. Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 21-2 (B.N., Ld 39 591).
The terms of the fourth Distribution are described in *Délibération*, pp. 30-4 (A.N., U 983).

*Délibération*, p. 27 (A.N., U 983).

Cf. below, pp. 235-6, the case of Plumard de Rieux.

This requirement could obviously only apply to those few creditors, particularly from the jurisdiction of the Parlements of Brittany, Normandy, and Dauphiné who had not yet received any of the money they claimed.

On this point, there seems to have developed some confusion. In some cases, the interest only began to accumulate after the edict of 1 July 1766 or the edict of 23 February 1770. Cf. A.N., G 9 47 *Etat de liquidation*.


See above, pp. 163-204.


*Ordre Général et Définitif* pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983). We know that the total capital claimed by the privileged creditors was approximately 150,000 *livres*. The second class claimed capital of more than 4,184,694 *livres* of which only slightly more than 1,250,000 *livres* can have been repaid by 1774 (the other *hypothèques* dated from 1758 or later). To these amounts must be added thirty-five percent of the other 2,934,500 *livres* claimed by the *hypothécaires* and thirty-five percent of the approximately 2,700,000 *livres* claimed in capital by the third and fourth classes. That thirty-five percent of the remaining unpaid capital of the second, third, and fourth classes amounts to about 1,952,000 *livres*. The total capital which the syndics had agreed to repay by 1774 was thus about 3,353,000 *livres*.

A.N., V 7 79 *arrêt du conseil*, 27 October 1774. The council repeated this statement in an *arrêt* of 8 February 1775 in A.N., V 7 79. Of course, the syndics would pay interest and costs of the claims of the privileged creditors and the *hypothécaires* whose *hypothèques* predated 1758. That might have amounted to a further 600,000 *livres* or more. But, considering what the royal council said, it seems likely that these costs were off-set by the inability of some or even many creditors actually to take advantage of the syndics' offer. In about one-quarter of the cases of creditors to whom the Jesuits had become indebted after 1761, the syndics required further proof of the legality of the claim. Many creditors may not have been able to produce this proof.
The receipts in cash and contracts of the syndics in Paris and the provinces cannot have been more than four million livres by the end of that year, and we assume that their expenses would have consumed a substantial part of this amount. Cf. Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 1–8 (B.N., Ld 39 591). By 1774, the Paris syndics' cash receipts were 3,177,078 livres and somewhat more than 600,000 livres in contracts. Even if the provincial syndics had by this time collected a further one million livres, the total would not be more than 4,800,000 livres. At the same time, the first twelve years' expenses included payments of at least 88,000 livres to the Econome Général, the costs of sending representatives to the colonies, and salaries for the syndics, counsels, Notaire Séquestre, and Procureur in Paris. I assume that such expenses combined would amount to more than 800,000 livres, and I also assume that my estimate of provincial receipts may be too high. Hence, it is unlikely that the syndics had repaid more than three of three and one-half million livres by 1774.

Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 8–9, and 14 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 7 (B.N., Ld 39 591). The syndics claimed they had been unable to avoid receiving payment from the government in this form. See below, p. 235–6, on the subject of de Rieux.


Desenne, Mémoire, p. 5 (B.N., Ld 39 590). Desenne charged, among other things, that not a single chirographaire had received a single obole of his interest or costs, and that many had not received any payment at all. See below, Chapter VII, p. 298 for a consideration of his criticism of the Union.

Ordre Général et Dénfinitif, p. 131, no. 393 (A.N., U 983). The same figure is cited in G 9 47 Etat de liquidation.

A.N., G 9 47 Etat de liquidation refers to the amount withheld as a retenue, which was normal in the case of many rentes but not in the case of this kind of délégation. It may be regarded as a kind of service charge, but I have found no satisfactory explanation for its having been levied in this case. Unfortunately, I have been unable to find the texts of the edicts which concerned the accumulation of interest which are referred to in the Etat de liquidation. It is possible that they allowed for the levying of a service charge or tax in certain instances.

A.N., G 9 47 Etat de liquidation explains the steps by which Rieux and his heirs were repaid, and Rouhette, Mémoire, pp. 3–8, and 13–15 (B.N., Ld 39 591) explains the corresponding steps by which a creditor
was supposed to be repaid.

Undated copy of a reply to Bellanger's request in A.N., G 9 47 summarized Bellanger's request and the crown's reply. It is not clear to which part of the royal administration Bellanger had addressed his request. The reply refers to the wishes of the Minister Bertin, but it is not certain that the reply is in fact from him. The series G 9 emanated originally from the Commission des Réguliers, but these particular documents in G 9 47 were apparently originally classified as part of G 8 (Agence du Clergé) and only recently transferred to G 9. I was not able to discover why the change in classification came about, but I assume it was intended as an improvement and that the papers in question did come from the Commission des Réguliers.


The calculation is based on the information contained in Ordre Général et Définitif pp. 1-396 (A.N., U 983). I have taken the minimum totals in all cases, although the actual principal claims of the recognized creditors in the Ordre are doubtless closer to seven and a half million livres than the 6,830,682 livres which is the sum of the known claims of the four classes. The calculation of the amount owed to the chirographaires is eighty percent of the 2,500,000 livres they claimed, plus the remaining twenty percent of the claims under 1,200 livres. Rouhette said that most chirographaires claiming principal of less than 1,200 livres took advantage of the offer to be repaid their entire capital on condition that they renounce their right to interest and legal costs. See Mémoire, p. 20 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

Rouhette said in Mémoire, p. 21 (B.N., Ld 39 591) that the Union required three million livres to repay the remaining chirographaires their interest, arrears, costs, and capital, as well as the remaining expenses of the Union. I conclude that the capital would have been the difference between 2,500,000 livres which is approximately what the chirographaires claimed in capital and the 2,200,000 livres which should have been repaid by 1790.

See above, p. 204.

See above, p. 174.

Rouhette, Mémoire, p. 3 (B.N., Ld 39 591).

Notes, Chapter V

Part III

Notes, Chapter VI

Part I pp. 242-243

1 See above, Chapter III, pp. 86-8.


4 Recueil des ordonnances des rois de France, vol. X, p. 412, lettres patentes of Charles VI, 28 May 1417, ordered the suppression of the commissaires and économes who had been charged with the administration of vacant bishoprics and restored the administration of these benefices to the bailiffs and receivers of the Royal Domain. Cited in Laplatte, "L'Administration", Rev. d'histoire de l'Eglise de France, vol. XXIII (1937) p. 175. It is not clear when the commissaires and économes were created.

5 The king's use of the régale during the middle ages and in the modern period has been the subject of a number of serious studies of which the most important are E. Lesne, "Les Origines du droit de régale", Rev. hist. de Droit français et étranger, vol. XLV (1921), pp. 5-52 and R. Chevaillier, "Les Revenus des bénéfices ecclésiastiques au dix-huitième siècle d'après les comptes de la régale et de la garde", La Révolution française, vol. LXXIV (1921), pp. 113-49. The most important contemporary treatments of the subject are Rolland Le Vayer de Boutigny, Dissertation sur l'autorité des rois en matière de régale (Cologne, 1682) (B.N., Ld 6 14), and A.N., AD XVII 17a Jannin, Traité des Economats (dating from the seventeenth century). Laplatte, "L'Administration", Rev. d'hist. de l'Eglise de France, vol. XXIII (1937), pp. 161-225 is useful primarily as a bibliographical article.

6 A.N., V 7 77 preambule of edict of Louis XIV, December 1691, which created new économes séquestrés in each diocese, offers this explanation. The edict is also in A.N., AD XVII, 16.

7 Hélène Delattre, "L'Aide financière aux Protestants convertis, étude sur le tiers des Économats et la régie des biens des religieux fugitifs des origines à 1724", Position de thèses de l'Ecole de Chartes, 1934-36 (thèse de 1936), pp. 12-13. The thesis was finished but never published. The author herself lost the only copy, which thus is known to us only through the ten page outline in the Position. See also Emmanuel Jahan, La Confiscation des biens des Religionnaires fugitifs de la révocation de l'Edit de Nantes à la Révolution (Paris, 1959), pp. 6-7. Copies of the arrêts du conseil are in A.N., A D XVII, 16. They are dated 31 July and 26 November 1677.
8 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 31 July 1677, appointed Pellison to this position.

9 It is possible that the king's decision to create this new set of offices reflected only a desire to raise money by their sale, and that his statements in the preamble of the Edict of December 1691, in which he expressed his desire to improve the administration for the sake of increasing the revenue to be paid to the New Converts, was merely intended to cloak his desire to gain money from the sale of the offices. This seems unlikely, however, as, in 1707, when he did seek to raise money from the sale of similar offices, the king openly said so. Moreover, by assuming responsibility for a major part of the payment of pensions for New Converts, the crown was making a new and lasting demand on the revenues produced by its benefices. Doubtless the only way it could hope to raise all the necessary money after 1677 was to improve the administration of royal benefices. Cf. A.N., A D XVII, 16 and V 7 77 edict of the king, December 1691 and A.N., A D XVII, 16 and V 7 77 arrêt du conseil d'état, 23 August 1707.

10 The word Economat, meaning the administration of a vacant bishopric and the administrative machinery set up to carry out that administration, was apparently first used in 1553. Bloch, Dictionnaire étymologique, cited in Laplatte, "L'Administration", Rev. d'hist. de l'Eglise de France, vol. XXIII (1937), p. 183. By 1691 and afterwards, it had, of course, come to refer not only to bishoprics but also to all the other benefices in the king's nomination. See below, Chapter VII, pp. 303-6 on the dismantling of the administration.

11 The complete text of the edict is in A.N., V 7 77 and A D VII, 16. It was registered in the Parlement of Paris on 12 January 1692 and printed by order of that body in 1765, when it was concerned with the functions of the Economé Général, the successor to the officials appointed in 1691 and the subject of this chapter.

12 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêts du conseil d'état, 2 September 1692 and 23 February 1696.


14 A.N., A D XVII, 16 and V 7 77 edict of the king, October 1703.

15 A.N., A D XVII, 16 and V 7 77 edicts of the king, August 1707 and July 1708.

16 Cf. preambule of A.N., V 7 77 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 27 November 1714.
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17 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêts du conseil d'état, 22 March and 21 June 1712.

18 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 27 November 1714.

19 Jahan, Confiscation, p. 44.

20 Jahan, Confiscation, pp. 49-63.

21 A.N., V 7 77 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 27 November 1714.

22 Jahan, Confiscation, p. 59.

23 A.N., V 7 77 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 27 November 1714.

24 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 25 June 1715.

25 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 4 August 1716.

26 Jahan, Confiscation, p. 57. The commission was created in 1708, but did not order Boucher to present his accounts until 1716. The commission, which included Marillac, d'Aguesseau, d'Ormesson, and, after 1714, La Bourdonnaye, was created by an arrêt du conseil [d'état] of 23 June 1708. On 9 May 1716, the same commission ordered Boucher to submit his accounts.

27 A.N., V 7 82 contains an acte de société made by the three on 1 July 1717.

28 A.N., V 7 77 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 12 August 1721.

29 Jahan, Confiscation, p. 62.

30 A.N., V 7 77 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 22 May 1722.

31 A.N., V 7 77 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 22 February 1724 outlined the faults of the previous administrators and commissioned Marchal de Sainscy to replace them both.

32 So far as I can discover, the term Econome Général, meaning both
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économé séquestré and receiver of the Economats was first used in an
arrêt du conseil d'État du roi, 2 April 1737 in A.N., A D XVII, 16.

Cf. Jahan, Confiscation, p. 66.

The last reference I have found to Du Muy's period in office appears
in A.N., V 777 arrêt du conseil d'État 24 September 1746. Jarente de
la Bruyère had become director by 1763. See B.N., Coll. Joly de
Fleury 1613 exchange of letters between Procureur Général and Président
Molé of that year. See above, Chapter III, p. 86. And Cf. A.N., F 4
1935 exchange of letters between Boullogne and Jarente dating from
1767, in which the latter spoke of the way in which he normally dealt
with the problems of his administration, thus suggesting he had been in
office for some time.

A.N., V 778 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'État, 13 May
1787 shows that Feydeau de Brou was director of the Economats at this
time. By 1789, his functions had been taken over by a special commission.
Cf. Laplatte, "L'Administration", Rev. d'hist. de l'Eglise de France,
vol. XXIII (1937), p. 204.

Sébastien Marchal de Sainscy was sole Econome Général du Clergé
from 1724 to 1743, when he shared his administration with his son,
Pierre Marchal. In 1746, both father and son retired and were replaced
by a brother of Pierre, named Louis-Pierre-Sébastien Marchal de Sainscy.
The latter shared his administration with Edme-Louis Meny until 1761,
when Louis-Pierre-Sébastien became the sole Econome Général. In 1767,
Louis-Pierre-Sébastien shared his administration with his son, Louis-
René and, in 1782, Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy became the only
Econome Général. He was declared bankrupt in 1787, and was replaced
by Brière de Mondetour in the same year. See below, pp. 280-7.

A.N., V 777 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'État, 22 February
1722.

See A.N., V 777. Many of the accounts for this period were not
judged until 1740-65. The commission was established by an arrêt du
conseil d'État 12 January 1734, to be found in A.N., V 777 and A D
XVII 16. It was made up of four Counsellors of State and ten Maîtres
des requêtes, including D'Aguesseau, Saunier, Maboul, De la Porte,
Bignon, Pineau de Duce, Chaunelier, and two others, who regularly signed
its papers during the first two decades of its existence.

See below, p. 280-5.

A.N., V 778 arrêt du conseil d'État 16 December 1741, and V 777
arrêt du conseil d'État, 24 September 1746.
A.N., V 7 78 contains the judgments passed by the commissioners general of the Commission of the Economats on Marchal's accounts for the individual years 1733-37 inclusive. The commissioners approved these accounts between 1739 and 1741. The following analysis is based on information contained in their statements about the accounts. Note that all amounts are cited to the nearest livre, based on calculations involving the full amount.

Each set of accounts includes one chapter of the expenditures allotted to "sums spent on the orders of the king", which over the five-year period amounted to much more than 12,000 livres. It is possible that some of the money thus spent went to converted Huguenots, and was thus taken from the revenue intended for pensions for New Converts. Unfortunately, the accounts are not sufficiently explicit to enable us to know whether this conjecture is right or not.

In this period the total revenue of the Abbeys of S. Manscy, S. Georges de Boscherville, and S. Liguaire were paid to the Economats.

This sum includes, of course, the Tiers des Economats.

The fact that the commissioners of the Economats approved the Econome Général's accounts of his receipts and expenditures is sufficient reason to believe that they were correct. The commissioners based their decision to approve the accounts on supporting evidence submitted by the Econome Général, which apparently no longer exists. On the other hand, they had no means to insure that the reliquat of the account, or the excess of receipts over expenditures, would ever be paid into the Royal Treasury. A.N., V 7 78 contains documents relating to the bankruptcy of the last Marchal in 1787, which suggest that the whole administration had been in arrears from its beginning in the 1720's.


A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 19 January 1743.

A.N., V 7 77 and A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 25 September 1746.

A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'état, 17 June 1761.
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1 The lettres patentes are in B.N., F 23627 (127). See above, Chapter III, p. 86 for earlier reference to this legislation.

2 Cf. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1610, ff. 256-259, preambule of declaration of the king, 2 April 1764, which reviewed the intentions of the lettres patentes of 2 February 1763.

3 This statement appears repeatedly in the judgments of the commissioners of the Economats in A.N., V 7 78 for the three decades after 1763.

4 See above, Chapter III, pp. 85-8 for Rolland's description of the very significant role which members of the Parlement played in obtaining both pieces of legislation.

5 Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, 7 March 1763, p. 44. The text of the lettres patentes of 2 February 1763 does not state that the crown had assumed this responsibility, although the preambule of the declaration of the king 2 February states that the crown had entrusted the administration of Jesuit benefices to the Econome Général du Clergé in the expectation of raising money for Jesuit pensions.

6 Miromesnil to Saint-Florentin, 12 March 1763; Saint-Florentin to Miromesnil, 15 March 1763; Miromesnil to Saint-Florentin, 26 March 1763; in Miromesnil, Correspondance, vol. II, pp. 192-6, 197, and 205-13. See also lettres patentes of 21 March 1763, by which the king disallowed the stringed anti-Jesuit legislation passed by the Parlement of Rouen on 3 March 1763 in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (139)).


8 Cf. Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (153-711) passim) which contains the texts of the legislation confirming most of the colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris (cf. Appendix V, below) and some of the other provincial colleges in possession of their property, including their benefices, And see below, pp. 268-70 on the results of this policy for the Econome Général.

9 A.N., X lb 8943 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 11 March 1763.

10 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêt du conseil d'État, 16 April 1763.

11 A.N., A D XVII, 16 arrêts du conseil d'État, 24 June 1763 (two arrêts), 1 and 18 August 1764, and 16 August 1765.

12 A.N., X lb 8944 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 5 July 1763.
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13. The text of these lettres patentes is in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (199)). And see above, Chapter V, p. 174.

14. A.N., A D XVII, 22 and Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (225)) lettres patentes of the king, 8 February 1764.

15. B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1610, ff. 256-259, declaration of the king, 2 April 1764.

16. See above, Chapter IV, pp. 145 and 148.

17. See preambule of declaration of the king, 2 April 1764 in B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1610, f. 256.
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1 A.N., F 4 1935 *Etat des recouvrements* made by Marchal de Sainscy of revenues from Jesuit benefices 1763-72. The precise number of benefices whose names are included in the accounts varies from one year to the next, but most accounts show that Marchal normally administered 193 benefices according to the terms of the *lettres patentes* of 2 February 1763.

2 Cf. Appendix IV below, which cites sixty-nine benefices attached to colleges and one benefice attached to a seminary in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris. Marchal did not administer the benefice attached to the College of Angoulême, the benefice attached to the Seminary of Nevers, or two of the benefices attached to the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris, which had been secularized before 1762. Nor did he administer one of the benefices of Aurillac.

3 The benefices of Comte-Robert and the Maladerie of Brie had apparently been secularized before 1763 and no longer counted as collegial benefices. Otherwise, the exceptional benefices were the Priory of Vindelles belonging to the College of Angoulême, and the Chapel of Carlat belonging to the College of Aurillac. Rolland provides a partial explanation for these developments in his *Compte rendu*, especially the *compte rendu* on the College of Angoulême given on 14 June 1763 (B.N., Ld 39 939). The bureau of administration of Angoulême was particularly concerned about the need to have revenue with which to maintain the college. It was perhaps because of the bureau's influence, then, that the Econome Général never assumed control over the priory, whose union to the College of Angoulême was confirmed by *lettres patentes* of 27 October 1763. See *Actes Royaux* (B.N., F 23627 (191)).

4 A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of the Econome Général for 1763-72 show that the revenues produced by the benefices in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris were consistently slightly less than half of all the revenue produced by all the Jesuit benefices in France.

5 A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of the Econome Général 1762-72, show that in the period 1766-1772 the Econome Général frequently showed current receipts for benefices which should have been returned to the colleges of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris by this time. An absence of information about the final destination of benefices belonging to colleges in other parts of France prevents us from making any generalizations about the provinces.

6 A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of the Econome Général 1762-72, show that in the course of 1764 and 1765, Marchal received many payments of "arrears due for 1762-63".

7 A.N., V 7 80 judgment of the commissioners general of the Economats
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2 June 1788 refers to Roque's involvement in the administration of the Caisse de Poissy and the alienation of the Domain of Artois, but most other documents call him simply as an intéressé in the affairs of the octrois of Montpellier (Cf. A.N., V 7 79 and V 7 80, frequent references to Roque in period 1772-79). V 7 80 procès-verbal of documents relating to the Roque affair which were deposited with the commissioners of the Economats as a result of their judgment of 2 June 1788 and prepared on 31 August to 3 September 1789 refers to the agreements of 17, 30, and 31 October 1763, by which the company gained the right to collect revenues from Jesuit benefices.

8 Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702 unsigned letter of 17 fructidor An XIII explains the relationship between Le Roy and Choisy, A.N., V 7 80 procès-verbal of 1789 refers to the agreement and later to a désistement de bail between Le Roy and Choisy.

9 Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702 unsigned correspondence of An XIII-XIV refers to Turgan as a fermier involved with Roque Le Roy, and Choisy.

10 A.N., V 7 80 procès-verbal of 1789 suggests that the company was formed in October 1763, at the same time as the individual members of it were granted the right to administer some of the Jesuit benefices. The Revolutionary administrators were unable to find out even the addresses of Bernard Turgan and Roque's other associates. Cf. Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702 unsigned correspondence of An XIII.

11 A.N., V 7 80 procès-verbal of 1789. The agreements were made on 4 and 9 January, and 27 February, 1764 and later. The terms of the bail are referred to in V 7 79 judgment of the commissioners general of the Economats of 17 July 1778.

12 This, Le Roy did in at least one case. Cf. A.N., V 7 79 judgment of the commissioners general of the Economats, 20 January 1779 concerning the Collège de la Madeleine at Bordeaux.

13 A.N., V 7 80 procès-verbal of 1789 contains references to Le Roy's accounts as well as to those of Roque. It is clear that they were separate documents.

14 Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702 inventory of Le Roy, Roque and Company's accounts dating from An VI refers to them as ci-devant fermiers de la majeur partie des Bénéfices des ci-devant jésuites depuis 1764 jusques et compris 1772. The commissioners general of the Economats normally noted that they were farmers of "a very large number" of benefices once belonging to the Jesuits. Cf. A.N., V 7 79 judgment of 6 September 1777 and passim.
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15 A.N., V 7 80 procès-verbal of 1789 and Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702 passim. Unfortunately, no complete list of the benefices in this company's control exists.

16 A.N., V 7 80 procès-verbal of 1789 and X 1b 8949 arrêt of Parlement of Paris, 8 March 1765 which shows that Duris administered a benefice (that of Comtal) belonging to the College of Bourges, as well.

17 A.N., V 7 80 procès-verbal and Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702, unsigned correspondance of An XIII-XIV.

18 Cf. letter from a former Jesuit, Fieural, to Brousse of the Parlement of Paris of 13 April 1769, B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1619, fol. 64-69, in which he appeals for the payment of a pension from Marchal's préposé administering the revenue of the Collège de la Madeleine in Bordeaux. The benefices of this college were at this time administered by Le Roy who, ironically, may never have received the 25,150 livres per year which the most valuable priory was supposed to be worth, and part of which Fieural was claiming. See A.N., V 7 79 judgment of the commissioners general of 20 January 1779.

19 Cf. A.N., X 1b 8947 Roussel de la Tour's compte rendu of Charleville given 22 May 1764. See also Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702, unsigned correspondance of An XIII-XIV.

20 A.N., V 7 79 extrait des registres du conseil d'état, 6 September 1777 registered by the commission general of the Economats on 7 July 1778 and F 4 1935, accounts of the Économé Général du Clergé of his administration of Jesuit property for the period 1762-72.

21 A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of the Économé Général 1766-72.

22 B.N., N.A.F. 21.255 and A.N., V 7 79 commissioners general report of 4 July 1778 both contain references to nine-year leases of Jesuit benefices made in the period after 1772, which appear to have been identical to the leases held by Roque and Company. The lettres patentes which confirmed many of the colleges in the possession of their benefices normally stipulated that the bureaux of administration should continue the leases made by the Économé Général.

23 B.N., N.A.F. 21.255, Brefs états des bénéfices des Jésuites pour les années 1775-1781 refer to priories directly administered by the farmer holding a lease from Marchal.

24 A.N., V 7 79 judgment of the commissioners general of 20 January 1779 shows this to have been done in the case of benefices in Bordeaux.
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25 A.N., V 7 78 contains 135 judgments of the commissioners general of Marchal's administration of approximately seventy benefices in the period 1762–64. A comparison between them and the accounts in A.N., F 4 1935 show that there was no consistent way in which repairs or special payments made on the orders of the king were financed. In some cases the cost of repairs was paid from loans made by the Union of Creditors. See Marchal's accounts for 1766, 1767, 1768, and 1770, in F 41935.

26 A.N., V 7 79 judgments of the commissioners general, 6 November 1772 and 30 March 1774 state that in this period Roque and Company were in arrears of more than 200,000 livres, and had not paid their lease for 1772. Although this debt was never completely satisfied, it was considerably reduced by the end of the decade. See below, p. 276. The available information for this period after 1771 is insufficient to permit me to generalize about it.

27 A.N., F 4 1935 Boulogne, Intendant of Finances, to Marchal de Sainscy, 17 December 1765, and Marchal de Sainscy to Boulogne, 24 December 1765. See also A.N., M 248 Coulland's references to the receiver of the Economats in Poitiers in the former's accounts for 1762–66.

28 A.N., F 4 1935 contains the statements submitted to the Control General for the years 1764–73, which deal with the receipts from the benefices in 1763–72 and the expenditures for the current year. It also contains letters about the accounts exchanged between Marchal de Sainscy; Jarente de la Bruyère, bishop of Orléans and Director of the Economats; and the Intendant of Finances, de Boulogne. A.N., F 4 2680 contains correspondance between members of the Control General about problems relating to the administration of Jesuit property and pensions in the 1780's and also a recapitulation of the outline of Louis-René Marchal's accounts for 1786.

29 A.N., V 7 78 and V 7 80 contain the judgments of the commissioners general of Marchal's accounts for the years 1762–64 and 1772–77. In individual cases, the receipts from a given benefice for a given year shown in F 4 1935 and V 7 78 or V 7 80 are different, but in general, the total receipts for a given year are about the same in the two sources.

30 A.N., F 4 1935 Economé Général's accounts of his administration of Jesuit property for the years 1763–72. The analysis which follows is based on information contained in these accounts. In many cases, the sums received and spent are shown as round numbers. I have found it convenient to dispense with the sols and deniers which occasionally are shown and to use instead the nearest number of livres for my calculations.
Cf. above, pp. 252-3. The amount of money which the Econome Général received from confiscated Huguenot property in the period 1733-37 was, on a yearly average, slightly more than one-fifth of the revenue which he now received from the Jesuit property in all of France. Unfortunately, we do not know how much revenue the Economats as a whole were dealing with in 1763-72.

See above, Chapter I on the nature of Jesuit property under the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.

Lyon in fact produced 95,263 livres, Poitiers, 91,516 livres and Amiens, 89,337 livres.

The actual amounts raised by these colleges' benefices were:

- Billom: 30,137 livres
- Tours: 25,662 livres
- Eu: 25,040 livres
- Roanne: 21,176 livres
- La Rochelle: 19,868 livres

Bourges produced 9,583 livres, and Charleville 9,748 livres.

The actual amounts which these colleges' benefices produced were:

- Aurillac: 6,436 livres
- Compiègne: 3,372 livres
- Mauriac: 2,875 livres
- Blois: 1,838 livres
- Fontenay-le-Comte: 709 livres
- Langres: 280 livres

The individual lettres patentes which confirmed the colleges' ownership of their benefices enjoined the bureaux of administration to maintain the leases made by the Econome Général.

Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702 unsigned correspondance of An XI and An XIII-XIV contains the only information I have found about the price of individual baux à ferme. Unfortunately, it is so fragmentary as to be nearly useless. In the cases where we can compare the official price of the bail with the revenue which apparently reached Marchal's caisse, we observe that only a small portion of the expected revenue was received. Thus, in the case of the priory of S. Julien at Charleville the price of the bail was 4,500 livres a year, or approximately 3,545 livres in 1764 after deductions had been made. Marchal's accounts show that he received 1,770 livres for this priory in that year. Similarly, the abbey of Asnières Bellay at La Flèche was farmed for 5,180 livres a year and produced 3,240 livres in 1764 (which, however, were not paid until 1767). The correspondance of An XI indicates that
it was subject to a lot of deductions, and that the farmers in fact left no debt. While these examples are interesting, they do not, however, allow us to make any generalizations about the extent to which actual payments of leases approximated the original assessment.

39 The crown's decisions about the fate of the benefices appeared in the lettres patentes confirming the existence of the colleges and their possession of the benefices. This legislation is to be found in Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (153-819), passim).

40 A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of the Econome Général for this period show that the payments were made. V 7 80 procès-verbal of 1789 includes the benefices of these two colleges in a list of those administered by Roque and Company. Hereafter, once again, all statements about payments actually made to the Econome Général, unless otherwise indicated, come from his accounts in F 4 1935.

41 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (188, 212, 431, 175, 472, 170) ), lettres patentes of 21 October 1763, 7 December 1763, 20 June 1765, 28 August 1763, 28 August 1765, and 8 August 1763. I have listed the colleges, and hence the legislation pertaining to them, in the order of their benefices' demonstrated wealth.

42 Some were also required to make annual payments to other, more needy colleges. After 1767 there were in fact fourteen colleges in this category as the college of Châlons-sur-Marne received some of the benefices previously held by the Jesuit college at Reims.

43 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (261) ) lettres patentes of 7 April 1764. The payments were to begin at the end of 1765.

44 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (330 and 194) ), lettres patentes of 16 August 1764 and 8 November 1763. The payments were to begin at the end of 1765.

45 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (344) ), lettres patentes of 4 September 1764. The payments were to begin at the end of 1766. After thirty years, the college was to continue paying the same amount not to the Econome Général but to the college of Compiègne.

46 Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (711, 430, and 589) ), lettres patentes of 28 November 1767, 20 June 1765, and 11 August 1766. Billom was to make concurrent payments of 1,500, 2,000, and 2,500 livres per year, per decade and after that 3,000 livres a year in perpetuity to the college of Clermont Ferrand. Amiens was to pay 2,400 livres a year to Nevers and 1,500 livres a year to Langres for ten years, and after that 3,000 livres a year to Nevers and 2,000 livres a year to Langres for perpetuity.
In the case of Billom, the payments were to begin at the end of 1765; in the case of Chalons-sur-Marne, at the end of 1767; and in the case of Amiens, at the end of 1768.

Eu, Moulins, and the Wallon college at Saint Omer were each required to pay 2,000 livres a year for the first ten years, 1,500, for the next ten years, and 1,000, for the last ten years. See Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (304, 340, and 819) ) lettres patentes of 21 July and 31 August 1764 and Edit du Roi of September 1768. Eu and Moulins were to begin to make their payments at the end of 1765, and Saint Omer, at the end of 1769. Roanne was required to pay 1,800, 1,200, and 800 livres, and Aurillac, 1,200, 800, and 600 livres in the same way. See Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (187 and 238) ) lettres patentes of 9 October 1763 and 3 March 1764. Aurillac was to begin to make payments at the end of 1765 and Roanne at the end of 1766. Mauriac was to pay 1,600 livres, and Charleville, 1,000 livres a year for thirty years. See Actes Royaux (B.N., F 23627 (432 and 471) ) lettres patentes of 20 June and 25 August 1765. Mauriac was to begin to make payments at the end of 1765 and Charleville at the end of 1766.

The calculation is, of course, based on the information contained in the royal legislation cited above.

Charleville, which in these years paid 6,737 livres, apparently overpaid its assessment of 6,000 livres. It is possible that in making this payment the bureau of administration was also paying some of the arrears of the farmers of the benefices. Eu paid exactly 14,000 livres, which was its assessment for these years.

Orléans paid 32,106 of its assessed 35,000 livres; Billom paid 20,147 of its assessed 21,000 livres, and Roanne paid 9,018 of its assessed 10,600 livres.

La Flèche paid 173,311 of its 210,000 livre assessment, while Paris paid 90,750 of its 105,000 livre assessment. The Collège des Bons-Enfants paid 15,000 of its assessed 18,000 livres, while that of Moulins paid 11,893 of its assessed 14,000 livres.

Saint Omer paid 4,000 of its 6,000 livre assessment, Amiens paid 6,000 of its 12,000 livre assessment, Aurillac paid 2,400 of its 8,400 livre reckoning, and Mauriac paid only 1,797 of its 11,200 livre bill.

What I have done to arrive at this conclusion is to compare the average yearly revenue of the benefices of each college when they were administered under the Econome Général (the average annual product of the fermages before the bureau of administration took control of the benefices) with the average yearly amount paid by the bureau of administration to the Econome Général after the bureau had resumed control of
the college's benefices. In most cases the second amount was considerably lower than the first. When I added all the average amounts raised by the fermages and compared that total with the sum of the average amounts sent to the Econome Général by the bureaux of administration, I found again that the second total was considerably less than the first.

54 See A.N., V 7 80 judgments of the commissioners general of 14 January 1786 contain all the information cited here about the Econome Général's activities in 1773-77, unless I have otherwise indicated.

55 See above, Chapter II, pp. 65-79, passim on the payment of Jesuit pensions.

56 Cf. comptes rendus presented by commissioners appointed by the Parlement of Paris 6 August 1762 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122) and A.N., X lb 8942-8953. Part of the commissioners' task was to evaluate the potential revenue of the colleges in the jurisdiction. None of the evidence they had produced by 1764—and we assume the situation was the same throughout France—would support the conclusion that all the Jesuit benefices in France could produce the 400,000 to 500,000 livres per year required in the early period to pay Jesuit pensions.

57 B.N., Coll. Joly de Fleury 1610 ff. 256-259, declaration of the king, 2 April 1764.

58 A.N., F 4 1935 de Boullogne to Jarente de la Bruyere, 14 March 1767.

59 See below, p. 274-5.

60 See above, Chapter V, p. 174 on the creditors' loan.

61 A.N., F 4 1935, the Econome Général's accounts for 1762-72. V 7 78 judgments of the commissioners general of the Economats for 1762-64 refer to a few payments made on the orders of the king to former Jesuit colleges and G 9 47, which contains accounts for 1789 also includes a statement of a similar payment made in 1764.


63 A.N., V 7 80 judgments of the commissioners general of the Economats of Marchal's accounts for 1773-77, given 20 March 1783.

64 A.N., F 4 2680 undated document accompanying Calonne's and Gojard's correspondance with Louis-René Marchal of 1785-86 lists the amount of
the commission his father had received for handling money from the Royal Treasury to be paid in pensions.

65 A.N., V 7 80 judgments of Marchal's accounts for 1773-77 show that over this five year period he paid more money in pensions than the crown had authorized him to pay. Cf. Appendix IX.

66 A.N., A D XVII 23 arrêt du conseil d'état 27 July 1764.


69 A.N., G 9 47 Situation de l'Economat au 1er Novembre 1789, unsigned document, demonstrates that the Economme Général was still administering the payment of Jesuit pensions at the end of 1789. See below, Appendix IX.


71 A.N., F 4 2680 unsigned statement accompanying correspondance of Calonne and Gojard with Marchal de Sainscy 1785-86. And see Appendix IX, part II, below.

72 A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of Economme Général 1768-72.

73 A.N., F 4 1935, corresponance of Jarente de la Bruyère and Marchal de Sainscy with the Control General 1765-72 shows that Marchal continued the practice of applying to the Control for the difference between the amount allotted by the crown in pensions and the amount raised by the régie at least until 1772.

74 See below, Appendix IX, part I.

75 A.N., V 7 80 judgments of commissioners general of the Economats of Marchal's accounts 1773-77, given 20 March 1783.

76 A.N., V 7 80 arrêt du conseil d'état 2 April 1782.

77 A.N., V 7 80 arrêt du conseil d'état 17 February 1787 refers to the acte de cautionnement of 7 March 1782. The first 200,000 livres were put up by his mother and his aunt or sister. The fact that the crown
demanded a caution was probably a precaution, not a sign of distrust, in a year when bankruptcies were "breaking out all over". See above, Chapter IV, pp. 152-5 on Bronod's bankruptcy.

78 A.N., F 4 2680 Calonne to Marchal de Sainscy, 12 June 1785 names the amount (1,460,573 livres 1 sol 1 denier), which had obviously been established sometime between 1782-85.

79 This is what it was to do five years later. The crown presumably might have allowed Louis-Rene to remain in office under surveillance, even if it had suspected his father of dishonesty, so long as there was any hope that he would repay his father's debts. His retention, therefore, should not of itself be regarded as a sign of trust.

80 A.N., V 7 79 judgments of the commissioners general of 20 March 1774 and 6 September 1777. Unfortunately there is no statement of the amount which Roque and Company had previously paid.

81 Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 508=997 Director of the Domain to Cornébize, Receiver (of the Domain), 10 March 1810.

82 None of the references in A.N., V 7 78-80 or F 4 1935 to the Econome Général's accounts suggest that he was responsible for money he did not receive.

83 A.N., V 7 80 judgments of the commissioners general of 14 January 1786.

84 A.N., F 4 1935 correspondance of Jarente de la Bruyère and Marchal de Sainscy 1764-72.

85 The total shown by the commissioners general in A.N., V 7 80 judgment of 14 January 1786 is 1,062,607 livres. It is clause I of the receipts, and is described as reliquat du compte général des revenus des bénéfices des jésuites des années 1768-1772. The total of Marchal's net receipts for 1763-72 shown in F 4 1935 is 1,028,607 livres. The difference of 34,000 livres could easily have been his net receipts from Roque and Company between 1772-77. The reduction of Roque's debt from 214,988 to 150,000 livres did not mean that Roque had actually paid Marchal the difference of 64,988 livres, but, more likely, that he had paid a portion of that amount and provided evidence that the rest had been spent in charges. It was not unusual for charges to amount to more than 50 per cent of gross revenue. Cf. V 7 78 judgments of commissioners general of receipts from 125 benefices in period 1762-64. I have considered the possibility that the sum cited by the commissioners general as the reliquat for 1768-72 was the difference between the revenue allotted by the crown for pensions and the net receipts which the Econome...
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Général applied to the payment of pensions, and that the crown was holding Marchal responsible for the portion that his régie had not paid. I have discarded this hypothesis for two reasons: First, for the crown to have done this would have been contrary to the spirit of the Declaration of the King of 2 April 1764, which allowed only for the Royal Treasury's eventual repayment. And secondly, by 1773 the difference would have been at least 2,273,123 livres, and by 1777 it would have been considerably more than that. This amount is obviously much more than the 1,460,573 livres we are attempting to account for.

86 A.N., V 7 80 judgments of the commissioners general of 14 January 1786 state this fact for the period 1773-77 and, if I am right about the origin of the 1,062,607 livres of clause I of the receipts, imply it for 1763-72.

87 Again, the similarity between the two amounts: 268,703 livres cited in A.N., F 4 1935 and 272,844 livres in V 7 80 judgments of commissioners general of 20 March 1783, may be coincidental, but here, even more than in the case of the accounts for a five year period, there seems to be no other explanation for clause I of the receipts in V 7 80: à cause du debet du compte général des gratifications alimentaires accordées aux jésuites de l'année 1771.

88 A.N., F 4 2680 Calonne to Marchal de Sainscy, 12 June 1785.

89 A.N., F 4 2680 unsigned document accompanying correspondance of Calonne, Gojard, and Marchal de Sainscy for 1785-86.

90 A.N., F 4 2680 unsigned document entitled Régie des Jésuites 1 Janvier 1787.

91 A.N., F 4 2680 Marchal de Sainscy to Gojard, 4 December 1786.

92 A.N., V 7 80 arrêt du conseil d'État, 17 February 1787.

93 A.N., V 7 80 arrêt du conseil d'État, 13 May 1787.

94 Cf. above Chapter IV pp. 150-1 concerning Bronod's salary.

95 A.N., V 7 80 arrêt du conseil d'État, 13 May 1787.

96 A.N., G 9 47 Situation de l'Economat au 1 er Novembre 1789.

97 A.N., V 7 80 arrêt du conseil d'État, 20 May 1787.
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98 See above, p. 253-4.

99 A.N., G 9 47 Situation 1789.

100 A.N., V 7 77 Exercises du Sr. Brière de Mondetour presented to the commissioners general on 19 December 1789. The expenses included 20,000 livres for Brière's own salary and 30,000 livres interest on his 600,000 livre caution.

101 A.N., G 9 47 Situation 1789. See below, Appendix IX.

102 A.N., V 7 77 Exercises. The two colleges which did not apparently make payments in this period were Orléans and the College des Bons-Enfants of Reims.

103 A.N., G 9 47 Situation 1789.

104 A.N., G 9 47 document bearing note, Lu au Roi en présence de M. le Garde des Sceaux à Paris le 15 December 1789. The membership of the new commission is not stated.

105 Archives parlementaires de 1787 à 1860..., première série (1787-99), vols. X-XVII, November 1789-June 1790 (hereafter this collection will be cited as Arch. parlt.).

106 Arch. parlt., vol. XVII, p. 51, 12 July 1790, and J.-B. Duvergier, Collection complète des Lois, Décrets, Ordonnances, Règlements...(Paris, 1825) vol. I, p. 242, 12 July-24 August 1790. (The second or last date is the one on which the king signed the legislation; hereafter this compilation of Revolutionary laws will be cited as Coll. Duvergier.)


109 On 29 August 1792, Borie pointed out that by 2 June 1792, Brière had checked and certified to be accurate 124 accounts of his predecessors. At the same time, Borie also noted that Brière had recently asked for six years in which to go through the Marchals' accounts. It is thus impossible to say how much of the work Brière had finished by this time.
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111 Arch. parlt., vol. LXVIII, pp. 440–2, and pp. 503–4, 8 July 1793, and Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 487-21, circular no. 1724, dated An VIII.

112 Coll. Duvergier, vol. IV, p. 431, and VI, pp. 33–4; 30 August–1 September 1792, and 18–24 July 1793. (The second date is the date on which the Convention issued the law to the public.)
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1 See ed. M.-J. Guillaume, Procès-Verbaux du Comité d'Instruction Publique de la Convention Nationale... (Paris, 1891-1959), 8 vols. (Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France publiés par les soins du ministère de l'instruction publique) on the Committee on Public Instruction which functioned under the Convention.

2 Clearly, for example, the entire membership changed in 1791, when, as a result of the self-denying ordinance of the National Assembly, no member of that body was elected to the Legislative Assembly. It should also be recalled that, despite its violent origins, the National Convention decided as early as 21 September 1792 to keep all the committees and commissions, though not necessarily their membership, created by the Legislative Assembly. Guillaume, Procès-Verbaux, vol. I, p. ii. It also decided that no man should belong to more than one committee.

3 It is not my intention to use this particularly difficult term in any but the narrow sense in which it may be applied to the administration created by the French Revolutionaries. As J. F. Bosher has demonstrated in his monograph, French Finances 1770-1795 from Business to Bureaucracy (Cambridge, 1970), the administrative revolution which took place in France in the period with which this dissertation is concerned, was a change from private to public methods of administering the French state. Until 1787, most of the men who ran the French administration were venal officials who bought their offices and considered the work they did for the state to be literally their own business, carried on for their own profit. After that date, Necker began to work a gradual transformation which was accelerated under the National Assembly and successive assemblies, by which all public officials, including those at the head of the various departments of the administration, became salaried civil servants accountable to public authorities. The transformation involved a process of centralization by which virtually any public servant became responsible to a superior official in a kind of pyramid structure. But more important was the fact that everyone in the public administration became a public servant. To a degree, the new organization and new use of bureaux or special offices made up of all manner of clerks, secretaries, accountants, auditors etc. under an administrative head, collectively doing the work of a department, were the means by which the administrative revolution was carried out. It was the rational organization of bureaux as a public administration which gave the term bureaucratie a new meaning at the end of the eighteenth century. I have used the English word "bureaucracy" to convey this new meaning. Cf. Bosher, French Finances, pp. 307, and 310-11, especially.

4 The possibility of using the property of the church to secure the national debt had existed since 4 August 1789, when the tithe had been abolished. In the same month, several deputies asserted that the property of the church really belonged to the nation. On 12 August,
the Assembly created the Ecclesiastical Committee to look into the matter and to consider what would become of the French church if it lost its lands. For the next six weeks, the Assembly occasionally discussed the possibility of confiscating the church lands. On 2 October 1789, a deputy drew the first parallel between the proposal to seize the church property and the fact that the Jesuits' property had been confiscated twenty-seven years before. The speaker was d'Argentré, the Bishop of Limoges, whose diocese had experienced more of the early problems of the Jesuit confiscation than most because its Jesuit property had been so dispersed. He pointed out that although the Jesuit order had been supposed to be rich, the confiscation of its property had not enabled its enemies to repay the Jesuits' creditors, let alone to realize a profit for themselves or the crown. The confiscation of Jesuit property had not achieved the desired ends. Nor, he said, would the confiscation of all ecclesiastical property in France. A week later, the Bishop of Autun, Talleyrand, argued the opposite case more persuasively, and recommended that, in taking the church's property, the state should guarantee to support the French clergy and members of religious orders. This was a principle which would be embodied in the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in July and August 1790. Needless to say, the Assembly acted on Talleyrand's suggestion. For further clarification of all these matters, see John McManners, *The French Revolution and the Church* (London, 1969), p. 26 n; Alfred Cobban, *A History of Modern France* 3rd. ed. (Harmondsworth, 1963), vol. I, p. 172 (Old Regime and Revolution 1715-1799); Georges Lefebvre, *The French Revolution from its origins to 1793* (London, 1962), p. 167 (trans. from the French by Elizabeth Moss Evanson). See also Arch. parl., vol. VIII, p. 461, and vol. IX, pp. 269 and 398, 12 August, 2 and 10 October 1789.


6 This was the amount intended for a curé; a vicaire des campagnes would get 700 livres and a bishop 20,000 livres a year, exclusive of lodgings. Latreille, *L'Eglise catholique*, vol. II, pp. 77 and 88.


9 Cf. the historiographical essay of Georges Lefebvre entitled "La Vente des biens nationaux", which first appeared in *Revue d'histoire moderne*, 1928, and which is reprinted with the bibliography brought up to 1954 in Georges Lefebvre, *Etudes sur la Révolution française* (Paris, 1954). Among the best monographs on the subject are Marcel Garaud, *La Révolution et la propriété foncière* (Paris, 1959) and
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Charles Girault, Les Biens ecclésiastiques dans la Sarthe à la fin du XVIIIe siècle (Laval, 1953) (B.N., Ld 4 4071). See also Marcel Marion, La Vente des biens nationaux pendant la Révolution (Paris, 1908), and Vialay, La Vente.

10 Ed. Pierre Caron, Recueil de textes législatifs et administratifs concernant les biens nationaux (Paris, 1926), vol. I, introduction (B.N., La 32 800 (9)).

11 Arch. parlt., vol. XII, p. 217, 17 March 1790.

12 Caron, Recueil, vol. I, introduction. The committee was created on 17 March 1790. Arch. parlt., vol. XII, p. 299 contains a list of the eleven commissioners elected 22 March 1790. A further eight were elected on 1 October 1790. Cf. Eugène Déprez, Les Opérations de la vente des biens nationaux organisation générale de direction centrale (Paris, 1907) (B.N., La 32 1005 (1)).


14 Caron, Recueil, vol. I, introduction.


16 Amelot (1760–1824) was the son of a master of requests of the same name. See Bosher, French Finances, p. 270. Déprez, Vente des biens nationaux, p. 491 points out that Amelot had been the intendant of the province of Burgundy from 1786 to 1789 or 1790.

17 Bosher, French Finances, pp. 270–1. Bosher's references are A.N., D VII I Amelot, Mémoire sur l'organisation des bureaux de l'administration de la caisse de l'extraordinaire, ms.; and Camus, Rapport fait par Monsieur Camus au nom des commissaires de l'extraordinaire... 1791, p. 3 (British Museum F 183).

18 Bosher, French Finances, pp. 271 and 330. It was Jean-Barthélemy Le Couteulx de Canteleu who in 1798 was to make the Rapport to the Conseil des anciens which recommended that the remaining recognized creditors of the Jesuits be made creditors of the French state. His report is in Corps législatif, Conseil des Anciens, Rapport... sur la Liquidation des Dettes de la Société des c.-d. Jésuites, 11 germinal An VI (Paris, [1798]) (B.N., Le 45 868). See below, pp. 315–16.

19 Bosher, French Finances, p. 271. Although somewhat dated, one of the most useful accounts of the use of the districts in selling nationalized property is probably Charles Bournisien, "La Vente des biens
Notes, Chapter VII

Part I pp. 292-294


22 It thus clearly included such institutions as the old régime church and adjuncts of the church. It will be recalled that for a time former Jesuits received pensions from the clergy, which, as a body, now no longer had a budget of its own. It would be logical to assume that such pensioners would be eligible to appeal to this new administration. In fact, I have not found evidence that they did so. On the other hand, the remaining creditors of the Jesuits were to fall under the scrutiny of this administration. See below, pp. 301-2.

23 Cf. Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 285=5702, 286=5702, 312=5664, and 504=870 etc. The correspondence of the years 1791-1810 and even to 1825 refers to the Extraordinaire in such a way as to suggest that it was this administration that survived and its director who corresponded with a representative of the Domaine for two decades after the Revolution.


26 Caron, Recueil, vol. I, introduction.


28 Cf. below, pp. 295-6, 302, 309, and 316.

29 Bosher, French Finances, p. 271.

30 Bosher, French Finances, p. 272. Dufresne de Saint Léon had held two offices under a Keeper of the Royal Treasury in the period 1777-88. After 1788 he had been Premier commis des dépêches under Necker. Louis-Valentin Denormandie had formerly been a National Accounting Commissioner.

31 Bosher, French Finances, pp. 272-3. He has described the six kinds of payments in the following terms:
...first, the arrears of the executive departments, that is, the claims of departmental employees for salaries, of tradesmen for settlement of accounts, and of others for compensation....Secondly, there was the liquidation of judicial, military and financial offices, including some 8,000 municipal offices created in 1771, 14,000 notaries, 392 Receveurs particuliers....Thirdly, the financial companies had to be liquidated, mainly the General Farm of Taxes and the Régie générale legally suppressed on 27 March 1791 and the Domains Administration converted into the Régie de l'enregistrement....Fourthly, there were the debts of the clergy who, as an estate or corporation...had borrowed heavily, in part for the purpose of lending to the Crown. Fifthly, the royal pensions were in arrears and although many were abolished as being quite unjustified, others were owing to employees, particularly to some 35,000 retired employees of the General Farm, Régie générale and Domains administration. Finally, the liquidation service had to settle all claims on the feudal domains of both Church and Crown, including the économates of royal management of vacant benefices.

To pay all these legitimate debts would cost nearly one billion livres.

32 Coll. Duvergier, vol. II, p. 366, decree of 8, 12, and 14 April-27 April 1791, article IV: L’Assemblée nationale attribue à la municipalité et au département de Paris, exclusivement, toutes les opérations à faire par les corps administratifs...pour ce qui reste à acquitter des dettes des ci-devant jésuites. Initially the administrator of the Caisse de l’Extraordinaire was involved in the proceedings. Cf. later statement in same article of the decree.

33 Coll. Duvergier, vol. VI, p. 34, decree of 18 July 1793.

34 Arch. de la Seine, Series DQ 10, subtitled Domaine. Cf. Bibliography for dossiers consulted.

35 Examples: in An V Rectoux was Directeur of the Domaines and in An X Gentil and then Eparvier were Directeurs of the Enregistrement. In An XIII, Eparvier was called the Directeur des Domaines à Paris.

36 Examples: in An VI, Cornébise was Receveur des domaines et d’enregistrement, and in An VII, there was a Régisseur de l’Enregistrement et du Domaines Nationaux (sic).

37 By An XIII (1805-1806), all the officials seem to be described as receveur, directeur, or inspecteur of the Domaines for specific arrondissements or for the Département de la Seine.
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1 On 2 November 1789, on the same day as it approved the principle of confiscating the property of the French church, the Assembly voted in favour of the proposal of Alexandre Lameth to prolong indefinitely the vacation of the parlements of France. The chambres des vacations assumed their functions until, a year later, the Assembly formally suppressed the parlements. Alfred Cobban, "The Parlements of France in the eighteenth century", in Aspects of the French Revolution (New York, [c. 1968]), p. 82.

2 Bernard Plongeron, Les Réguliers de Paris devant le serment constitutionnel, sens et conséquences d'une option 1789-1801 (Paris, 1964), passim, makes several references to the seven former Jesuits who were in Paris during the Revolution, but says nothing of their reaction to this development. Siron's letters to the Ecclesiastical Committee and to the President of the National Assembly of 18 February 1791 and 1 April 1791, though they make no mention of Jesuits living in Paris, make it clear that the remaining Jesuits, wherever they were, followed the events of the Revolution with interest. Cf. A.N., D XIX 82 no. 647 and 88 no. 712.

3 From 1762 to 1767, the Jesuits had always been referred to by their enemies in the Parlement, and especially by Rolland d'Erceville, as the "soi-disant ci-devant" Jesuits, although after 1767, even he ceased to use it. See Rolland, Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages, passim (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122). After 1790, the Parlement of Paris is referred to in the papers of the Revolution as the "ci-devant" Parlement. Cf. A.N., H 2180.

4 That is, the doubling of the representatives of the Third Estate so that its membership in the Estates General of 1789 should be numerically equal to the combination of the first two estates.

5 Rolland D'Erceville, de l'Averdy, and perhaps even Roussel de la Tour died on the scaffold in 1793-94. Terray died in 1778 but had a nephew who, possibly because of his connection with the Abbé, was executed in 1794. See Michaud, Biographie universelle, vol. III, p. 112-13; vol. XXXVI, pp. 635-6; vol. XXXVIII, pp. 474-6; and vol. XLV, pp. 175-90. A leading creditor, Cazotte, and former Jesuits were also executed under the Terror.

6 Rouhette, the chief lawyer of the Union of Creditors; Lambert, its Procureur in the Parlement of Paris; Doillot, its surviving Notaire Séquestre; and Bouclier, the last Curateur of Jesuit property each gave account to the Revolutionaries and one or all of them also reported on Bronod's affairs. To this extent they served the new régime, although, as we shall see, Doillot suffered under the new bureaucracy. See below, pp. 300-1.
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7 Desenne, Mémoire (B.N., Ld 39 590).

8 See above, Chapter V, p. 239 for a reference to Desenne's criticism of unions of creditors.

9 Rouhette, Mémoire (B.N., Ld 39 591)

10 I have discovered no indication that the Assembly disbelieved Rouhette. He was not punished or threatened with punishment and he later co-operated with the bureaux under the municipality and department of Paris to help them discover the state of the repayment of Jesuit debts and of the indebtedness of various administrators of former Jesuit property to the new régime.


Au moyen des règles qui viennent d'être établie pour le paiement des créanciers dont il s'agit, les unions et directions formées part quelques-uns d'eux, notamment celles formées pour les biens des jésuites, sont et demeurent dès-à-présent dissoutes et comme non avenues...

The article concluded by ordering all provincial representatives of the Union or anyone holding any of its property or records to hand them over to the directoires des départements.

12 Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, pp. 427-40, decree of 23 and 28 October-5 November 1790, Titre I, De la distinction des biens nationaux à vendre dès-à-présent, et de l'administration générale, art. 27, p. 430, in effect gave all former administrators of the Union until 1 January 1791 to submit their accounts. This part of the decree, like the others, was taken seriously by the Paris bureaux under the Bureau de Liquidation. Cf. Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 312=5664, memorandum dated 28 September 1792.

13 Coll. Duvergier, vol. II, p. 366, decree of 8, 12, and 14 April 1791-27 April 1791. Décret relatif aux créanciers des maisons corps, commuées et établissements suprimés, Titre I Des Créances exigibles art. 4, p. 366:

L'Assemblée nationale attribuée à la municipalité et au département de Paris exclusivement, toutes les opérations à faire par les corps administratifs et tout qui est prescrit par l'article 24 du titre IV [of the decree of 23 and 28 October 1790] pour ce qui reste à acquitter des dettes des ci-devant jésuites.
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The rest of the terms by which the municipality and department of Paris were to carry out their new functions followed. See below, pp. 314-18 for a discussion of the new solutions which the Paris authorities attempted to use in order to see to it that the creditors were repaid.

14 Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 312=5664 passim. See especially [Bachellery] to Director 2 Messidor An IX (20 June 1801).

15 These officials are identified in note 6, above. Doillot was apparently replaced by a Fleury during the first years of the Revolution.

16 Cf. above, Chapter V, pp. 158-62 on the Union and the Union's officials.

17 Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 312=5664 papers of Régisseurs de l'Enregistrement et du Domaine National to Nectoux, Directeur à Paris, Paris, 6 Thermidor An IV (24 July 1796) refer to the request of the Minister.

18 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 312=5664 Bachellery, Vérificateur de l'Administration du Domaine national to Girard, Directeur, Paris, 17 Floréal An IX (6 May 1801).

19 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 312=5664 receipt of Trésorier de l'Extraordinaire signed on behalf of Lecouteux by Messelin of 8 November 1792 (An I). A document of 28 September 1792 emanating from the Bureau de Liquidation makes it clear that members of that bureau or lesser bureaux under it had already undertaken to examine Doillot's accounts. There is no indication that these early investigations revealed anything amiss.

20 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 312=5664 Régisseur de l'Enregistrement et du Domaine National to Nectoux, Directeur à Paris, Paris, 6 Thermidor An IV (24 July 1796) and further correspondence from the rest of that year and the An V. The Agence de l'Enregistrement et des Domaines stated that the 301,522 livres 17 sols 1 denier in question were the amount in Doillot's caisse on 10 December 1790 when, according to the decree of 5 November 1790, Doillot had presented his accounts and they had been transcribed into the registers of the municipality of Paris.

21 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 312=5664 long correspondence of the An IV and An V consisting mainly of statements and letters of Doillot to the Minister of Finance. See especially the document headed Département de la Seine, Agence de l'Enregistrement et des Domaines Nationaux, 3 Ventose An IV (21 March 1796) followed by a pathetic statement made by Doillot himself.

22 See above, Chapter IV, p. 121.
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23 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 504=870 undated document of An IX or X (1800-1801) included with the correspondence of Girard and Bachellery. Also referred to in DQ 10 312=5664 passim.

24 See above, Chapter IV, p. 153 on Le Pot d'Auteuil.


26 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 504=870 Directeur des Domaines Nationaux, Girard to Vérificateur, Bachellery, Paris, 17 Floréal An IX (6 May 1801).

27 Cf. above, Chapter V, p. 205-41, especially pp. 236-41.

28 See above, Chapter IV, pp. 147-51 regarding Bronod and Chapter V, p. 160 for an earlier reference to Doillot, who had been in office since 1763. I have found no references whatsoever to any hint of fraud in Doillot's affairs before the Revolution.

29 Arch. de Saeine 312=5664 Doillot to Minister of Finances, 26 Ventose An IV (16 March 1796) and references contained therein to his earlier statements of 1792-93.

30 Cf. above, Chapter VI, pp. 277-80 on Louis-René Marchal de Sainscy's failure to pay all his father's debts and Chapter IV, pp. 152-5 on Bronod's bankruptcy, from which, so far as I can determine, the state or the Union of Creditors recovered very little. On the last subject, see Chapter V, pp. 182-3.

31 None of its officials, including the last Marchal de Sainscy, had ever been threatened in the way that Doillot was threatened by the Revolutionary bureaucracy.

32 Arch. parl., vol. X, p. 669, Lanjuinais' speech of 18 December 1789. He was, in fact, criticizing a motion of Treilhard on the sale of church property. Lanjuinais warned the Assembly against taking on too great a responsibility for the administration of church property and cited the Economats as an example of a costly administration which the Assembly should avoid duplicating. Lanjuinais wished the districts to assume the major responsibility for all ecclesiastical property, including that en Economats.

33 Arch. parl., vol. XI, pp. 438-9, Treilhard's speech of 5 February 1790 proposed the promulgation of a decree on holders of benefices or
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pensions on the Economats or clergy in general. The decree adopted was a modification of his proposal.

34 Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, p. 99, decree of 5-12 February 1790 (royal legislation issued as lettres patentes), Décret portant que tous possesseurs de bénéfices ou de pensions sur des biens ecclésiastiques quelconques, seront tenus d'en faire leur déclaration....art. 1 makes it clear that the decree applied to holders of benefices or pensions controlled by the Economats.

35 See above, Chapter VI, pp. 281-5.

36 Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, p. 242, decree of 12-18 July 1790. Décret portant que l'économe général continuera, pendant l'année 1790, la règle qui lui est confiée. The decree was approved by the Assembly on the recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Committee.

37 See below, pp. 310-14 for a discussion of the payment of Jesuit pensions during the Revolution.


41 Assemblée Nationale...Comptabilité (B.N., Le 33 3G) contains Borie's Rapport of 29 August 1792. It is also reproduced in Arch. parlt., vol. XLIX, pp. 100-2.

42 Cf. above, Chapter VI.


44 Arch. parlt., vol. LXVIII, pp. 441-2, and 503-4. Borie made his second report on 8 July 1793 and the Assembly embodied some of his
suggestions in a decree on 10 July 1793. The decree of 10 July 1763 is also in Coll. Duvergier, vol. VI, pp. 13-14.

45 Arch. partl., vol. LXVIII, p. 440 n., added to the original text by Borie. In the note, Borie observed:

Il est bon au surplus d'instruire la Convention, que tandis qu'on croyait que la caisse [of the Economats] était débitrice de 400,000 livres du cautionnement et que la loi du 29 aout [1792] basait la respectabilité sur le cautionnement, le règisseur [Brière de Mondetour] a avoué en dernier lieu, au comité qu'il était remboursé de son cautionnement et que c'était Lessard qui, s'y était prêté. On ne conçoit pas comment cela a pu s'opérer sans fraude, et il sera bien important de vérifier, lors du jugement du compte, de l'époque du paiement du cautionnement, et de celle ou on a cessé d'en faire payer les intérêts.

The references to the caution reveal that Brière had been repaid the amount which he had put up in order to gain his office in 1787. I have not been able to find out whether a thorough analysis of even the last accounts of the Economé Général was carried out by the Revolutionaries.

46 Coll. Duvergier, Table générale des lois, refers to a decree of 17 Ventôse An II (7 March 1794) which ordered that an end be put to pensions établies sur les économats et le clergé, and to a decree of 28 Messidor An III (16 July 1795) on the mode de la comptabilité du receveur général et des préposés particuliers des économats.

47 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 487=21 circular no. 1724 from the Régisseur de l'Enregistrement et du Domaine national to departmental directors of 3 Nivose AN VIII (23 December 1799) includes a reference to a circular of 12 March 1793 regarding Brière de Mondetour's accounts. The decrees of 29 August 1792 and 10 July 1793 make it clear that the Bureau de Liquidation was involved, too.

48 See above, pp. 305-6.

49 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 487=21 circular no. 1724 of 3 Nivose AN VIII (23 December 1799).

50 See above, Chapter VI, p. 276. Also A.N., V 7 80 proces-verbal of 1789, which is an inventory of Roque's debts.

51 See A.N., V 7 79-80 passim regarding the old régime investigation into the matter. The Revolutionary papers on the Roque affair are to be found in Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 285=5702 and DQ 10 286-5702, which are almost exclusively devoted to the bureaux investigations of 1793-1810, and DQ 10 508=997, which deal with the period after 1810.
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52 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 285=5702 Vérificateur des Domaines, Pierret to Directeur des Domaines, 29 Thermidor An VII (16 August 1799) contains reference to this amount. By 10 July 1810, the Receveur des Domaines, Cornébise and the Directeur des Domaines had apparently agreed that because of the inflation caused by the use of assignats and because of the difficulties of ever recovering the money after this date, the whole debt should be abandoned. See Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 508=997 and DQ 10 285=5702 for copies of this correspondence, which also includes an interesting reference to the fact that since the trésor public and the Domaine sont également [des caisses] du gouvernement, they should not have been working at cross purposes to recover the money owed by Roque to the Economats. Apparently Roque's notary, Lambot, had paid at least some of the money owed to Roque's creditors (though not necessarily that owed to the Economats) to the Public Treasury.

53 Admittedly, they had not found anyone whom they could compel to pay the Economé Général's debts as they had compelled Doillot to pay the Union of Creditors' debts. But they did carry on an unremitting search for Roque's old associates or their heirs and found Roque's solicitor whom they tried to compel to pay his debts. They also tried to force payments by old local leaseholders (who had held Jesuit benefices from the Roque company) for leases of 1767-72, which the records of the Economé Général of that period show were in fact paid at the time. Cf. Arch. de la Seine DQ 10=5702 and DQ 10 286=5702 passim, and A.N., F 4 1935 accounts of Marchal de Sainscy 1763-73. The men who held benefices belonging to the College of Charleville were especially unlucky.

54 See below, pp. 311-14.
1 The decree of 30 August-1 September 1792, Décret relatif aux biens des abbayes et communautés étrangères is summarized in Coll. Duvergier, vol. IV, p. 431. The significant provision is:  
...que tous les biens...qui proviennent des bénéfices des ci-devant Jésuites, et qui sont situés dans la dominion française, soient vendus au profit de l'Etat à l'instar des domaines nationaux.

Any property making up Jesuit benefices which had not automatically been taken after the promulgation of the decree of 2 November 1789 was now to be seized.

2 The decree of 18-24 July 1793 is in Coll. Duvergier, vol. VI, pp. 33-4, Décret relatif à la régie et vente des biens des ci-devant Jésuites. The significant article is article I which states:  
Les biens des ci-devant Jésuites seront régis, vendus et payés comme les domaines nationaux.

The decree went on to instruct district administrators to keep separate accounts for the sale and payment of Jesuit property, but what is more important about the remaining nine articles is that they ensure that all creditors of Jesuit property should apply to the Directeur Général of the Liquidation, and that all private administrators of any remaining Jesuit property were to cease their functions on 1 August 1793. Thereafter, remaining Jesuit property was to be administered by a special bureau of the Domaines nationaux.


4 Any movable property once belonging to Jesuit colleges, noviciates, professed houses, and missions which had been taken over by other parts of the church after 1762 was nationalized by the decree of 19 November 1789, along with most of the property of the French church.

5 See above, pp. 295-6.

6 Cf. B.N., F.F. 10.568 Etat des anciens Jésuites du Royaume, 1 June 1787, with later additions made in 1788, and A.N., G 8 210, 219, and 617 Agence du Clergé, Pensions, which contain similar lists. My estimates are based on the complete list of 1787 corrected to show the few deaths which occurred in 1788. I have assumed that the mortality rate of 1788-89 was similar to that of 1787-88.

7 Cf. Vivier, Status Assistentiae Galliae, passim, frequent references to Jesuits "living privately" and Hamy, Chronologie, passim.

8 The lists of Jesuits receiving pensions in 1762-89 contain no reference to men living as far away as White Russia, although, for a
time, they might legally have lived outside France and still draw a pension. See above, Chapter II, pp. 72-9.

9 Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, p. 101, decree of 10 (19)-26 February 1790, Décret qui fixe le traitement des religieux qui sortirent de leurs maisons. The matter was certainly discussed in the assembly before the decree was drafted. Cf. Arch. parlt., vol. XI, p. 646, speech given by de Coulmiers, 19 February 1790 suggested all that was embodied in the decree.

10 The decree of 10 (19)-26 February 1790 stated that members of religious orders who were under fifty were to receive 900 livres a year; and those over seventy, 1,200 livres a year. By 1790, there were no former Jesuits who had qualified for pensions in 1762 who were under fifty.

11 The relevant provision of the decree stated:

Les ci-devant Jésuites résidant en France, et qui ne possèdent pas en bénéfice ou en pension sur l'État un revenu égal à celui qui est accordé aux autres religieux de la même classe recevront le complément de ladite somme.

The fact that the state, in law if not in fact, was prepared to assume this responsibility explains the repeated demands members of the Assembly made of the pensioners of the Economats to declare the amount of their pensions. Example: Arch. parlt., vol. XI, p. 438, speech by Treilhard of 5 February 1790. The outline of a law on this subject is in Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, p. 99, décret of 5-12 February 1790, Décret portant que tous possesseurs de bénéfices ou de pensions sur bénéfices ou sur les biens ecclésiastiques quelconques, seront tenus d'en faire leur déclaration....

12 This would have hardly been surprising, since, according to the law of 19 February, Jesuits were entitled to up to 1,000 livres or 1,200 livres, yet on 19 May 1790, the Assembly decided that the Economats, in paying pensions for 1789 should pay no more than 600 livres to a single claimant. Cf. Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, p. 178, 19 May 1790, Décret qui ordonne le paiement sur les économats jusqu'à la somme de 600 livres.

13 Arch. parlt., vol. XVII, p. 51, Chasset's speech on behalf of the Ecclesiastical Committee, 12 July 1790.

14 None, however, was to receive more than 1,000 livres for a whole year. Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, p. 228 decree of 27 June 1790-11 February 1791 Décret relatif aux pensions.... Some state pensioners lost their pensions according to this law, but the Jesuits retained theirs.
Notes, Chapter VII

Part III pp. 311-313


16 Arch. parlt., vol. XVII, p. 444, Camus' speech of 31 July 1790.

17 See above, Chapter II, p. 78 for a description of the terms on which the clergy paid its supplements.

18 See above, pp. 303-8 for a description of the suppression of the Economats. By a decree of 24 July-24 August 1790, referred to in Coll. Duvergier, vol. I, p. 279, in the decree of 11-24 August 1790, some of the other pensioners of the Economats became pensioners of the state. The law did not apply to the Jesuits, who remained pensioners of the Economats for the rest of 1790.

19 On 9 January 1791, Camus, in the name of the Committee on Pensions affirmed that Jesuit pensions due to be paid on the Economats and the clergy would be paid for 1790. See Arch. parlt., vol. XXII, p. 103, 9 January 1791. It is in A.N., D XIX 82 no. 647 Siron to Ecclesiastical Committee, 18 February 1791 and DXIX 88 no. 712 Siron to Ecclesiastical Committee, 1 April 1791 and the replies of that Committee of 15 March 1791 and post-1 April 1791 that the involvement of the Public Treasury is most clearly pointed out.

20 A.N., D XIX 82 no. 647 Siron to Ecclesiastical Committee 18 February 1791 and its reply of 15 March 1791.

21 A.N., D XIX 88 no. 712 Siron to Ecclesiastical Committee 1 April 1791 and its undated reply scribbled in the margin of Siron's letter.

22 On 7 August 1792 the Legislative Assembly issued a decree dictating the amount of pensions to be paid to nuns. Needless to say, the amount was considerably less than that formerly authorized to be paid to members of men's religious orders. See Arch. parlt., vol. XLVII, p. 545. This is the last reference I have found to the payment of pensions to any kind of religious.

23 Cambon suppressed the budget des cultes, after a struggle which had lasted two years, on 18 September 1794. Lepointe, L'Eglise et l'Etat, p. 78.

24 Hamy, Chronologie.

25 Unfortunately, the only copy of Hamy's Chronologie available in
the B.N. was missing the last seven to ten pages. It is thus impossible
to tell exactly how many Jesuits' lives he traced. The extant pages
tell the story of several dozen Jesuits, of whom all but seventeen died
before the French Revolution. A handful of those who died before
1789, died in foreign countries. Some of those seventeen survivors
eventually died in the diocese of their birth, thereby suggesting that
they had been trying to conform to the Revolutionaries' laws on the
payment of pensions by the districts in which former Jesuits were
domiciled. Plongeron, *Les Réguliers de Paris*, lists seven former
Jesuits who were in Paris in the early phases of the Revolution.
Similarly, the *Catalogus Sociorum et Officiorum Societatis Jesu on
Gallia 1814-1818* ([Rome], n.d.) (A.R.S.J.), lists the seven Jesuits
who returned in 1814. Legally, under the old régime, Jesuits living
outside France could receive pensions on the *Economats*, provided they
had an attorney in the kingdom. See above, Chapter II, pp. 72-9. The
Revolutionaries apparently made no such provision for any members of
religious orders or congregations, and it is most unlikely that any of
the seven had received pensions during the Revolution.

26 None of the sources on the Union of Creditors or the completion
of its affairs indicates how many creditors remained to be paid or
how much money they sought. Neither Rouhette's *Mémoire* of 1790 (B.N.,
Ld 39 591), nor *Corps Légalisatifs, Rapport* (B.N., Le 45 868), nor Arch.
de la Seine, papers emanating from the various *bureaux* concerned,
includes any kind of specific statement about the creditors of the
Jesuits and the money owed to them. In 1801, the *Domaines* did prepare
a statement of all the money still owed to the Jesuit order. See
Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 312=5664 and DQ 10 504=870. There is no
indication that a similar statement dealing with the creditors of the
Jesuits was ever prepared.

27 See above, p. 299.

28 See above, p. 300. The Parisian noviciate and professed house
still remained to be sold for the creditors and they still had rights
to considerable colonial property. See above, Chapter V, pp. 204 and
236. See also Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 312=5664 several documents
dating from 1800 or 1801 describing the extent of the creditors' rights
to colonial property.

29 Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 312=5664 papers of the *Bureau de Liquidation*.

30 Cf. especially Arch. de la Seine DQ 10 285=5702 papers from the
relevant *bureaux* of the 1er and 2ème arrondissements.

See above, p. 309.
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32 Cf. the case of Doillot, the former Notaire Séquestre of the Union of Creditors whose case caused so much concern among the Paris bureaux through much of the Revolution. See above, pp. 300-3.

33 Lecouteulx was Jean-Barthélemy Lecouteulx, a député from the department of the Seine and formerly a Treasurer General of the Caisse de l'Extraordinaire, who had been a banker under the old régime. He was often called Le Couteulx de Canteleu and had been a member of the Conseil des Anciens since September 1795 and secretary of the Conseil since 27 January 1796. He continued to be active and to be recognized for his services under the Consulate, Empire, and Restoration. See Bosher, French Finances, p. 330.


35 See above, Chapter V, pp. 205-41 for a description of this document and earlier use to which it was put.


37 Duvergier, Collection, vol. X, pp. 290-291, Decree of 11 Germinal An 6 (31 March 1798) Loi qui détermine le mode de liquidation des créanciers de la société des ci-devant Jésuites. In the law, any creditor who had received the payments of various percentages of his capital and interest according to the schedule established by the Union of Creditors was considered to be a normal case and did not need to produce further evidence in support of his claim. Anyone in an irregular situation (who had received more or less than the schedule suggested he should do) had to produce the certificate referred to in Lecouteulx's speech.

38 Certainly Arch. de la Seine, series DQ 10, papers of the various bureaux involved contains no indication that they repaid any.

39 The relevant documents in the Arch. de la Seine, series DQ 10 stop at 1824 or 1825.

40 Arch. de la Seine, DQ 10 508=997 Directeur des Domaines to Cornébize, Receveur, 10 March 1810. The director was referring to a state of affairs that existed in the An IV (1796).
1 *Catalogus Sociorum... in Gallia 1814-1818* (A.R.S.J.), title page bears the text from St. John's Gospel VI, 12: *Colligite quae superaverunt fragmenta ne pereant.*
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Appendix I  An Eighteenth century map showing the location of major Jesuit institutions in France

The map on the following page is a photocopy reduction of Carte de l'Assistance de France, divisée en cinq grandes Provinces, où sont compris tous les Collèges, Noviciats, Séminaires, Maisons professes, Missions, et Résidences de la Cie de Jésus..., n.p. [1706 with later additions] (B.N., Ld 39 362).
Appendix II  A Description of Jesuit institutions in the jurisdiction of
the Parlement of Paris on the eve of the confiscation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Date and nature of foundation</th>
<th>Number of attached benefices</th>
<th>Nature of studies pursued</th>
<th>Highest known student enrolment and that of 1762</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aire</td>
<td>1612 (A) none</td>
<td>GHR</td>
<td>230 (1660) 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>1604 (D) 9</td>
<td>GHRPT</td>
<td>1,500 (1629) --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême</td>
<td>1622 (A) 1e</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>450 (1720) 275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras (p)</td>
<td>1603 (A) none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>200 (1641) --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac</td>
<td>1619 (D) 3</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>400 (1629) --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre</td>
<td>1622 (B) none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>-- -- 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-le-Duc</td>
<td>1615 (A) none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>180 (1754) 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béthune (n)</td>
<td>1621 (D) none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>300 -- --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom</td>
<td>1558 (B) 1</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>1,500 (1610-25) F --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>1623 (A) 2</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>239 (1627) --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges (p) (U)</td>
<td>1572 (D) 2</td>
<td>GHRPT</td>
<td>-- -- 900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>1618 (A) none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>650 (1618-24) 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville (n)</td>
<td>1612 (C) 1</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>266 (1629) c100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
<td>1618 (D) none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>300 (1680) --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferrand (p) (n)</td>
<td>1634 (C) none</td>
<td>GHRPT</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>1653 (C) 1</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>200 -- --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>1581 (C) 4</td>
<td>GHRPTg</td>
<td>440 (1627) --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td>1637 (D) 2</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>167 (1750) c 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin (n)</td>
<td>1613 (D) none</td>
<td>GHR</td>
<td>300 (1613) --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche (p) (n)</td>
<td>1603 (C) 6</td>
<td>GHRPT</td>
<td>1,400 (1606) c400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres</td>
<td>1630 (A) 2</td>
<td>GHRPTg</td>
<td>281 (1690) 207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laon</td>
<td>1730 (B) none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>1629 (C) 1</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>-- -- c100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes, indicated by elevated letters, are at the end of the appendix.

Key:

--- Information not known
(A) Municipal council
(B) Diocesan bishop
(C) King or prince
(D) Layman
(E) Jesuits (own initiative)
(U) Connected to local University
(p) pensionnat
(n) New (completely new foundation)

G Grammar
H Humanities
R Rhetoric
P Philosophy
M Mathematics
T Theology
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Date of foundation</th>
<th>Number of attached benefices</th>
<th>Nature of studies pursued</th>
<th>Highest known student enrolment and that of 1762^d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyon: La Trinité (p)</td>
<td>1565 (A)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CHRPMT</td>
<td>1,200 (1604) 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre-Dame (n)</td>
<td>1630 (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GHR</td>
<td>-- -- 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mâcon</td>
<td>1650 (E)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins (p)</td>
<td>1604 (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>412 (1626) --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevers</td>
<td>1572 (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>381 (1626) --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans (n)</td>
<td>1617 (E)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHRP</td>
<td>800 (1623) 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (p) (n)</td>
<td>1560 (B)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GHRPMT</td>
<td>3,000 (1687) 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers (2p)</td>
<td>1607 (A)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GHRPT, GHRP</td>
<td>800 -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims (p) (n)</td>
<td>1603 (D)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GHRPMT</td>
<td>924 (1629) --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne (n)</td>
<td>1611 (D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHRP, GHRPT</td>
<td>106 (1660) --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Flour</td>
<td>1643 (A)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>GHRP, GHRPT</td>
<td>350 -- c 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallon</td>
<td>1568 (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GHRPT</td>
<td>680 (1597) 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (n)</td>
<td>1593 (D)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>GHR</td>
<td>150 (1670) c 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>1623 (B)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>GHRP, GHRPT</td>
<td>250 (1658) 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>1635 (B)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GHRP, GHRPT</td>
<td>-- -- 800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
--- Information not known
(A) Municipal council
(B) Diocesan bishop
(C) King or prince
(D) Layman
(E) Jesuits (own initiative)
(U) connected to local university
(p) pensionnat
(n) new (completely new foundation)

G Grammar
H Humanities
R Rhetoric
P Philosophy
M Mathematics
T Theology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesuit residences</th>
<th>Date of foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guéret</td>
<td>1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoise</td>
<td>1614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noviciates</th>
<th>Date of foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professed House</th>
<th>Date of foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Mission</th>
<th>Date of foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bapaume</td>
<td>1636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminaries served by Jesuits</th>
<th>Date on which Jesuits assumed responsibility for seminary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevers</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>1716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Notes

a Unless otherwise stated, the information in the chart is based on Delattre Etablissements, 5 vols. This work is arranged alphabetically according to the location of the establishment in question.

b For consistency, I have in this chart cited the date given by writers of the articles on individual Jesuit establishments in Delattre, Etablissements. These are not always the same as the dates used by the map-maker whose work is reproduced as Appendix I, but are probably more correct. The discrepancy exists because there was often a lapse of time between the decision to found a Jesuit college and the signing of the necessary contracts.

c This column is based on A. N., F 4 1935 Etat des recouvrements, the accounts of the Econome Général submitted to the Contrôle Général 1762-1767, unless otherwise stated.

d Unless otherwise indicated, the date in parentheses following the number indicates the year in which the highest known enrolment occurred, if this information is stated in Delattre, Etablissements. Unfortunately, few contributors to that collection have dealt with this question (or any other) in a systematic fashion, and there is no way of knowing whether the figures and years they cite, which I have also cited, are the highest recorded enrolment of a given college. Allowing for the obvious pro-Jesuit proclivities of the contributors (all of whom were Jesuits), I have assumed that they have cited the highest available figures. The obvious conclusion is that most colleges had more students in the seventeenth century than in the eighteenth.

e A. N., F 4 1935 Etat des recouvrements makes no mention of Angoulême's priory, but it is referred to in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939), in Rolland's compte rendu on Jesuit property in Angoulême given on 14 June 1763.


In the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, a full four-year course in theology was taught only in the colleges of Paris, La Flèche, Bourges, Amiens, Poitiers, Clermont-Ferrand, Lyons, and Reims. The other colleges which included theology in their curriculum offered only the first one, two, or three years of the course.
Appendix III  The Financial condition of Jesuit institutions in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris at the time of the confiscation**

In the following table, the financial statements prepared by Jesuits, municipal authorities, officials of the bailliages and sénéchaussées, and the Parlement's Commissioners are set forth. In general, the figures for the years before 1762 come from the triennial reports sent by Jesuit procureurs to their superiors in Rome; those for the years after 1762 come from the comptes rendus prepared by the Parlement's Commissioners (and are indicated thus: *); and those for the year 1762 come either from the reports prepared by the Jesuits in execution of the Parlement's or crown's orders of 1761 or from the reports prepared by the local authorities in execution of similar orders. When two sets of figures are presented for 1762, those of the Jesuits precede those of the local authorities. Moreover, for 1762, the Jesuits' figures are underlined; the local authorities' are not. All amounts are in livres tournois.

The various kinds of Jesuit institutions are separated into categories in this chart. When a college sponsored annual missions, the financial statement for that mission follows that of the college, however, and the word "mission" is abbreviated "miss." An approximate figure is indicated in this way (for example): c20,000. Each figure pertains to a single year, and the "Number of Jesuits" column refers first to the number of Jesuits fed by annual revenues shown and then to the number of Jesuits who Jesuit authorities thought could be fed by the net revenue in question. Finally: the amounts indicated are taken from existing statements and are not always arithmetically verifiable! Not all statements made by the various authorities in question were complete, and the chart is hence incomplete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Active (Credits)</th>
<th>Passive (Debts)</th>
<th>No. of Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1765</td>
<td>8,681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>1740 17,705</td>
<td>6,923</td>
<td>10,782</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td>10,585</td>
<td>21/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757 20,994</td>
<td>8,364</td>
<td>12,629</td>
<td>13,189</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,555</td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763 25,074</td>
<td>4,957</td>
<td>c20,000</td>
<td>11,597</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême</td>
<td>1740 6,000</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758 7,498</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763 6,584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,635</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras</td>
<td>1740 12,393</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>9,985</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>c3,000</td>
<td>18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757 15,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>c6,000</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1764 15,503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The footnotes, indicated by elevated letters, will be found at the end of the appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Active (Credits)</th>
<th>Passive (Debts)</th>
<th>No. of Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>7,145</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>4,678</td>
<td>6,833</td>
<td>14,210</td>
<td>16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>8,426</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>16,866</td>
<td>15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>8,155</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>5,383</td>
<td></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7,516</td>
<td>9,218</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>9,546</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>8,730</td>
<td>9,854</td>
<td>4,469</td>
<td>16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,857</td>
<td>14,856</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>8,649</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>5,599</td>
<td>18,921</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-le-Duc</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>4,059</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>6,413</td>
<td>5,326</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béthune</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1765</td>
<td>10,623</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>8,282</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>12,129</td>
<td>4,526</td>
<td>7,603</td>
<td>21,885</td>
<td>12,430</td>
<td>26/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>23/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>14,015</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>10,746</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>11,756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,452</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>3,591</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>12,104</td>
<td>9/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>16,055</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td>5,922</td>
<td>19,832</td>
<td>24/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>17,065</td>
<td>11,090</td>
<td>5,169</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>18/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1764</td>
<td>16,883</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>27,471</td>
<td>14/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marne</td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td>437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>6,266</td>
<td>5,518</td>
<td>23,964</td>
<td>14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Gross Revenue</td>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>Active (Credits)</td>
<td>Passive (Debts)</td>
<td>No. of Jesuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>7,324</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>6,777</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>7,757</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>7,189</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>16/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>7,034</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1764</td>
<td>10,117</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,536</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>4,896</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>5,384</td>
<td>12/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>6,313</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>10,382</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>6,082</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>13/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>11,333</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>8,895</td>
<td>19,878</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>9,960</td>
<td>35,618</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>21,138</td>
<td>9/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>16,892</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,146</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>4,929</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>16,815</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>6,217</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>7,252</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1764</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>9,340</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>7,340</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>c6,000</td>
<td>c2,000</td>
<td>c1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td></td>
<td>c2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>8,464</td>
<td>4,609</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>5,247</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>6,443</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td>5,314</td>
<td>5,297</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1765</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>59,521</td>
<td>22,558</td>
<td>36,963</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>71/71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>64,728</td>
<td>26,879</td>
<td>37,849</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>80/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>60,901</td>
<td>35,179</td>
<td>25,724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>41,788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Gross Revenue</td>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>Active (Credits)</td>
<td>Passive (Debts)</td>
<td>No. of Jesuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>10,318</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>9,144</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>10,648</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>9,245</td>
<td>6,789</td>
<td>12,075</td>
<td>10/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miss.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laon</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>98,980</td>
<td>20/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>[16,500]</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>14,507</td>
<td>4,873</td>
<td>9,634</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>7,127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>14,677</td>
<td>9,571</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>La Trinité</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>58,657</td>
<td>15,743</td>
<td>42,914</td>
<td>57,700</td>
<td>48,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>347,687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre-Dame</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>8,786</td>
<td>4,714</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>188,220</td>
<td>14/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>7,672</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,098</td>
<td>14/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>8,289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td></td>
<td>56,266</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mâcon</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>4,612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1762</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>11,098</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>6,238</td>
<td>7,863</td>
<td>6,208</td>
<td>19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>11,157</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1762</td>
<td>14,990</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1762</td>
<td>13,545</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>12,671</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>10,311</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>4,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Gross Revenue</td>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>Active (Credits)</td>
<td>Passive (Debts)</td>
<td>No. of Jesuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevers</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>15,472</td>
<td>17/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>[7,305]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>19,672</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>12,363</td>
<td>8,937</td>
<td>22,428</td>
<td>25/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>25,166</td>
<td>9,837</td>
<td>15,329</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>21/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>27,640</td>
<td>10,204</td>
<td>17,436</td>
<td>14,398</td>
<td>6,303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>29,037</td>
<td>9,835</td>
<td>19,092</td>
<td>15,390</td>
<td>6,259</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>54,072</td>
<td>17,448</td>
<td>36,624</td>
<td>29,452</td>
<td>19,065</td>
<td>57/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>65,095</td>
<td>24,303</td>
<td>40,792</td>
<td>58,936</td>
<td>35,947</td>
<td>57/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1757]</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,760</td>
<td>37,645</td>
<td>23,115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>30,348</td>
<td>20,462</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,905</td>
<td>32,075</td>
<td>65/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>16,790</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>26,660</td>
<td>68/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>20,008</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>15,084</td>
<td>10,525</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>31/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,961</td>
<td>10,468</td>
<td>18,492</td>
<td>13,665</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>51/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miss.</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>28,961</td>
<td>10,468</td>
<td>18,492</td>
<td>13,665</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>51/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1764</td>
<td></td>
<td>c20,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>6,973</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>5,185</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>4,994</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,742</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Flour</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>2,792</td>
<td>/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>6,693</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>14,961</td>
<td>16/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,209</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>4,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saint-Omer
Wallon College

*1764 14,899 9,707

English College

*1763 13,129
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Active (Credits)</th>
<th>Passive (Debts)</th>
<th>No. of Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>3,638</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>11/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>9/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>17,461</td>
<td>9,364</td>
<td>8,097</td>
<td>14,674</td>
<td>58,618</td>
<td>20/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>18,141</td>
<td>10,267</td>
<td>7,874</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>23,456</td>
<td>17/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,863</td>
<td>11,105</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seminaries**

**La Rochelle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nevers</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Active (Credits)</th>
<th>Passive (Debts)</th>
<th>No. of Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>4,571</td>
<td>5/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reims**

**Noviciates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lyon</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Active (Credits)</th>
<th>Passive (Debts)</th>
<th>No. of Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(St. Joseph)</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>8,962</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>2,328</td>
<td>45,294</td>
<td>16/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>9,195</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>17/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Active (Credits)</th>
<th>Passive (Debts)</th>
<th>No. of Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>24,117</td>
<td>6,269</td>
<td>17,848</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,745</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>30,568</td>
<td>7,876</td>
<td>22,692</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,438</td>
<td>62/63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Residences</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Gross Revenue</td>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>Active (Credits)</td>
<td>Passive (Debts)</td>
<td>No. of Students or Jesuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Convictu or Pensionnat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>19,529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>57,060</td>
<td>24,226</td>
<td>26,334</td>
<td>17 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>41,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>24,978</td>
<td>277,070</td>
<td>257,799</td>
<td>145,064</td>
<td>27 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers (Irish College)</td>
<td>*1764</td>
<td>c3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bapaume</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences Guéret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoise</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>3,422</td>
<td>4/3 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td></td>
<td>c1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Jes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professed House</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Gross Revenue</td>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>Active (Credits)</td>
<td>Passive (Debts)</td>
<td>No. of Jesuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>22,851</td>
<td>64/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c3,600</td>
<td>67/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1763</td>
<td>334,943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foreign Missions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Active (Credits)</th>
<th>Passive (Debts)</th>
<th>No. of Jesuits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>120,412</td>
<td>17,145</td>
<td>103,267</td>
<td>86,649</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes, Appendix III

a The information contained in this chart comes from the General Archives of the Society of Jesus in Rome (A.R.S.J.) triennial reports, 1740-58; A.N., X lb 8943-8949 original comptes rendus prepared by the commissioners of the Parlement; and A.N., M 245-249 reports on Jesuit property prepared by local officials.

b Delattre, Etablissements, vol. III, p. 1228 cites these figures for Paris in 1757. The source is not given.
**Appendix IV**  
Benefices attached to Jesuit colleges in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris in 1760-1761*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of college and date of its foundation followed by name of benefice and date of its union to college when known</th>
<th>Earlier holders of benefice Type of benefice</th>
<th>Revenue produced in 1760-1761</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiens (1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frémontiers (1608) #</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1,248&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Denis (1607) #</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Léger de Flichecourt (1608)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Quentin</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D. de la Roze #</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D de Gouy (1610)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D de Vignacourt (1608) #</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D de Lorette (1611-1621)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Nicolas de Parvilliers (1609)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême (1622)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindelle</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac (1619)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugeac (1699)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers (1664)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlat</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois (1623)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framel</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Eutrope de Montrion (1631)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges (1572)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Comtal</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blancafort (1616-1619)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Notes indicated by elevated letters, are found at the end of the appendix.

**Key:**

- **P** priory
- **A** abbey
- **C** chapel
- **Cu** cure
- **D** dependency
- **OSB** Benedictines
- **OSA** Augustinians
- **Cist** Cistercians
- **Jes** Jesuits
- **—** Information not known

# benefice attached to original college before Jesuit college founded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of college and date of its foundation</th>
<th>Type of benefit</th>
<th>Earlier holders of benefit</th>
<th>Revenue produced in 1760-1761</th>
<th>Gross</th>
<th>Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleville (1612)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Julien de Mézières</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne (1653)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D de Bonne-Nouvelle</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu (1581)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Martin au Bosc (1607)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouchy</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Eustache du Tost</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D. des Frez</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte (1637)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay l'Abbatu (1756)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Avertin les Deffends (1645)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche (1603)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asnières-Bellay (1748)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>4,062</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellebranche</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cist</td>
<td>23,348</td>
<td>8,162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Jean le Mélinais (1607)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luché</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecheneau</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Jacques</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres (1630)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Gengoult (1606)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tronchy (1621)#</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>3,715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle (1629)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieululidon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

- P: priory
- A: abbey
- C: chapel
- Cu: cure
- D: dependency
- OSB: Benedictines
- OSA: Augustinians
- Cist: Cistercians
- Jes: Jesuits
- --: Information not known

# benefice attached to original college before Jesuit college founded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of college and college when known</th>
<th>Type of benefice</th>
<th>Earlier holders of benefice</th>
<th>Revenue produced in 1760-1761 Gross</th>
<th>Revenue produced in 1760-1761 Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyon/ La Trinité (1565)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Julien-en-Jarez (1580-1593)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Romain des Atheux (1580)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Marie de Tense (1577)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Martin de Dunières (1577)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon/ Notre-Dame (1630)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Romain-en-Jarez</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauriac (1560)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Martin de Valmeroux (1663)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Laurent de Vigean (1752)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins (1604)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Vincent de Chantelle (1612)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Nevers (Serninary)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sauveur</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans (1617)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Samson (1619)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sulpice de l'Aigle (1619)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>7,826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (1560)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montalet (1612)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gargenville (1659)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Martin aux Bois (1676)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Jes</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comte-Robert (1695)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladerie de Brie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villenauxe (1707)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- **P**: priory
- **A**: abbey
- **C**: chapel
- **Cu**: cure
- **D**: dependency
- **OSB**: Benedictines
- **OSA**: Augustinians
- **Cist**: Cistercians
- **Jes**: Jesuits
- **information not known**: Information not known

# benefice attached to original college before Jesuit college founded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of college and date of its foundation followed by name of benefice and date of its union to college when known</th>
<th>Type of benefice</th>
<th>Earlier holders of benefice</th>
<th>Revenue produced in 1760-1761</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poitiers (1607)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Martin de Ligugé (Mallezais) (1607)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Maixent de Pamprou (1606)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D. du Château de Loudon (1606-1607)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. D. de la Motte</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Florence de Comble (1618)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Radegonde (1620)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reims (1606)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Maurice (1625)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Laurent de Chaudefontaine (1606)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Preuve (1606)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cist</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D. de Vassy (1608)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D. de Larzicourt (1626)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roanne (1611)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pierre d'Aigonnay (1618)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Martin de Riorges (1609) #</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. Omer/ Wallon College (1568)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Jean de Cohen (1586)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tours (1635)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Julien</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.-D. de Beaulieu (1678)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Jean du Grais</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Julien</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- **P** priory
- **A** abbey
- **C** chapel
- **Cu** cure
- **D** dependency
- **OSB** Benedictines
- **OSA** Augustinians
- **Cist** Cistercians
- **Jes** Jesuits
- **---** Information not known

# benefice attached to original college before Jesuit college founded.
Notes, Appendix IV

\( ^a \) This chart is based on information contained in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and Recueil de plusieurs Ouvrages (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122); the comptes rendus of the Parlement's commissioners in A.N., X 1b 8943-8949; Cottineau, Répertoire des abbayes et prieurés, vols. I-II; Delattre, Etablissements, vols. I-IV; and A.N., M 245-249 reports of local officials and Jesuits.

\( ^b \) The unit is \textit{livres tournois}. 
Appendix V  The Fate of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris 1762-1789

Part I  The Division of Jesuit institutions between the three Commissioners of the Parlement appointed on 6 August 1762

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Town in which the property found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>Amiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Langres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolland d'Erceville</td>
<td>Angoulême</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurillac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auxerre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Billom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bourges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guéret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Flèche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mauriac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moulins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orléans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poitiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontoise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint-Flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roussel de la Tour</td>
<td>Aire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bapaume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar-le-Duc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Béthune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charleville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compiègne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hesdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint-Omer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The footnotes indicated by elevated letters, will be found at the end of the appendix.
Appendix V The Fate of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris 1762-1789

Part II The Presentation of Comptes Rendus on Jesuit institutions in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town and institutions</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Date of presentation of the Compte Rendu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aire (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>11 February 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens (C)</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>15 March 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>14 June 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>3 August 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>5 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>23 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bapaume (R)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>2 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-le-Duc (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>11 February 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béthune (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>15 July 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>11 February 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>29 April 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>7 June 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalons-sur-Marne (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>5 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>22 May 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>5 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>15 July 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>2 July 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>10 March 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>2 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guéret (R)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>2 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>11 February 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Floc'h (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>5 July 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres (C)</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>19 March 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laon (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>5 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle (C, S)</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>22 July 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon (2C, N)</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>8 March 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mâcon (C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>24 March 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauriac (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>5 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>19 March 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevers (C, S)</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>15 March 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>27 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (C, MP, N)</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>14 &amp; 15 Jan. 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoise (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>7 June 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>11 May 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims (C, S)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>24 January 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouane (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>5 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Flour (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>2 September 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer (2C)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>23 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>19 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours (C)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>12 August 1763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The footnotes, indicated by elevated letters, are found at the end of the appendix.
The Order in which the Comptes Rendus were presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town and institution</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Date of presentation of the Compte Rendu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>14 &amp; 15 Jan. 1763 (C, MP, MP &amp; N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>25 February 1763 (C, MP &amp; N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>8 March 1763 (2C, &amp; N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>15 March 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevers</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>15 March 1763 (C, &amp; N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>19 March 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>19 March 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>24 March 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>29 April 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoise</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>11 May 1763 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>14 June 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>15 June 1763 (C, MP &amp; N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>2 July 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>5 July 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom &amp; Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>15 July 1763 (2C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>de l'Averdy</td>
<td>22 July 1763 (C &amp; S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laon</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>5 August 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>12 August 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>19 August 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>23 August 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>23 August 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English College)</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>27 August 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>2 September 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-le-Duc</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>2 September 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>2 September 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guéret</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>2 September 1763 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Flour</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>2 September 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>5 September 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>5 September 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac &amp; Mauriac</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>5 September 1763 (2C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>5 September 1763 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>24 January 1764 (G &amp; S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>10 March 1764 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>22 May 1764 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>7 June 1764 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>Rolland</td>
<td>7 June 1764 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras [, Dunkerque]</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>3 August 1764 (2C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>21 August 1764 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wallon College)</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>11 February 1765 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aire</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>11 February 1765 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>11 February 1765 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béthune</td>
<td>Roussel</td>
<td>11 February 1765 (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V The Fate of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris 1762-1789

Part III The Legal decisions determining the fate of former Jesuit institutions and other property of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.*

The Colleges:

The following chart shows the decisions concerning the colleges taken by Parlement and crown in the years immediately after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1762 and should not be regarded as an attempt to schematize the history, however brief, of the colleges between the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1762 and the outbreak of the Revolution.

Unless otherwise indicated by a footnote, the fate in law of each college was the same. Its property was described in comptes rendus presented by the Commissioners of the Parlement, who then drafted the appropriate royal legislation. Lettres patentes of the king (registered soon afterwards by the Parlement) confirmed the college's continued existence under the government of a bureau of administration and its eventual enjoyment of the revenues of any benefices which had been attached to the college under the Jesuits (and in those cases in which the royal legislation confirmed the union of benefices to the college, the date of the legislation is marked thus: *). The arrêt of the Parlement in question is not the one which confirmed the Parlement's acceptance of the lettres patentes but the one which confirmed the college's ownership of various other forms of attached property. Once these various forms of legislation had been published for each college, it was expected to be run under the authority of the bureau unless the crown saw fit to change the arrangement.

Colleges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town in which college found</th>
<th>Date of compte rendu</th>
<th>Date of royal legislation</th>
<th>Date of Parlement's arrêt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aire</td>
<td>11 Feb. 65</td>
<td>Sept. 68</td>
<td>June 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>15 Mar. 63</td>
<td>21 May 63</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême</td>
<td>14 Jun. 63</td>
<td>27 Oct. 63*</td>
<td>29 Jan. 65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras</td>
<td>3 Aug. 64</td>
<td>Sept. 68</td>
<td>18 Mar. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac</td>
<td>5 Sept. 63</td>
<td>3 Mar. 64*</td>
<td>29 Jan. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre</td>
<td>23 Aug. 63</td>
<td>10 Nov. 63</td>
<td>29 Jan. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-le-Duc</td>
<td>2 Sept. 63</td>
<td>25 Jan. 64</td>
<td>8 Aug. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béthune</td>
<td>11 Feb. 65</td>
<td>Sept. 68</td>
<td>June 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom</td>
<td>15 Jul. 63</td>
<td>20 Jun. 65*</td>
<td>19 Jul. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>29 Apr. 63</td>
<td>8 Dec. 63*</td>
<td>29 Jan. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>7 Jun. 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>5 Sept. 63</td>
<td>11 Aug. 66*</td>
<td>26 Mar. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville</td>
<td>22 May 64</td>
<td>25 Aug. 65*</td>
<td>8 Aug. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
<td>5 Sept. 63</td>
<td>25 Feb. 64</td>
<td>9 Jan. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>15 Jul. 63</td>
<td>25 Jan. 64</td>
<td>11 Feb. 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Footnotes, indicated by elevated letters, will be found at the end of the appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town in which college found</th>
<th>Date of compte rendu</th>
<th>Date of royal legislation</th>
<th>Date of Parlement's arrêt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>2 Jul. 63</td>
<td>28 Aug. 63*</td>
<td>8 Aug. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>10 Mar. 64</td>
<td>21 Jul. 64*</td>
<td>19 Jul. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td>2 Sept. 63</td>
<td>26 Oct. 63</td>
<td>29 Jan. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td>11 Feb. 65</td>
<td>Sept. 68</td>
<td>June 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche</td>
<td>5 Jul. 63</td>
<td>7 Apr. 64*</td>
<td>15 Jan. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres</td>
<td>19 Mar. 63</td>
<td>19 Aug. 63</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laon</td>
<td>5 Aug. 63g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>22 Jul. 63</td>
<td>21 Oct. 63*</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon (2)</td>
<td>8 Mar. 63</td>
<td>29 Apr. 63*</td>
<td>9 May 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>24 Mar. 63</td>
<td>28 Aug. 63</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>5 Sept. 63</td>
<td>20 Jun. 65*</td>
<td>19 Jul. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins</td>
<td>19 Mar. 63</td>
<td>20 Jul. 63</td>
<td>31 Aug. 64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevers</td>
<td>15 Mar. 63</td>
<td>11 Aug. 63</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td>27 Aug. 63</td>
<td>8 Nov. 63*</td>
<td>4 Sept. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>14 &amp; 15 Jan. 63</td>
<td>21 Nov. 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>7 Jun. 64d</td>
<td>4 Sept. 64j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne</td>
<td>24 Jan. 64</td>
<td>9 Oct. 63</td>
<td>29 Jan. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Flour</td>
<td>2 Sept. 63</td>
<td>26 Oct. 63</td>
<td>15 Jan. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer (2)</td>
<td>23 Aug. 63</td>
<td>14 Mar. 64</td>
<td>19 Jul. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>19 Aug. 63</td>
<td>19 Jul. 64</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>12 Aug. 63</td>
<td>7 Dec. 63*</td>
<td>11 Feb. 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noviciates

| Paris                        | 14 & 15 Jan. 63     | 6 Aug. 62l                |
|                             | 25 Feb. 63          |                            |
|                             | 15 Jun. 63          | 21 Nov. 63k               |
| Lyon                        | 8 Mar. 63           | 21 Nov. 63k               | 6 Aug. 62l               |

Professed House

| Paris                        | 14 & 15 Jan. 63     | 6 Aug. 62l                |
|                             | 25 Feb. 63          |                            |
|                             | 15 Jun. 63          | 21 Nov. 63k               |

Residences

| Guéret                      | 2 Sept. 63          | 21 Nov. 63k               | 6 Aug. 62l               |
| Pontoise                    | 11 May 63           | 21 Nov. 63k               | 6 Aug. 62                |
### Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town in which mission found</th>
<th>Date of compte rendu</th>
<th>Date of royal legislation</th>
<th>Date of Parlement's arrêt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bapaume</td>
<td>no compte rendu</td>
<td>21 Nov. 63 k</td>
<td>6 Aug. 62^1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seminaries

- **La Rochelle**: 22 Jul. 63
- **Nevers**: 15 Mar. 63
- **Reims**: 24 Jan. 64

### Benefices attached to colleges

(See above, Appendix II for colleges possessing benefices)

- with college compte rendu
- with lettres patentes for college
- 2 Feb. 63
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Part III The Legal decisions determining the fate of former Jesuit institutions and other property of the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, continued

The Order in which the existence of the colleges was confirmed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Date of royal legislation confirming the college(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyon (2)</td>
<td>29 April 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>21 May 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins</td>
<td>20 July 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevers</td>
<td>11 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres</td>
<td>19 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>28 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>28 August 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne</td>
<td>9 October 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>21 October 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td>26 October 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Flour</td>
<td>26 October 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême</td>
<td>27 October 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td>8 November 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre</td>
<td>10 November 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>21 November 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>7 December 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>8 December 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>25 January 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-le-Duc</td>
<td>25 January 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
<td>25 February 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac</td>
<td>3 March 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer (English College)</td>
<td>14 March 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche</td>
<td>7 April 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>19 July 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>21 July 1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>20 June 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billov</td>
<td>20 June 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville</td>
<td>25 August 1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>11 August 1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer (Wallon College)</td>
<td>September 1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras</td>
<td>September 1768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following colleges continued to exist although not confirmed by royal legislation:

Poitiers
Bourges
The following colleges, at first suppressed, were re-established by royal legislation of June 1777:

Aire
Béthune

The following college may have continued to exist, although not confirmed by royal legislation. It may have been transferred to the local hospital:

Laon

The following colleges were not confirmed by royal legislation, but were suppressed:

Reims
Hesdin
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Notes

Part I

a Based on letter of 27 September 1762 in Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and on A.N. AD XVII, 20 printed document entitled Tableau alphabétique [of the towns in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris, stating when the various comptes rendus were presented etc.]

b By an arrêt of 15 December 1763, the Parlement named Cochin to replace de l'Averdy as Commissioner, after the latter had, on 13 December, become Controller General of Finances.

Part II

a Based on Rolland d'Erceville, Compte Rendu, on A.N., AD XVII 20 Tableau alphabétique..., and on original copies of comptes rendus in A.N., X lb 8943-8949. The Tableau alphabétique confuses the dates on which the accounts for Pontoise and Guéret were presented.

b (C): College; (R): Residence; (MP): Professed House (Maison Professe); (N): Noviciate; (S): Seminary.

The compte rendu on the College of Arras in A.N., X lb 8948 contains another on the College of Dunkerque. The College of Dunkerque is not mentioned again in the papers of the Parlement of Paris.

Part III

a The sources for this appendix are Rolland, Compte rendu (B.N., Ld 39 939) and Recueil (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122) original copies of the comptes rendus given by the commissioners of the Parlement; A.N., X lb 8945-8957 in the arrêts of the Parlement which confirmed the colleges' possession of their property; and B.N., F 23627-23630 Actes Royaux, passim, which contain the royal legislation. I have compared my findings with the contemporary Tableau alphabétique in A.N., AD XVII, 20.
Notes, Part III

b Aire, Arras, Béthune, Hesdin, and Saint-Omer: The history of the former Jesuit colleges in the region of Artois after the closing of Jesuit colleges in April 1762 is a complicated one. The fact that the local Council of Artois was unwilling to register any anti-Jesuit legislation accounts for the relative slowness with which the Parlement’s recommendations and legislation and the crown’s legislation were applied to the whole region. Only the English College at Saint-Omer had the same kind of legal history as other Jesuit colleges in the Parlement’s jurisdiction in this period (the compte rendu of 23 August 1763, the lettres patentes of 14 March 1764 and the Parlement’s arrêt of 19 July 1765 applied to it). The legal fate of the others was decided by two sets of royal legislation in September 1768 and June 1777. According to two edicts of September 1768, the two colleges of Arras and Saint-Omer (the Wallon College, in this case) were allowed to remain open, while the other three, the colleges of Aire, Hesdin, and Béthune were suppressed. The property of the colleges of Aire and Hesdin was to be given to that of Saint-Omer, and that of Béthune to Arras. The two remaining colleges of Arras and Saint-Omer were, in return, to guarantee places and scholarships to students from the other three towns. This settlement was only possible because of the proximity of all five colleges and their locally acknowledged poverty. In June 1777, however, apparently in response to local requests, the crown issued other edicts which reversed the Edicts of September 1768 and re-established the colleges of Aire and Béthune, under religious masters. Hesdin apparently remained suppressed. Cf. Rolland, Recueil, (B.N., R 6074 and Res. R 1122), p. 169.

c Amiens, Langres, La Rochelle, Macon, and Nevers: The colleges of these towns have the usual legal history, except that the Parlement apparently did not find it necessary to issue arrêts to confirm their possession of the colleges’ attached property. Since such arrêts were apparently issued to insure that the creditors of the Jesuits should not seize property belonging to the colleges, it is possible that the reason why there were no arrêts was because the creditors posed no problem in these towns.

d Bourges and Poitiers: As the colleges of both Bourges and Poitiers were attached to the local university, they remained under its control and were not subject to the provisions of the Edict of February or to other legislation meant for other former Jesuit colleges of the Parlement’s jurisdiction.

Châlons-sur-Marne: The lettres patentes of 11 August 1766 gave legal recognition to the continued existence of this college and to the transfer of the Priories of Vassy and Larzicourt, which had been attached to the college of Reims, to the college of Châlons-sur-Marne.

La Flèche: The history of the college at La Flèche after 1762 is complicated. Its existence and possession of its benefices were conferred in the lettres patentes of 7 April 1764, and the Parlement issued the appropriate arrêt in its favour on 15 January 1765. In 1764 it became a preparatory school for the Ecole Militaire of Paris, in 1765 it was granted a special affiliation with the University of Paris, and in 1783 it gained a similar connexion with the University of Angers.
Notes, Part III

Laon: I have not been able to discover what happened to the college of Laon after 1763. It may have been turned over to the local hospital.

Lyon: The lettres patentes confirming the existence, under a single bureau of administration, of the two colleges at Lyon said nothing about the benefices attached to the two colleges of that town. Neither the accounts of the Econome Séquestre of Paris nor those of the Econome Général du Clergé shed light on this problem. It is impossible to tell how the benefices in question were supposed to be administered after 1773. Before that time they were administered under the Econome Général.

Paris: The history of the former Jesuit college of Louis-le-Grand is complicated after 1762 because the Parlement and crown agreed that certain colleges attached to the University of Paris might be transferred to the buildings of Louis-le-Grand. The transfers of the College of Lisieux and of Dormans-Beauvais were sanctioned by lettres patentes of 21 November 1763 and 7 April 1764. The lettres patentes of 16 August 1764 confirmed the existence of the college as well as its ownership of its benefices.

Reims: The lettres patentes of 4 September 1764 suppressed the college which was deemed unnecessary because of the existence of another college in Reims, and handed over its biens-fonds to the Collège des Bons-Enfants. The Collège des Bons-Enfants was also to have its Priories of Saint-Maurice and Chaudefontaine. The Priories of Vassy and Larzicourt went to the College of Châlons (cf. above, note "e"). It is not certain what became of the Priory of St. Preuve.

The noviciates of Paris and Lyon, the professed house of Paris, the residences of Guéret and Pontoise, and the mission of Bapaume had the same fate in law. Lettres patentes of the king of 21 November 1763 confirmed the principle that Jesuit institutions not devoted to public education should become the property of the creditors of the Jesuits. The Union of Creditors was authorized to sell these institutions in the authorized manner.

An arrêt of the Parlement of Paris 6 August 1762 had laid down the principle, again embodied in Lettres patentes of the king of 21 November 1763, that property not intended for public education should be turned over to the Jesuits' creditors.

Lettres patentes of the king of 2 February 1763 handed all benefices attached to Jesuit colleges over to the Econome Général du Clergé from 1 January 1763 until such time as the existence of the college had been confirmed by individual lettres patentes, which normally also fixed the date on which the new bureau of administration of the college (established according to the Edict of February 1763) should gain control of the benefice(s). After regaining control of its benefice(s), a college was to make annual payments to the Econome Général to enable him to continue to pay Jesuit pensions.
Appendix VI  The Known cost of the seizure and administration of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris 1762 to 1764*

Part I  Approved payments to officials in the bailliages and sénéchaussées, municipal officers, and various functionaries:  

### Parlement's legislation by which payment approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>January 1764</th>
<th>May 1764</th>
<th>July 1764</th>
<th>April 1766</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbeville</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aire</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angers</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoulême</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bapaume</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar-le-Duc</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauvais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béthune</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgargental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>6,723</td>
<td>3,623</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>2,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville/S. Mennehout</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartres</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateauroux</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudefontaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont en Beauvoisis</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etampes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexicourt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Others]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guéret</td>
<td>527</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>954</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>4,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laon</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochesse</td>
<td>971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusignan</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Footnotes, indicated by elevated letters, are at end of appendix.*
Parlement's legislation by which payment approved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>January 1764</th>
<th>May 1764</th>
<th>July 1764</th>
<th>April 1766</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magny</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monferrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montargin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Forest de] Montbrisson</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montdidier</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montmorillon</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>5,618</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>596</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoise</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribemont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Auvergne à] Riom</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne [Montbrison]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Flour</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Maixant</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Omer</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Pierre-le-Moutier (Nevers)</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saumur</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sézanne</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verneuil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villeneaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitry-le-Francois</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yenville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30,535</td>
<td>34,526</td>
<td>40,597</td>
<td>22,391</td>
<td>128,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI  The Known cost of the seizure and administration of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris 1764-1764.

Part II  Approved payments to provincial économes séquestres for the period 1762-1764

We do not know precisely what salary each économse séquestre received. Normally, we know either his salary for the first year and the commission (in deniers or sols per livres) to which he was entitled in subsequent years or the commission to which he was entitled. Thus, when two amounts are shown in the third column of the following chart, the first indicates the salary to which the économse séquestre was entitled for the first year of his administration and the second amount indicates the salary or commission to which he was entitled in subsequent years. When only one amount is shown in the third column it is either his constant annual salary or his constant annual commission. It has been convenient to use the symbol: "liv." to mean livre, the symbol "*" means the college in the place in question had been confirmed by royal legislation before payment of the économse séquestre in question had been approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name of économse séquestre(s)</th>
<th>Salary or honorarium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbéville (Eu)</td>
<td>J. Lefebvre</td>
<td>2 sols per liv./2106 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Amiens</td>
<td>J.-B. Roger, fils</td>
<td>1,800 liv./1,500 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Angoulême</td>
<td>J. Bouard</td>
<td>1,310 liv./600 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arras</td>
<td>P.-A. Thomas</td>
<td>1,200 liv./18 den. per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Aurillac</td>
<td>F. Martin</td>
<td>450 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Auxerre</td>
<td>P. Deschamps</td>
<td>1,200 liv./2 sols per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bar-le-Duc</td>
<td>P. Launais</td>
<td>400 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béthune</td>
<td>F. Gottran</td>
<td>2 sols per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom</td>
<td>A. Fournet</td>
<td>600 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Blois</td>
<td>P. Rabineau</td>
<td>500 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>P. Malgreau</td>
<td>18 den. per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>F. Collot</td>
<td>1,235 liv./18 den. per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville</td>
<td>A.-J. Collot</td>
<td>2 sols per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[S. Marchould]</td>
<td>A. Hébert</td>
<td>2 sols per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chaumont-en-Bassigny</td>
<td>Chappon</td>
<td>1,000 liv./800 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont en Argonne</td>
<td>H.-L. LeClerc</td>
<td>240 liv. (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>S. Bertrand</td>
<td>1,200 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Compiègne</td>
<td>L.-H.-N. Vaudorp</td>
<td>2 sols per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td>Dougnet</td>
<td>1,000 liv./800 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guéret [La Marche]</td>
<td>Bounyault</td>
<td>185 liv./1 sol per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesdin</td>
<td>M. de Canneville</td>
<td>270 liv./1 sol per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* La Flèche</td>
<td>D. de Daxy</td>
<td>1 sol per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 den. per liv. argenterie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Langres</td>
<td>D. Roger</td>
<td>2 sols per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* La Rochelle</td>
<td>Le Gras</td>
<td>500 liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurignan</td>
<td>L. Delage</td>
<td>18 liv. (total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Lyon</td>
<td>C.-O.-J. Guyot</td>
<td>18 den. per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.-J. Bardonet</td>
<td>18 den. per liv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.-N. De l'horme</td>
<td>18 den. per liv.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place

* Macon
Mauriac
* [Forêt à] Montbrizon
   (for Roanne)
* [Abbaye de S.] Martin
   aux Bois (for Paris)

* Moulins
* [S. Pierre le] Moutier
   (Nevers)
Orléans
Poitiers
Pontoise
Roie
* Saint-Flour
Saint-Omer
Sens
* Sézanne (Villenauxe)
* Tours

Name of économ
e sequestre(s)                  Salary or honorarium

Enjorrant                      400 liv.
P. Chapouille                   18 den. per liv.

Ardaillon                      1,800 liv./800 liv.

N.-C. Cocquerel
   (fondé of Bronod)           18 den. per liv.
C. Perrouin                    2 sols per liv.

F. Landelle                    18 den. per liv.
B. Poriandy                    2 sols per liv.
F. Coulland                    1,500 liv./1,000 liv.
L. Auger                       1 sol per liv.
--                             35 liv. (total)
A. Bernard                     600 liv./450 liv.
Duivivier                      1 sol per liv.
Nonat                          18 den. per liv.
Champenais                     2 sols per liv.
Dupuis                         2 sols per liv.

Observations on the payment of commissions
to économes sequestres:

A commission of two sols per livre was paid to the économes sequestres of
the following bailliages and sénéchaussées:

Abbéville (Eu)
Auxerre
Béthune
Charleville & S. Marchould
Compiègne
Langres
Moulins
Orléans
Sézanne (Villenauxe)
Tours

And of eighteen deniers per livre to the following:

Arras
Bourges
Châlons-sur-Marne
Lyon
Mauriac
A commission of eighteen deniers per livre was paid to économes séquestres of the following: (continued)

[Abbaye of S. Martin aux Bois] (Paris)
Saint Pierre-le-Moutier (Nevers)
Sens

And of one sol per livre to the économes séquestres of the following:

La Flèche
Pontoise
S. Omer

Observations on the payment of salaries to économes séquestres:

A salary of 1,800 liv. for the first year was paid to the économme séquestre of each of the following:

Amiens
Roanne

A salary of from 1,000 liv. to 1,799 liv. for the first year was paid to the économme séquestre of each of the following:

Angoulême
Arras
Auxerre
Châlons-sur-Marne
Chaumont-en-Bassigny
Clermont-Ferrand
Frontenay-el-Comte
Poitiers
Appendix VI  The Known cost of the seizure and administration of Jesuit property in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris 1762 to 1764.

Notes

Part I

The sources for Part I of this appendix are A. N., X lb 8945, 8947, and 8951 arrêts of Parlement of Paris 24 January, 22 May, and 7 July 1764; and 18 April 1766. All authorized the payment of local officials who had taken part in the seizures or confiscation of Jesuit property in 1762 to 1764.

Part II

The sources for Part II of this appendix are A. N., X lb 8947 and 8951 arrêts of Parlement of Paris 5 June 1764 and 15 April 1766.

The amount cited was the annual payment Lefèbvre received for 1763 to 1764. See A. N., X lb 8951 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 15 April 1766.

The case of Bourges and Poitiers, as we have noted many times before, is unique. Because the colleges of these towns were attached to universities, they never had bureaux of administration and the économies séquestres named in 1762 continued to administer college property for the next two decades. cf. above.

The information cited for Châlons-sur-Marne, like part of that for Abbéville, comes from A. N., X lb 8951 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 15 April 1766. Otherwise, all other information in this table comes from A. N., X lb 8947 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 5 June 1764.

S. Marchould or S. Menehoult was a priory whose connection with other Jesuit property I have not been able to discover. It is linked in the arrêt with Charleville, however.

The three économies séquestres of Lyon apparently divided the work between them and each received a commission on the money he personally handled.

It is clearly difficult to draw significant conclusions from the above groupings of bailliages and sénéchaussées under the general heading "Observations ...". One would assume that the greatest rewards went to the administrators of the richest colleges, but there is little concrete proof of this fact.

Villenauxe was a priory attached to the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris, but delegated by Bronod to another économie séquestre of the provinces.
### Appendix VII  The Accounts of Edme-Louis Bronod, Econome Séquestre of Paris*

#### Part I  The Annual accounts 1762-1765

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Difference (surplus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1762-63</td>
<td>1763-64</td>
<td>1764-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Jesuits (in execution of arrêt of 23 April 1762)</td>
<td>34,177</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears from payment of rentes (owed to Jesuits)</td>
<td>211,408</td>
<td>188,762</td>
<td>156,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents from houses and other real property in Paris (owed to Jesuits)</td>
<td>34,291</td>
<td>34,324</td>
<td>21,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From College of [Paris] for Jesuit pensions</td>
<td>19,583</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement of capital (constituted as rentes)</td>
<td>80,039</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Jesuit property in Paris and provinces</td>
<td>279,000</td>
<td>65,801</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts sent by provincial économes séquestres</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>56,038</td>
<td>17,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>658,498</td>
<td>352,296</td>
<td>244,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus from previous year</td>
<td>288,844</td>
<td>357,371</td>
<td>258,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>658,498</td>
<td>641,140</td>
<td>602,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Expenditures: |                                                          |                                                                                           |                      |
| To Jesuits (pre 6 Aug. 1762) | 21,163 | -- | -- | 21,163 | -- | -- |                      |
| To Jesuit as subsistence and travel allowances (by Parlt. arrêt 6 August 1762) | 239,069 | 3,850 | -- | 239,069 | 3,850 | -- |                      |
| To Morisse (Notaire Séquestre of Union of Creditors for administrative costs) | 36,000 | 55,000 | -- | 36,000 | 55,000 | -- |                      |
| For new masters of colleges | 48,311 | 57,167 | 71,459 | 48,311 | 57,167 | 71,459 |                      |
| Paid on order of Parlement and commissioners of 6 Aug. | 25,111 | 167,751 | 272,053 | 25,111 | 167,751 | 272,053 |                      |
| Total | 369,654 | 283,769 | 343,512 | 369,654 | 283,769 | 343,512 |                      |

| Total receipts | 658,498 | 641,140 | 602,209 | 658,498 | 641,140 | 602,209 |                      |
| Total expenditures | 359,654 | 283,769 | 343,512 | 359,654 | 283,769 | 343,512 |                      |
| Difference (surplus) | 288,844 | 357,371 | 258,697 | 288,844 | 357,371 | 258,697 |                      |

*All amounts are in livres tournois. Notes, indicated by elevated letters, will be found at the end of the appendix.*
Appendix VII  The Accounts of Edme-Louis Bronod, *Econome Séquestre* of Paris*

Part II  The Accounts of 30 April 1767-11 November 1773

Receipts:
Arrears from payment of *rentes* (due to be paid to the former Jesuit establishments listed below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the <em>Aides et Gabelles</em>:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Amiens</td>
<td>9,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Béthune</td>
<td>193.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Châlons</td>
<td>1,086.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Chaumont</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Hesdin</td>
<td>2,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Langres</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nevers</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Poitiers</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Tours</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novociate (Retreat house of)</td>
<td>1,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professed house</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions des Indes</td>
<td>1,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions du Canada</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence of Guéret</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence of Pontoise</td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Seminary (Residence, Poitiers)</td>
<td>10,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agen</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Caen</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Ensisheim</td>
<td>5,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pont-à-Mousson</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Strasbourg</td>
<td>5,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novociate of Rouen</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maison S. Jaume (Marseille)</td>
<td>2,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence of Dieppe</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence of Marennes</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence of Nantes</td>
<td>2,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **On *Communauté des inspecteurs des vins*:** | | |
| College of Châlons | 1,500 | |
| College of Chaumont | 375 | |
| College of Hesdin | 500 | |
| College of Langres | 1,350 | |
| College of Nevers | 2,250 | |
| Irish Seminary (Residence, Poitiers) | 450 | |
| College of Strasbourg | 14,625 | |
| Novociate of Rouen | 675 | 21,725 |
On Provincial États and other institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Béthune</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Chaumont</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Paris (Louis-le-Grand)</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Poitiers</td>
<td>7,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Seminary (Residence, Poitiers)</td>
<td>3,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of Bapaume</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Missions</td>
<td>3,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Caen</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Strasbourg</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence of Dieppe</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                                           | 21,347  |

Repayment of advances made to college bureaux:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Chaumont</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Mauriac</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Paris (Louis-le-Grand)</td>
<td>104,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                                           | 105,723 |

Rent on real property                             75

Repayment of money owed to Jesuits                 684

Surplus of preceding account                      115,150

Total Receipts                                    326,206

Expenditures:

To colleges, as a result of lettres patentes of the king or arrêts of Parlement giving college bureaux possession of college property:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Amiens</td>
<td>16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Angoulême</td>
<td>4,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Châlons</td>
<td>6,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Chaumont</td>
<td>5,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Compiègne</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Lyon</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Macon</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nevers</td>
<td>5,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Poitiers (S. Marthe)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of S. Omer (Wallon/French)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Tours</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Guéret (Barnabites)</td>
<td>1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Caen</td>
<td>4,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Douai (Scottish)</td>
<td>6,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Rennes</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Strasbourg</td>
<td>45,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Vannes</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                                           | 134,263 |
Payments to other people and institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of Laon</td>
<td>1,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curé of Marguilliers</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndic of Diocese of Nevers</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieur Le Roy (Roque's partner)</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieur Le Seur/S. Esteve</td>
<td>4,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repairs to real property (especially houses) in Paris

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To three Irish boursiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payment to local officials of remaining expenses incurred during the confiscation:

| Bailliage of Amiens | 701   |
| Sénéchaussée of Artois (sic) | 248   |
| Bailliage of Aurillac | 432   |
| Bailliage of Auxerre | 54    |
| Bailliage of Fontenay | 82    |
| Bailliage of Guise | 24    |
| Bailliage of Laon | 210   |
| Bailliage of Mauriac | 264   |
| Bailliage of Moulins | 402   |
| Bailliage of Ribemont | 33    |
| Bailliage of Roze | 35    |
| Bailliage of Saint-Omer | 160   |
| Bailliage of Tours | 36    | 2,681 |

Administrative expenses (chiefly the cost of the legislation in the Parlement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenditures 182,854

Recapitulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total receipts:</td>
<td>326,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures:</td>
<td>182,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (surplus):</td>
<td>143,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes, Appendix VII

Part I

The sources for Part I of this appendix are A.N., X lb 8945, 8947, and 8957, arrêts of Parlement of Paris 20 December 1763, 5 June 1764, and 18 March 1769.

This figure includes money allotted for repairs to college buildings as well.

In 1762–1763, the nature of expenses is unspecified; in 1763–1764, the amount in this column was used for honoraria given to provincial officials and for payment of expenses of the College of Louis-le-Grand; in 1764–1765, the amount in this column was divided as follows: 122,159 livres for honoraria to local officials and 149,894 livres for expenses of the College of Louis-le-Grand. It seems likely that the category of "local" or "provincial" officials included not just officials of the various baillages and sénéchaussées, but also some of the provincial économes séquestres, and perhaps some Parisian servants of the Parlement as well. It is because the categories are so undifferentiated in the Parlement's arrêts that the table is necessarily vague about the sums of money "paid on the order of the Commissioners of the Parlement" or paid on the order of the Parlement.

Part II

The source for Part II of this appendix is Archives de la Compagnie de Jésus in Chaillot (A.S.J.P.) Papiers Rolland d'Erceville, accounts of Edme-Louis Bronod, the younger, Econome Séquestre of the Prévôté and Vicomté of Paris 30 April 1767 – 11 November 1773, 90 pp. in-4°.

A.N., X lb 8957 arrêt of Parlement of Paris 14 March 1769 refers to the attempt of the Marguilliers to recover 4,000 livres owed to them by the Jesuits. This amount presumably was what they finally received.
The purpose of the following table is to show the extent of Lavalette's original debts; the amount which remained to be repaid to his creditors after the Jesuit order had done what it could to satisfy them in the period before 1762; and the amount which remained to be repaid to his creditors by 1772, after the Jesuit order had been suppressed in France, Gatin had continued to make a few small payments, and the Union had begun to make a few payments to its members.

Because of the nature of the available sources, it is, unfortunately, to some extent a hypothetical table, and I have attempted to show when this is so in specific instances by using certain symbols. Square brackets indicate that an amount known to be correct for a later period (in which it is shown without parentheses or brackets) is assumed to be correct for an earlier period. Thus, a man known to have been owed 1,000 *livres* in 1772 is assumed to have been owed 1,000 *livres* in May 1762 and at whatever time before that date when the original debt was contracted. The original debt may, of course, have been more than 1,000 *livres*, but since we are dealing in principal sums only, and since the *Ordre Général* of 1772 did not include debts contracted after April 1762, we know that the original, pre-May 1762 debt cannot have been less than the principal sum cited. In all cases, then, my totals or my figures should indicate the known minimum which Lavalette (and subsequently the Jesuit order and the Union of Creditors) owed to his creditors. Amounts in square brackets are repeated from the nearest column indicating a known amount. Thus, if we know that a creditor was owed 7,000 *livres* in 1762 and 4,000 *livres* in 1772 (when his name was entered in the *Ordre Général* of Creditors) we may assume that the original sum which he lent to Lavalette was at least 7,000 *livres* (and that between 1762 and 1772 he was repaid 3,000 *livres*).

The entire table is based on only two sources: the *Ordre Général* of 1772 (A. N., U 983) and the Abbé Terray's list of creditors and the amounts owed to them of May 1762 (A. N., X lb 8941, included with arrêt of 19 May 1762). The *Ordre Général* frequently stated the amount of the original debt, and hence that document is the source of any unbracketed information in the first column. Terray's list is normally the source of unbracketed information in the second column (and, hence, it normally refers to the situation in May 1762). In two cases, when there is a discrepancy between information contained in the *Ordre Général* and Terray's list, the amount in the latter is cited in column two, but enclosed in parentheses, while the amount in the former is, as would be expected, enclosed in brackets.

Lavalette's associates in Martinique are indicated by an "M" in the margin, the known négociants are indicated by an "N" in the margin, and Paris bankers are indicated by a "B". The creditors of Lavalette who were also creditors of the Lioncys are indicated by an asterisk, thus: "*".

All amounts are in *livres tournois.*
Appendix VIII  The Creditors of Lavalette

A list of the creditors of Antoine Lavalette and the amounts of money owed to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Original debt of 1747-1762</th>
<th>Amount due in May, 1762</th>
<th>Amount due in 1772</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnel</td>
<td>[ 28,150]</td>
<td>[ 28,150]</td>
<td>28,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>[ 25,000]</td>
<td>[ 25,000]</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquart</td>
<td>[ 5,000]</td>
<td>[ 5,000]</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubineau</td>
<td>112,330</td>
<td>91,553</td>
<td>91,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Aucane*</td>
<td>[ 56,500]</td>
<td>[ 56,500]</td>
<td>56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auger de la Plante/Lussy</td>
<td>37,253</td>
<td>[ 36,089]</td>
<td>36,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Avenir</td>
<td>28,570</td>
<td>[ 20,400]</td>
<td>20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Banquet</td>
<td>73,948</td>
<td>55,461</td>
<td>55,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bareyre</td>
<td>15,243</td>
<td>[ 9,000]</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Batbedat</td>
<td>[ 8,000]</td>
<td>[ 8,000] (7,500)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Bellacla frères</td>
<td>[ 3,333 ]</td>
<td>[ 3,333 ]</td>
<td>3,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belouche &amp; heirs</td>
<td>33,822</td>
<td>23,822</td>
<td>23,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Besnard</td>
<td>47,319</td>
<td>[ 32,137]</td>
<td>32,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beuvron &amp; heirs</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>[ 51,563]</td>
<td>51,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleyeat</td>
<td>[ 9,509]</td>
<td>[ 9,509]</td>
<td>9,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blondel/Clozier</td>
<td>[ 5,000]</td>
<td>[ 5,000]</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Bompar</td>
<td>[ 47,116]</td>
<td>47,116</td>
<td>47,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Bourcier</td>
<td>18,507</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourdon</td>
<td>[ 20,000]</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Boussé &amp; Dangirand</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>[ 40,833]</td>
<td>40,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyer/Blanc</td>
<td>28,436</td>
<td>19,309</td>
<td>19,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Brunaud frères</td>
<td>[ 962]</td>
<td>[ 962]</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Capdevielle</td>
<td>[ 22,033]</td>
<td>[ 22,033]</td>
<td>22,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Carrere</td>
<td>[ 2,000]</td>
<td>[ 2,000]</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Castillon*/Desverges</td>
<td>[ 54,667]</td>
<td>[ 54,667]</td>
<td>54,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cazenave de la Bareyre</td>
<td>[ 80,629]</td>
<td>[ 80,629]</td>
<td>80,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cazotte</td>
<td>103,199</td>
<td>103,199</td>
<td>96,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Chaix heirs</td>
<td>[ 43,680]</td>
<td>[ 43,680]</td>
<td>43,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Chauraud</td>
<td>[ 7,500]</td>
<td>[ 7,500]</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Chauvet</td>
<td>9,565</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Chol &amp; cie</td>
<td>[ 91,737]</td>
<td>[ 91,737]</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choran</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>[ 2,000]</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavier</td>
<td>[ 26,205]</td>
<td>[ 26,205]</td>
<td>26,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corée (Ve)</td>
<td>82,866</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>82,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulogne</td>
<td>63,085</td>
<td>48,577</td>
<td>48,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croisier/Trudon*</td>
<td>[ 70,000]</td>
<td>[ 70,000]</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deducay</td>
<td>[ 12,000]</td>
<td>[ 12,000]</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaferriere</td>
<td>[ 3,459]</td>
<td>[ 3,459]</td>
<td>3,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisse</td>
<td>[ 1,500]</td>
<td>[ 1,500]</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Desclaux</td>
<td>20,815</td>
<td>17,234</td>
<td>17,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Desfoissés</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>[ 4,000]</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Deshayes/Myrat/Luker</td>
<td>40,779</td>
<td>[ 29,250]</td>
<td>29,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desjardins/heirs</td>
<td>[ 58,000]</td>
<td>[ 58,000]</td>
<td>58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despinacy</td>
<td>[ 72,000]</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destrois</td>
<td>4,626</td>
<td>[ 2,000]</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desvigne</td>
<td>[ 2,042]</td>
<td>[ 2,042]</td>
<td>2,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Devillasse &amp; cie</td>
<td>174,854</td>
<td>129,496</td>
<td>117,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Original debt of 1747-1762</td>
<td>Amount due in May, 1762</td>
<td>Amount due in 1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Didier</td>
<td>[100,000]</td>
<td>[100,000]</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubourg</td>
<td>[7,500]</td>
<td>[7,500]</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Dufour/Malet &amp; cie</td>
<td>[24,570]</td>
<td>[24,570]</td>
<td>24,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Dufresne</td>
<td>17,797</td>
<td>[11,118]</td>
<td>(11,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Dumoulin</td>
<td>[22,500]</td>
<td>[22,500]</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupont/Jacques etc.</td>
<td>[18,937]</td>
<td>[18,937]</td>
<td>18,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Dupuis</td>
<td>[33,334]</td>
<td>[33,334]</td>
<td>33,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutasta</td>
<td>[180,165]</td>
<td>[180,165]</td>
<td>180,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famín/Laferre</td>
<td>[28,000]</td>
<td>[28,000]</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faucher</td>
<td>[6,000]</td>
<td>[6,000]</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faugé</td>
<td>5,623</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>2,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferino</td>
<td>8,380</td>
<td>[5,000]</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feron</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>[2,000]</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Fouque</td>
<td>32,948</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Gavary</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendron</td>
<td>[69,540]</td>
<td>[69,540]</td>
<td>69,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Godin</td>
<td>[1,333]</td>
<td>[1,333]</td>
<td>1,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosselin/Dufour</td>
<td>[5,001]</td>
<td>[5,001]</td>
<td>5,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Grou (Ve) &amp; fils</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>[20,000]</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Guillantina</td>
<td>[71,443]</td>
<td>71,443</td>
<td>71,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hariague</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>[3,981]</td>
<td>3,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Hurard</td>
<td>6,738</td>
<td>[3,000]</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquier</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>[43,844]</td>
<td>43,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Judde, Leveque, Judde</td>
<td>22,743</td>
<td>[12,321]</td>
<td>12,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Lachenaye</td>
<td>[207]</td>
<td>[207]</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafargue</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>[9,000]</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Lamy Frères &amp; Rozières</td>
<td>[17,950]</td>
<td>[10,010]</td>
<td>10,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Lasalle</td>
<td>11,615</td>
<td>[11,615]</td>
<td>11,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauriol/Moreau</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>[30,002]</td>
<td>30,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebrun (Ve)</td>
<td>[2,500]</td>
<td>[2,500]</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Lefebvre de Givry</td>
<td>130,962</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>107,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Lequesne</td>
<td>[31,034]</td>
<td>[31,034]</td>
<td>31,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Leroi d'Arcourt</td>
<td>[57,260]</td>
<td>[57,260]</td>
<td>57,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroux, Mermier, etc.</td>
<td>[12,000]</td>
<td>[12,000]</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Levacher*</td>
<td>13,010</td>
<td>[10,508]</td>
<td>10,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Lioni frères &amp; Gouffre</td>
<td>1,502,276</td>
<td>921,118</td>
<td>263,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liunel</td>
<td>[5,500]</td>
<td>[5,500]</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunel/Estrine/Manen</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>[6,000]</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malherbe</td>
<td>[12,000]</td>
<td>[12,000]</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mancé</td>
<td>[10,000]</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massy</td>
<td>9,606</td>
<td>9,606</td>
<td>8,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Mathieu</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>84,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazurier</td>
<td>[10,000]</td>
<td>[10,000]</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Mendès frères</td>
<td>[39,865]</td>
<td>[39,865]</td>
<td>39,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercier</td>
<td>[75,278]</td>
<td>[75,278]</td>
<td>75,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Montaudoin/Demode</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Montigny/Aly</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morin (De)</td>
<td>[23,744]</td>
<td>[23,744]</td>
<td>23,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogier</td>
<td>17,067</td>
<td>[15,600]</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Olive</td>
<td>11,001</td>
<td>[7,500]</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Original debt of 1747-1762</td>
<td>Amount due in May, 1762</td>
<td>Amount due in 1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Paillet (Ve)</td>
<td>[40,000]</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papelier &amp; Eberts</td>
<td>[2,432]</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>2,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piquier</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>[3,000]</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Plumangat</td>
<td>[44,643]</td>
<td>[44,643]</td>
<td>44,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumard de Rieux/heirs</td>
<td>53,332</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progen</td>
<td>[10,000]</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poulgin</td>
<td>[1,500]</td>
<td>[1,500]</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Raphel</td>
<td>[25,000]</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Rat</td>
<td>[30,000]</td>
<td>[30,000]</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Remongin &amp; Joubert</td>
<td>[19,310]</td>
<td>[19,310]</td>
<td>19,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Rillaubet</td>
<td>[7,581]</td>
<td>[7,581]</td>
<td>7,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M de la Rivière</td>
<td>[75,608]</td>
<td>[75,608]</td>
<td>75,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rognan (Ve)</td>
<td>[1,400]</td>
<td>[1,400]</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Rolland &amp; fils</td>
<td>[25,000]</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>13,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Sandrin/heirs</td>
<td>[200,000]</td>
<td>[200,000]</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarthon (Ve)/Laporte</td>
<td>[19,000]</td>
<td>[518]</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Tassin</td>
<td>37,647</td>
<td>[25,467]</td>
<td>25,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testas</td>
<td>[20,100]</td>
<td>[20,100]</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Thelusson, Necker &amp; cie</td>
<td>[2,358]</td>
<td>[2,358]</td>
<td>2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tiran</td>
<td>[113,813]</td>
<td>[113,813]</td>
<td>113,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tissinier</td>
<td>[51,787]</td>
<td>[51,787]</td>
<td>51,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Tosgobly</td>
<td>[2,600]</td>
<td>[2,600]</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M de la Tour</td>
<td>[3,200]</td>
<td>[3,200]</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Trochereau de la Berlière</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>47,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trubert</td>
<td>[55,866]</td>
<td>[55,866]</td>
<td>55,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Tussureau</td>
<td>[20,100]</td>
<td>[20,100]</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Vandenyvert frères</td>
<td>[79,355]</td>
<td>[79,355]</td>
<td>79,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villeneuve (Dlle)</td>
<td>[1,110]</td>
<td>[1,110]</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

| | 5,980,831 | 4,912,512 | 4,048,513 |

The creditors of the Lioncys:

In all columns above, the claims of the Lioncy brothers and Gouffre are artificial insofar as they conceal the identity of the increasingly significant creditors of the Lioncys (whose claims account for a larger and larger percentage of the Lioncys' own claims). Unfortunately, we know nothing about these people's individual claims even as late as 1761 (when they were all covered by the umbrella of the Lioncys' claim for more than one and one-half million livres). But by 1762 when Terray compiled his list, they were separated from the Lioncys and given the status of creditors of the Jesuits. They received the same recognition in 1772.

Thus, we may analyse the Lioncys' claims in the following way:
The Lioncy brothers and Gouffre and their creditors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Original debt of 1747-1762</th>
<th>Amount due in May, 1762</th>
<th>Amount due in 1772</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lioncy brothers and Gouffre</td>
<td>1,502,276</td>
<td>810,000</td>
<td>32,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their creditors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucane*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Berthomé</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croisier/Trudon*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castillon*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Delacour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delatouche/Beaupoil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquiau</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Levacher*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,518</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Roux &amp; fils</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,100</td>
<td>68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarthon (Ve)/Laporte*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Testart</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villaquier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>1,502,276</td>
<td>921,118</td>
<td>263,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IX  The Accounts of the Econome Général du Clergé for the administration of Jesuit benefices and pensions 1763-1789.*

Part I  The Econome Général's receipts from Jesuit benefices and former Jesuit college bureaux in the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris 1763-1772

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlling College</th>
<th>1764</th>
<th>1765</th>
<th>1766</th>
<th>1767</th>
<th>1768</th>
<th>1769</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1771</th>
<th>1772</th>
<th>1773</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>11,820</td>
<td>12,859</td>
<td>8,441</td>
<td>28,306</td>
<td>9,007</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurillac</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billom</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleville</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Notes, indicated by elevated letters, are to be found at the end of the appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>1764</th>
<th>1765</th>
<th>1766</th>
<th>1767</th>
<th>1768</th>
<th>1769</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1771</th>
<th>1772</th>
<th>1773</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eu</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-le-Comte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Flèche</td>
<td>14,113</td>
<td>31,710</td>
<td>7,560</td>
<td>4,794</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>17,124</td>
<td>18,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>10,727</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>9,892</td>
<td>13,153</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>21,475</td>
<td>15,406</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>11,723</td>
<td>6,614</td>
<td>11,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moulins</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td>17,959</td>
<td>20,664</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>9,186</td>
<td>18,866</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>8,989</td>
<td>21,195</td>
<td>12,275</td>
<td>11,562</td>
<td>5,093</td>
<td>8,198</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>21,475</td>
<td>15,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>17,360</td>
<td>7,995</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including Châlons-sur-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marne)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Omer</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wallon College)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>15,477</td>
<td>5,761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amounts produced by benefices</td>
<td>92,337</td>
<td>174,816</td>
<td>77,966</td>
<td>42,144</td>
<td>75,872</td>
<td>46,410</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>36,533</td>
<td>16,524</td>
<td>20,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amounts paid by college bureaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total for jurisdiction of Parlement of Paris</td>
<td>92,337</td>
<td>174,816</td>
<td>117,166</td>
<td>92,388</td>
<td>119,706</td>
<td>96,366</td>
<td>71,797</td>
<td>112,966</td>
<td>75,442</td>
<td>62,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total for whole of France</td>
<td>183,030</td>
<td>358,094</td>
<td>273,014</td>
<td>170,150</td>
<td>252,708</td>
<td>186,389</td>
<td>152,086</td>
<td>227,181</td>
<td>150,909</td>
<td>91,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

952,985

1,953,561
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Part II  Summary of the gross and net receipts from the whole of France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in which accounts presented</th>
<th>Gross Receipts</th>
<th>Net Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>183,030</td>
<td>131,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>358,094</td>
<td>222,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>273,014</td>
<td>74,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>170,150</td>
<td>83,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>252,708</td>
<td>29,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>186,389</td>
<td>103,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>152,086</td>
<td>98,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>227,180</td>
<td>158,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>150,909</td>
<td>122,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773-1777</td>
<td>1,044,087</td>
<td>869,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>224,364</td>
<td>89,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>139,399</td>
<td>110,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III  Summary of amounts authorized or known to have been spent on Jesuit pensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount ordered to be paid</th>
<th>Amount known to have been paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763-1764</td>
<td>695,000</td>
<td>2,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>1,826,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>341,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>376,750</td>
<td>350,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>354,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>326,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>1,597,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>237,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>327,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Amount ordered to be paid</td>
<td>Amount known to have been paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td></td>
<td>226,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td></td>
<td>206,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Notes are at end of appendix. All amounts are in livres tournois.
Notes, Appendix IX

Part I

Part I of this appendix is based on A.N., F 4 1935 *Etat des recouvrements*, the accounts submitted to the Contrôle Général by the Econome Général for 1763-1772. The first set of figures for any year refers to the amounts received (in nearest livre) from college bureaux after the benefices had been handed over to them for their management. Totals shown at the end of each year are also in nearest livre, based on calculations involving the complete original amount. Hence, the totals, though correct to the nearest livre, are not necessarily the sum of the amounts shown in the column. Note that the year in which the account was presented was the year after the one in which the revenue was produced. The statements dated 1773 are for the first six months of that year only.

Part II

Part II is based on A.N., F 4 1935 *Etat des recouvrements*, the accounts submitted to the Contrôle Général by the Econome Général for 1763-1772 and F 4 1935 correspondence of Jarente, Bishop of Orléans, with the Contrôle Général in the same period; A.N., V 7 80 judgments of the commissioners general of the Commission of the Economats 14 January 1786, which is their judgment of Marchal's accounts of 1772-1777; A.N., F 4 2680 unsigned document entitled Règle des Jésuites 1 Janvier 1787, which deals with 1786; and A.N., G 9 47 unsigned document entitled Situation de l'Economat au ler Novembre 1789 and dealing with the year 1789.

Each account normally recorded receipts made by the end of the previous year and spent in the year in which the account was presented.

Part III

Part III is based on A.N., F 4 2680 unsigned document accompanying the correspondence of Calonne, Gojard, and Marchal de Sainscy for 1785-1786, which lists the amounts which the crown authorized to be spent on Jesuit pensions; and the accounts of the Econome Général for 1772-1777, 1786, and 1789 in A.N., V 7 80, F 4 2680, and G 9 47.