Interpreting the Failure of the French Republican Calendar, 1793-1799

Abstract

The decision taken by the French National Convention in 1793 to replace the Gregorian calendar with one which was decimal, rational and secularised was one of the most radical expressions of the scope and content of revolutionary ideology. Despite its ultimate failure and widespread popular rejection, Lynn Hunt has called the republican calendar ‘perhaps the defining development’ of the French Revolution.¹ Indeed, many of the defining conflicts and tensions of the revolutionary era - between the enlightened and the sacred, the rational and the traditional, the rights of the citizen and his obligations to the state - are evident in the Convention’s successive failed attempts to encourage in its citizens a new, secular mode of temporal perception. The temptation to view the conflict over the calendar as microcosmic of a conflict between a radical Revolution and citizens of uncertain loyalty thereto, then, is understandable. Much of the historiography of the calendar has interpreted its failure through the prism of this conflict; Matthew Shaw, for example, has written of the ‘close association between Republican sympathy and calendar use and, on the other hand, counter-revolutionary feeling and defence of the Catholic Gregorian Calendar’.² This essay, relying upon a re-evaluation of evidence both elite and popular, argues that it is reductive to conceive of the controversy over the calendar as a conflict between a monolithic Revolution and its rebellious citizens; though in some cases the rejection of the calendar was an explicitly counter-revolutionary act, in others it was a course of action defended specifically in terms of the ideals and rhetoric of the Revolution. In yet other cases, the failure of the calendar had little to do with ideology at all, but was rather precipitated by mundane, practical concerns such as the division of labour. Ultimately, it is shown, the failure of the calendar was the consequence of a diverse variety of circumstances; the tendency to reduce its implementation to a conflict between the Republic and its enemies is shown to be erroneous.

The Calendar in Republican Politics

It is useful in the first case to examine both the intended ideological function of the republican calendar and its contestation within the parameters of the Convention and Directory. Much academic attention is paid to the ‘dechristianizing’ character of the calendar, the extent to which it was intended to transfer the authority over the definition of the temporal - and the sacrality derived therefrom - from the hands of the church to those of the state.³ Suzanne Desan has written of the calendar as an attempt to construct a ‘rival
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cosmological and moral system’ to Christianity and thus to assert the pre-eminence of republicanism over religiosity. This characterisation - which necessarily posits the decision to adopt the republican calendar or not to do so as a choice between fidelity to the Revolution and fidelity to Christianity - is, of course, not without foundation.

Officially adopted in the early period of the Terror, the calendar was, unsurprisingly, associated with the violent suppression of the observance of religious festivals and holy days. Even after the end of the Terror and the (limited) liberalisation of laws on religious worship, the directive to implement the calendar provided a useful outlet for the dechristianizing impulses of individual state agents - in the canton of La Chapelle Egalité, local commissioners attempted to ban any religious gatherings outside of the décadi, while in Allier a cantonal agent suggested the closure of churches on every day but the décadi in order to prevent Sunday worship. The passage of legislation in 1798 rendering the use of the calendar in correspondence and in print, mandating the observance of the décadi and allowing the closure of schools which observed the ci-devant dimanche was necessarily antagonistic to the practice of Christianity.

It is important to note, however, that dechristianization or anti-religiosity were neither the central justifications for the creation of the calendar nor necessary consequences of its original implementation. Broadly speaking, the Committee of Public Instruction, in developing the calendar, assigned it three specific functions. First, the calendar was designed to signify the absolute temporal rupture between the Revolution and that which preceded it. By establishing a new calendar with its starting point in the establishment of the French Republic and in terms of which the dates of the ancien régime could not even be expressed, the Committee intended to inaugurate an utterly new historical era. Fabre d’Églantine, responsible for the nomenclature of the calendar, expressed a desire to ‘no longer count years during which the kings oppressed us as a time in which we lived’. Second, the calendar was part of a broader programme of standardisation and rationalisation - the standardisation of the number of days in a month
and switch to a decimal system of measurement was consistent with the decimal standardisation of weights and measures across France in this period.\(^\text{10}\) Finally, the calendar was meant to serve a didactic function - d’Églantine in particular hoped that his use of agrarian terms in the names of the months and days would help to ‘introduce elementary rural ideas amongst the people’.\(^\text{11}\) It is notable moreover that the Abbé Henri Grégoire, the constitutional bishop of Blois and a leading figure in the Constitutional Clergy, encouraged the drafting of didactic agrarian almanacs and sat on the Committee of Public Instruction as it drafted the new calendar (though he would disagree with its final form).\(^\text{12}\) The idea that the primary function of the calendar was to suppress religious observance or to aid in a broader campaign of dechristianization is conspicuously absent from the records of the Committee of Public Instruction or the debates on the calendar in the Convention; when Romme detailed the final proposals for the calendar in a speech to the Convention on 20 September 1793, he justified its implementation in terms of its rationalising and didactic functions rather than by any appeal to dechristianizing sentiment.\(^\text{13}\)

Moreover, the form in which the calendar was implemented in 1793 was considerably less antagonistic to the observance of religion than was the case after the legislation of 1798 dramatically expanded the scope of, and compulsion behind, the calendar. In its initial implementation, the use of the calendar was only mandated for those employed directly by the state, such as those working in the production of military armaments or in various bureaucratic capacities within the civil service. In both private correspondence and printed publications, citizens were free to use Gregorian dates alongside those of the new calendar. The observance of Sundays by institutions such as school was not, until 1798, directly proscribed by calendar legislation (though such practices were subject to general suppression during the Terror).\(^\text{14}\) Thus, the observance of Sunday mass and rest was not directly impinging upon the calendar; even at the height of its coercive implementation, when schools observing the \textit{ci-devant dimanche} could be closed, private citizens were not mandated to work on Sundays. Nonetheless, and despite its relatively swift implementation within the bureaucratic sphere, the calendar was met with little enthusiasm and low rates of adoption long before the institution of particularly antagonistic and coercive legislation.\(^\text{15}\) This inertia in the adoption of the calendar quite apart from the provocation of profound religious grievances.
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tends to suggest that the rejection of the calendar need not be read as the active resistance of a disgruntled populace.

In addition to bearing in mind the various functions of the calendar not directly related to dechristianization, and the relatively late occurrence of its most aggressive forms of implementation, it is important to avoid interpreting the calendar as something which enjoyed universal or unequivocal support within the domain of the Republic itself. Throughout the span of its usage, the wisdom or otherwise of the calendar was an open topic of debate within the National Convention. Several leading figures within the Convention were openly critical of the calendar on both a practical and an ideological level - the Abbé Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, for example, noted the deeply socially ingrained nature of the week in the organisation of daily life and labour, and argued that the implementation would inevitably be unsuccessful and thus wasteful. Jean Denis, comte Lanjuinais, a deputy who had participated prominently in the drafting of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, viewed the implementation of the calendar as an arrogant assumption of authority over time on the part of the state, dismissing those who dared to ‘change the times and days’ as ‘tyrants’ and reminding the Convention of the scornful attitude of the populace at large to it. Fabre d’Églantine, and the Convention which ultimately supported his proposals, meanwhile, defended the calendar by reference to liberty and equality - in this formulation, one of the key virtues of a secular calendar was that it afforded greater freedom of religion; those who were not Christian would not have to live according to Christian time.

Later, when the Fructidorian Directory began to explicitly consider the possibility of mandating that priests transfer their Sunday masses to the nearest décadi, this proposal was again met with explicit criticism which both originated within Republican circles and was articulated with specific reference to Republican ideals and institutions. The bishop Le Coz, for example, vigorously opposed the measure. In his Observations sur la célébration du dimanche (dated an VII), he argued that forcing worshippers who wished to observe Sunday as a holy day to transfer that worship to the décadi was a direct contravention of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, of the 1793 Constitution, and of the 1795 Thermidorian laws guaranteeing freedom of religion and permitting public worship. Simultaneously, Grégoire expressed the opinion that attempting to impose such a transfer was both ‘tyrannical’ and ‘stupid’. Lucien Bonaparte was likewise critical of the measure, noting that even in Rome, Jews were
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allowed to choose their own Sabbath. Not only did such figures articulate their grievances with the proposed abolition of Sunday worship in terms of revolutionary rhetoric and institutions, many of them also had well-established histories of pro-revolutionary practice. Grégoire was an active member of both the National Convention and the subsequent Council of Five Hundred. Le Coz had long been a leading member of the Constitutional Clergy and a strong advocate of the compatibility of Christianity and the Revolution - in 1793 he expressed the expectation that ‘our holy religion’ would ‘gain much from this Revolution’.

Ultimately, the proposal to allow the celebration of mass only on the décadi was decisively rejected by the government of the Republic. In areas where particularly zealous departmental commissioners attempted nevertheless to impose such a policy, they were consistently overruled by their superiors - both François de Neufchâteau and Nicolas Marie Quinette, as subsequent Ministers of the Interior, forbade such attempts by reference to the obligations of the Republic to uphold liberté des cultes. What is evident from the records of the discussion of the calendar within the Convention is that Republican opinion on its implementation was by no means a monolith; the calendar was both criticised and defended with reference to the the ideals of the Republic (popular will, liberty, equality), and multiple prominent figures within the revolutionary state were unafraid to publicly voice their opposition to it even in the dangerously heightened political atmosphere of late 1793 and early 1794 and at the peak of its compulsory enforcement under the Fructidorian Directory. Even at the most aggressive stage of its compulsory implementation, the scope of the calendar was limited by the obligations of the state to uphold the religious liberty of its citizens. The fraught and contested position of the calendar within the realm of high Republican politics calls into question the notion of a simplistic binary wherein pro-revolutionary sentiment is synonymous with support of the calendar and the rejection of the calendar is synonymous with counter-revolutionary sentiment.

**Interpreting the Popular Rejection of the Calendar**

That the calendar was a resounding failure in terms of its popular implementation is a matter of historical consensus. Although the calendar was quickly integrated upon local bureaucratic structures upon its inception, it was not until its use was strictly mandated (and the use of the Gregorian calendar forbidden)
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In 1798 that it entered wide usage in the context of print culture.\(^\text{24}\) In certain particularly enthusiastic quarters of the public, such as Jacobin Clubs, and in regions of strife, where the performance of one’s loyalty to the Republic in daily life was of particular importance, the calendar was adopted and the décadi enthusiastically celebrated.\(^\text{25}\) In most regions, however, and for the majority of citizens, the republican calendar never became a structural temporal force to rival the observance of the Gregorian calendar. The records of departmental commissioners and municipal agents across France consistently report low rates of adoption of the calendar, infrequent usage of its dating schemes in private communication, poor attendance at the fêtes décadières and the continued treatment of Sunday as a day of rest.\(^\text{26}\) If Shaw and Friguglietti are correct to describe the observance of the calendar as to some extent a proxy for the loyalty of citizens to the Republic, then the rates at which the calendar was adopted are a damning indictment of that loyalty indeed.\(^\text{27}\) The use of such practices as a barometer of pro- or counter-revolutionary sentiment is, however, unreliable. It is worthwhile to consider both the variety of non-religious reasons for the continued observances of traditional festivals and rest days and the fact that those observances, when religious, often co-existed with pro-revolutionary opinion.

In the first case, it is worthwhile to interrogate the extent to which those who continued to adhere to the treatment of Sunday as a day of rest and to the holding of festivals, fairs and markets according to the old Gregorian schedule were motivated by religious sentiment at all. The notion of an attempted ‘transfer of sacrality’ from Sunday to the décadi (and thus of legitimacy from the church to the state) is premised upon the notion that Sunday was sacred in the first place; that is to say, the idea that those who observed Sunday as a day of rest prior to the creation of the republican calendar conceived of that observance as ‘religious’ in the first place. It is a matter of considerable historiographical difficulty in any examination of popular religious practice to establish the difference between habitual or customary practice, practice with mundane motivations, and genuine religious belief - Roger Chartier, for example, has noted difficulties inherent in reaching conclusions about trends in actual spiritual conviction from trends in popular mass attendance.\(^\text{28}\) The work of Ozouf and others on the attempts by the Republic to co-opt the authority of the church assumes that Sundays were a sacral entity, but it is not clear whether this is so.\(^\text{29}\) As Shusterman notes, the observance of Sundays as a day of rest was incredibly widespread in pre-
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revolutionary France, and did not vary according to other potential indicators of religiosity such as mass attendance or ownership of religious texts.\textsuperscript{30}

Similarly, it is difficult to disentangle the balance of the religious and the localist or customary elements of popular festivals or customary fair dates. Throughout the eighteenth century, for example, the Gallican church carried out a series of concerted efforts to suppress popular religious festivals, which were deemed both improper and wasteful, or to transfer their occurrence to Sundays. Such attempts were of starkly limited success; in many areas, people were content to ignore or to actively oppose the attempts of the clergy and the episcopate to reform the customary ordering of their practices.\textsuperscript{31} That a century of concerted clerical intervention could not suppress such festivals, even in areas of high mass attendance and in which parish priests enjoyed good relations with their flocks, is suggestive that their value was not conceived of in entirely religious terms. Departmental commissioners tended to interpret the failure to comply with any element of the republican calendar, from the observance of the \textit{décadi} to the rescheduling of fairs and markets, as indicative of a religious attachment to the old, Gregorian order of time; in doing so, they failed for the most part to consider the role of habit and custom in the maintenance of traditional temporal habits.\textsuperscript{32} The sense of time is a deeply habituated, not necessarily easy to change upon a whim; the ingrained seven-day week, as sociologists have put, becomes a powerful ‘social fact’.\textsuperscript{33}

It is important to note that there were a variety of immediate, practical motives for non-compliance with, or active resistance to, the imposition of the republican calendar amongst the general populace. Perhaps chief amongst these was the impact of the calendar on standard labour practices. As early as 1793, workers in the civil service and governmental bureaucracies, as well as those in state-owned industries such as the production of armaments and military uniforms, were required to adjust their schedules of labour from that of the seven-day Gregorian calendar to that of the \textit{décade}.\textsuperscript{34} From 1798, when the observance of the \textit{décadi} was made mandatory, fines were imposed for the practice of public work on the \textit{décadi} and public institutions such as schools which observed Sundays (or failed to observe the \textit{décadi}) were threatened with closure, this effect became both more general and more pronounced.\textsuperscript{35}
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The implications of such measures for the lives of those who were subject to them were, on a purely mundane level, far from trivial. The shift in observance from a seven-day to a ten-day week (as well as the abandonment of specific religious holidays), each containing just one day of rest, for example, necessitates a significant increase in the number of days of consecutive work in a given décade and a significant decrease in the number of rest days in a given year. Where a worker could previously have expected fifty-six days of rest in a year, he could now expect only thirty-two. Moreover, where previously a worker would be expected to work for no more than six days at a time without resting, that figure was now nine days. Records of resistance to and protests against the republican calendar clearly display grievances with these increased labour requirements. In the aftermath of the initial approval of the calendar in 1793, Parisian mill-workers employed by the state spent several months on strike, protesting the reduction in their annual rest days. Departmental commissioners under the Fructidorian Directory recorded widespread grievances against the new schedule of labour; Valentin Dupont of St. Martin in the Gironde complained of the exhaustion induced by the working requirements of a ten-day week, telling his local commissioner that ‘man and beast cannot work nine days consecutively’.

In addition to the extension of working hours necessitated by the republican calendar, the new system for the measurement of time also forced a transformation of the schedules on the basis of which economic activity occurred. This transformation of the old rhythm of economic activity, especially when paired with the levying of fines and other punishments upon those who worked on the décadi, had the potential to be highly disruptive. In July 1798, for example, the failure to swiftly produce the new regulations concerning the holding of fairs and markets had deleterious economic consequences in the countryside - the Directory had banned the old schedule of markets but not published the new, leading to a state of affairs at the beginning of the harvest whereby farmers had difficulty selling their produce and households had difficulty acquiring food to eat. The significant costs imposed upon ordinary citizens by this bureaucratic failure led to strong resistance; at Montréjeau, a huge crowd gathered to hold a market in defiance of the local gendarmes. In a variety of other circumstances, the temporal sensitivity of certain economic activities brought their practitioners into conflict or tension with the state; Shaw notes examples of manufacturers who needed to prepare their products on the décadi and sailors for whom it
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was important to launch a ship at a specific tide.\textsuperscript{40} Though permits could be attained for such activities, the bureaucracy and delay involved in doing so, in tandem with the risk that they might not be granted, no doubt encouraged some citizens to engage in such practices covertly on the décadi.

The case of the disruption of labour by the republican calendar and the attendant grievances on the part of citizens and subsequent conflicts with the state exemplifies an important point to bear in mind when interpreting the failure of the public at large to comply with the calendar. Time, in addition to being a question of ideology and worldview, is a practical structuring principle in the context of economic activities. That some citizens were aggrieved by the significant extension of their working hours, or by bureaucratic failures which reduced their access to the purchase of food or their capacity to practice their livelihood when it was necessary to do, need not suggest any antipathy to the revolution or the Republican cause. The calendar was, for a significant subset of French citizens, simply incompatible with the daily economic necessities of their lives. In such cases, even citizens with a strong desire to display their loyalty to the Republic simply may not have had the choice to do so.

The fact that French citizens had motives other than the religious for rejecting the calendar and continuing to observe Gregorian rest days is not, of course, to suggest that they never did so for religious reasons. On the contrary, there exists plentiful evidence of a strong desire to engage in religious practice amongst the population in this period, particularly in the aftermath of the fall of Robespierre and the liberalisation of restrictions on religious worship. For example, from 1795-1801, forty percent of petitions from the Yonne region to the central administration regarded the desire to re-open churches, while others requested the return of deported priests or relics, while similar popular attempts to revive religious practice occurred across northern and central France.\textsuperscript{41} It is easy to conclude, therefore, that in the aftermath of the Terror saw a significant popular revival of religious practice. What is much less easy to conclude is that those who favoured traditional religious practice over the revival of calendar were engaging in a meaningfully ‘counter-revolutionary’ act. Doubtless, much of the disobedience directed at the institutions of the state, not least the calendar, was religious in nature - citizens strongly resisted attempts to keep their churches closed, often gathering and directly intimidating municipal officials, for example.\textsuperscript{42} As Ozouf notes, multiple nineteenth-century authors, including Edgar Quinet and Charles Fourier considered the persistence of Christianity a decisive failure on the part of the revolution.\textsuperscript{43}
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The evidence suggests, however, that French citizens need not have viewed their desire to practice Christianity as a choice between the tenets of their faith and their fidelity to the revolution; on the contrary, Suzanne Desan's analysis persuasively suggests that they not only perceived their faith to be compatible with their revolutionary principles, but that they considered their entitlement to the former to be an explicit ideological premise of the latter. Throughout the period of religious revivalism in the Yonne, she notes, citizens consistently justified their acts of protest and civil disobedience by reference to the principles and rhetoric of the revolution - at St. Bris, for example, an area of strong revolutionary loyalty, citizens specifically referenced the revolutionary principle of freedom of religion when demanding the re-opening of their church. Elsewhere, Francois Dupuis, a priest, responding to efforts to transfer his Sunday services to the décadi, reminded the central administration of his region that the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen and of the 1793 Constitution. At the same time, he took pains to emphasise his revolutionary commitment, noting that he celebrated the décadi and revolutionary festivals in addition to Sundays. One could yet argue that the deployment of such rhetoric was merely a matter of political expediency, an attempt to earn favour with the revolutionary state. This possibility is, of course, impossible to conclusively dismiss, but Desan does present extensive evidence of widespread and seemingly spontaneous Republican fervour amongst the same civilians demanding access to Christianity; cries of ‘Vive la loi! Vive la Republique!’ were heard alongside demands for the re-opening of churches. Moreover, Catholic revivalists continuously used the political mechanisms of the revolutionary state itself, for example the citizens’ petition, to demand their rights, despite the relatively weak enforcement powers of most departmental commissioners and municipal agents. The issuance of petitions in such a circumstance is likely indicative of a desire to remain clearly on the side of the Republic. Despite the dechristianizing and anti-religious sentiments of some senior revolutionary figures and local administrators, then, there is no particular reason to believe that those who kept to the religious observance of the Gregorian calendar rather than adopted the décade viewed their own actions in any sense in a counter-revolutionary light; to them, their position was often defensible within the ideological parameters of the revolution.

None of this is to suggest, of course, that the decision not to adopt the republican calendar was a politically frictionless decision, one never inspired by counter-revolutionary sentiment. Undoubtedly, there
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exists evidence of plentiful cases in which non-compliance with the calendar was a deliberately counter-revolutionary act. Shaw and Shusterman, in particular, provide a compelling series of examples to suggest that in areas of high civil strife, where counter-revolutionary and pro-revolutionary sentiment sat alongside one another, the adoption or rejection of the calendar often became a particularly important performative display of support for or opposition to the Republic. Fines were levied particularly frequently in Nantes, Avignon, Besançon, Lille and Amiens, areas where there was a groundswell of counter-revolutionary sentiment. In such areas, locals often made a point of dressing shabbily for civil weddings (which could only occur on the décadi) while celebrating religious weddings in style. Moreover, departmental reports suggest that it was not uncommon for citizens to work pointedly loudly inside their homes and workshops on the décadi in order to protest the ban on public work. In regions of low unrest, on the other hand, low observance of the calendar was accompanied by lax enforcement on the part of local commissioners.

In conclusion, then, the failed implementation of the republican calendar is a complex issue, one which does not submit itself easily or accurately to historiographical simplifications such as the attempt to use the observance or rejection of the calendar as a proxy for pro- or counter-revolutionary sentiment. On the one hand, the purpose, scope and implementation were hotly contested within the high-political spheres of the Republic itself; in multiple cases, for example the question of the mandatory transfer of mass from Sunday to the décadi, zeal for the implementation of the calendar was tempered by the importance of the principles of public opinion and liberté des cultes. The inertia with which popular adoption of the calendar was beset, on the other hand, arose from a variety of sources - in some cases, from genuine counter-revolutionary sentiment, but in others from attachment to custom, the economic difficulties posed by the calendar, or the sense that the right of observance of Gregorian time was not only consisted with, but indeed guaranteed by the principles of the Republic. Thus, the calendar was neither uniformly supported by the agents of the revolution nor rejected solely on the basis of counter-revolutionary sentiment. Appealing though parsimonious simplifications of the conflict over the calendar may be, they are not reflective of the true nuance of its failure.
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