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Abstract
On the morning of 11 May 1745, some 90 transport vessels under escort of a British naval squadron sailed into Gabarus (Gabarouse) Bay on Cape Breton Island. Aboard the transports were nine regiments of hastily raised citizen soldiers from the colonies of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. They had come to conquer the great French fortress of Louisbourg; in 47 days they were to do just that, and shatter the myth of invincibility that had begun to surround the fortress.

Submitted for publication, 1971, by Raymond F. Baker, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada.

Preface
The following study of the 1745 siege of Louisbourg involved three months’ research among the archival holdings of the Fortress of Louisbourg.¹ It is not a comprehensive study, as time would not permit detailed examination of many phases of the siege deserving further investigation. The following are those phases which I feel are of particular significance, with the thought that subsequent research might be undertaken upon them: the New England vessels participating in the expedition; the provisions used by and the method of provisioning the New England forces during the siege; the relations between Warren and Pepperrell during the siege, as well as the nature and extent of army-navy co-operation; the state of the Louisbourg defences (both fortifications and armaments) prior to the siege; the extent of the disaffection of the Louisbourg garrison prior to the siege, and the influence the disaffection might have had on the final outcome and the provincial scouting parties sent out during the siege, with particular reference to the purposes intended, the results achieved, and the effect the scouting parties might have had on the final outcome of the campaign.
**Background**

The fall of the Fortress of Louisbourg in 1745 was the culmination of events that began with another surrender 32 years before, in 1713, when France signed the Treaty of Utrecht ending Queen Anne’s War. By the terms of that treaty, France lost most of her North American empire. Acadia (comprising the present provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and much of the state of Maine), the vast Hudson’s Bay trading area and Newfoundland passed into English hands, leaving the rest of New France (Canada) virtually isolated and vulnerable to attack from the New England colonies. Louis XIV tried to retain Acadia and thus provide a buffer of sorts, but the best he could secure was Cape Breton, a rocky island off the coast of Nova Scotia. This was not much of a gain, but it did give France a toe-hold on the Atlantic frontier; and the island’s strategic position at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, “the natural highway into the heart of Canada,” would, if defended by a large enough fleet, allow the French to maintain that vital lifeline to the interior.

To ensure control of the St. Lawrence and to protect her North American commerce and commercial fisheries, France spent the next 30 years and ten million dollars building the fortified naval station of Louisbourg at Havre à l’Anglais on Cape Breton’s southeast coast. The fortifications were begun in 1719, based upon the principles of defence developed by the renowned French military engineer, Sebastien Le Prestre de Vauban. They eventually enclosed a town area of some 57 acres with 30-foot-high masonry walls and a series of bastions. The most important of these, stretching south and east for three-quarters of a mile along the landward front, were, respectively, the Dauphin Demi-bastion on the harbour side, the King’s Bastion, the Queen’s Bastion, and, buttressing against the Atlantic, the Princess Demi-bastion. A glacis, ditch and covertway afforded additional protection.

The main barracks building, located in the gorge of the King’s Bastion (together known as the Citadel), was Louisbourg’s administrative and military centre and contained the governor’s apartments, a chapel, officers’ rooms, and quarters for the garrison. Most of the town of Louisbourg consisted of stone and timber and “picquet” buildings.¹

Louisbourg Harbour runs roughly northeast by southwest, and while the two peninsulas at the entrance are about a mile apart, the actual roadway is reduced to less than half a mile between Goat and Battery islands on one side and numerous reefs off Lighthouse Point on the other. The harbour entrance was protected by the Island Battery and by the Royal Battery on the mainland, about a mile northeast of the town fronting the harbour: the circular battery at the Dauphin Bastion, the Maurepas Bastion at the neck of Rochefort Point, and an artillery work called Pièce de la Grave near the quay.

Garrisoned by French regulars and militia and mounting more than 100 cannon (mostly 24- and 42-pounders), Louisbourg, fortress and harbour, by 1745 presented an imposing and formidable appearance. Some considered it impregnable.²

For 30 years after the Treaty of Utrecht, England and France remained at uneasy peace. During this time, New Englanders had locked upon Louisbourg’s development with growing interest and not a little concern. But it took the outbreak of King George’s War (part of the larger European War of the Austrian Succession) in 1744 to underscore the threat the fortress posed to their security. When word reached North American waters that France and England had declared war in April of that year, French privateers operating out of Louisbourg began to prey on the New England coastal trade. Between 31 May and 12 June, two French privateers armed only with muskets captured at least ten Massachusetts fishing vessels off the Sable Island and Canso banks. By July, French raiders were operating off the coast of Massachusetts, threatening the trade routes to and from Boston.³

In late May French troops surprised and captured the poorly defended English fishing village of Canso at the mouth of Chedabucto Bay, carrying its garrison off to captivity at Louisbourg — a costly error, since this gave the English the opportunity to scrutinize the French defences and note any weaknesses. In August, another troop detachment sent out from the fortress laid siege to Annapolis Royal, the British stronghold on the Bay of Fundy, but withdrew after three weeks of desultory attacks when the defences proved too strong.⁴

The French gained little by attacking Canso and Annapolis Royal and succeeded only in angering the New Englanders and rousing them to action. Perhaps, as the anonymous habitant de Louisbourg later claimed “Les Anglois ne nous auraient peut-être point inquiétés, si nous n’eussions été les premiers à les insulter . . . Les habitans de la nouvelle Angleterre étoient intéressés à vivre en paix avec nous. Ils l’eussent sans doute fait, si nous ne nous étions point avisés mal à propos, de les tirer de cette sécurité où ils étoient à notre égard.”⁵ But attention had been forcibly drawn to the dangers posed by the French naval base, and the clamour for an expedition against the fortress would not be silenced.

The originator of the Louisbourg expedition has long been a subject of controversy, but credit for promoting and gathering support for it must go to Massachusetts’ 50-year-old royal governor, William Shirley. Born in England and trained for the law, Shirley had come to Boston in 1731 when his meagre London law
Governor William Shirley. (The Canadian Magazine, Vol. 22, No. 4, p. 356.)
practice proved inadequate to support a wife and eight children. In the next 10 years, his legal career had blossomed; so, too, had his popularity and reputation as a staunch supporter of the king's interests, and in 1741 he became the colony's governor.6

Shirley had long contemplated an expedition against Louisbourg, and when the Canso garrison returned to Boston from confinement at the fortress in late 1744, he listened attentively to reports that the "impregnable" French stronghold was far from impregnable – that the garrison was small, discontented, and mutinous; that the fortress was dominated by high hills to the west; that the Royal Battery had two unrepaired breaches, and that supplies and munitions were inadequate to withstand a long and determined siege.7 The longer Shirley listened, the more convinced he became that an attack on Louisbourg could succeed if it were launched before the French reinforced the garrison in the spring.

On 20 January 1745, Shirley went before the Massachusetts General Court seeking the authority to raise and fit out an expedition. After swearing the members to secrecy, he warned them of the threat Louisbourg presented to navigation and trade, to supply ships, to the New England fisheries, and to the general security of British settlements. Nothing, he argued, would more effectively promote the interests of [Massachusetts] ... than a reduction of that place ... From the best information that can be had of the circumstances of the Town and of the number of the soldiers and Militia within it, and of the situation of the Harbour, I have good reason to think that if Two Thousand men were landed upon the Island [Cape Breton] as soon as they may be conveniently got ready ... such a number of men would, with the blessing of Divine Providence upon their enterprise, be masters of the field at all events.8

The court did not share Shirley's optimism and voted down the proposition after several days' debate. It was only after Boston merchants learned of the decision and petitioned the court to reconsider the governor's proposal that the expedition was finally approved on 5 February by the narrow margin of one vote – occasioned, it is said, when one of the members of the court broke his leg while hurrying to cast a dissenting ballot.9 Shirley then notified the home government in London of the intended attack, drew up a "Scheme for Attacking Louisbourg" (see Appendix B), which he sent to the admiralty, and appealed for volunteers from colonies as far south as Pennsylvania.

At the same time, Shirley requested naval assistance from Commodore Peter Warren, commanding British naval operations in American waters, then stationed in the Leeward Islands in the West Indies. Warren, 42 years old, had been on duty in North America since 1730. He had property holdings and family connections in New York (he was married to the sister of Chief Justice James De Lancey of the New York Supreme Court) and, like Shirley, had long favoured attacking Louisbourg. Indeed, as early as February 1743, Warren had recommended just that to the Admiralty, but nothing had come of it.10 Shirley, possibly with Warren's outlook in mind, told the commodore that if he would release ships to assist in the expedition, they (along with the vessels the colonies furnished) would ensure the ultimate success of New England arms. The governor even offered Warren command of the expedition, writing that "if the service in which you are engaged would permit you to come yourself and take command of it, it would I doubt not be a most happy event for his Majesty's service and your own honour."11

Warren's reply, which reached Shirley in mid-March, was disappointing. The commodore wrote that he would have willingly complied with the governor's request, but his fellow officers had met in council and decided that, without Admiralty instructions, Warren had no authority to send naval assistance for the expedition. He was, however, sending two warships to patrol New England waters and thus relieve those colonial vessels taking part in the campaign.12

In the meantime, Warren received orders from the Admiralty which, interpreted broadly, gave him authority to assist in the expedition. He immediately fitted out his 60-gun flagship Superbe, and on 24 March sailed from Antigua in company with two 40-gun ships of the line (the Mermaid and the Launceston) and a transport. He sent word to Shirley that, to save time, he would sail directly for Louisbourg, stopping at Canso for water and the latest intelligence. Warren also ordered two other battleships (one a captured French prize) to join him off Louisbourg.13

The Louisbourg expedition has been called both "a mad scheme" and "a project of wild audacity,"14 fitting epithets when one considers that there were no experienced troops in the colonies to carry it out – no regular soldiers, no trained officers, no knowledgeable veterans, and no naval force. Few, indeed, could boast of more than a passing acquaintance with the rudiments of basic military drill, let alone the intricate art of siegecraft. This state of affairs led a skeptical Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia to caution his brother in Boston: "Fortified towns are hard nuts to crack, and your teeth are not accustomed to it. Taking strong places is a particular trade, which you have taken up without serving an apprenticeship to it ... But some seem to think forts are as easy taken as snuff."15
2 Sir Peter Warren. (New Brunswick Museum.)
Despite Franklin’s misgivings – and there were others who shared his concern – more than 4,000 men, all New Englanders, signed up to attack Louisbourg. Some 3,300 came from Massachusetts (which then included Maine), 500 from Connecticut, and 450 from New Hampshire (some of whom were paid by Massachusetts). New York supplied a few cannon of varying size and quality, and Pennsylvania and New Jersey sent food and clothing. Rhode Island voted to raise three companies of men, but, having second thoughts, cautiously withheld them until the campaign had ended. Other colonies sent their prayers and best wishes, but nothing else.

The army (if that name can be applied to such a heterogeneous and undisciplined body of men) was made up of fishermen, farmers, mechanics, merchants, and frontiersmen of all age and circumstance, all determined to see Louisbourg devastated because that place “was Like to prove Detremental if not Destroying to our Country.” So great was the enthusiasm to enlist in the expedition that Major John Storer of the Maine militia signed up a company of three score men in a single day, their ages running from 16 to 60.

The great religious revival that had so recently swept through New England also brought a large number of militant Protestant clergymen into the army’s ranks, all anxious to lay waste that “Stronghold of Satan” on Cape Breton Island. One, the Reverend Samuel Moody of York, Maine, and at 70 “the oldest man in the army,” reportedly brought his own ax to cut down the “idols” in the Louisbourg churches. English Methodist minister George Whitefield, who did not accompany the army to Louisbourg, supplied a motto: Nil desperandum Christo duce (Despair of nothing while Christ leads). The presence of the ministers gave the expedition an atmosphere of a crusade, causing a later writer to feel that the campaign was a “strangely combined muster and camp-meeting.”

The terms of service varied little from colony to colony, each man usually receiving a specified amount of money and a blanket. Those who could bring their own musket, sword, belt and cartridge box, blanket, and whatever else might be required, “to the acceptance of the military officer who shall enlist them,” received higher monthly stipends. To those unable to furnish such items, the colony would see to their needs, with the stipulation that each item furnished must be returned at the end of the campaign and that any item lost be paid for. All enlistees would also have an equal share in all plunder, be free from the collection of debts until returning to the colony, and receive one month’s wages in advance before embarkation. The men were also promised such goodly portions of rum that Connecticut’s Governor Jonathan Law felt compelled to caution Captain John Prentis of the Connecticut sloop Defiance against allowing his men to indulge too heavily for fear they might be inebriated in time of danger.

Command of the army and expedition was given to 49-year-old William Pepperrell of Kittery, Maine. Pepperrell, who received the rank of lieutenant general, was president of the Massachusetts Council and a prosperous and influential merchant. He had no previous military experience beyond an occasional muster of the militia, of which he was colonel, but he was popular and possessed a marked degree of common sense – primary requisites for a leader of undisciplined citizen-soldiers. Pepperrell’s commission as commander of the army did not come from Massachusetts alone; he held simultaneous commissions from New Hampshire and Connecticut. Each of these colonies, therefore, possessed a degree of authority over his actions. Surprisingly, Pepperrell was not hampered by this and he maintained relative independence of command.

Second in command was Roger Wolcott, 67-year-old deputy governor of Connecticut, who received his appointment and rank of major general as a condition for that colony sending troops. The brigadiers were Samuel Waldo, prominent merchant and landowner, and Joseph Dwight, colonel of the artillery train actively commanded by Richard Gridley.

The provincial army was organized into nine regiments according to colony, as follows:

First Massachusetts Regiment, William Pepperrell, colonel. (Actively commanded by Lieutenant Colonel John Bradstreet.)
Second Massachusetts Regiment, Samuel Waldo, colonel. (Actively commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Arthur Noble of Georgetown, Massachusetts.)
Third Massachusetts Regiment, Jeremiah Moulton, colonel.
Fourth Massachusetts Regiment, Samuel Willard, colonel.
Fifth Massachusetts Regiment, Robert Hale, colonel.
Sixth Massachusetts Regiment, Sylvester Richmond, colonel.
Seventh Massachusetts Regiment, Shubael Gorham, colonel.
Connecticut Regiment, Andrew Burr, colonel.
New Hampshire Regiment, Samuel Moore, colonel.

To carry the army to Canso, where it would rendezvous before sailing on to Louisbourg, Shirley had managed to assemble (exclusive of Warren’s squadron then on its way north from the Leewards) a fleet of 90 transports, 5 men-of-war, and 6 sloops. It was commanded by Commodore John Rous of the frigate Shirley. Captain Edward Tyng, of the frigate Massachusetts, was senior provincial naval officer present, acting under Shirley’s commission.
Sir William Pepperrell. In the background of this painting by John Smibert is a view of Pepperrell’s forces in action at Louisbourg. (Essex Institute, Salem, Massachusetts.)
The expedition sailed on 4 April. For the men, tightly packed into the holds of the transports, the trip to Canso was far from enjoyable. For many, it was their first time at sea. "Wee had'ent Sailed, above 3 or 4 Leagues, before Some were Sea Sick," wrote one volunteer. The sickness increased and soon he was noting that "our Vessel was A Very Hospital, wee were all Sick, in a Greater or lesser Degree." The gunsmith Seth Pomeroy of Northampton, Massachusetts, was among those distressed, writing that he was so sick "day & night that I have not words to set it forth." The campaign was not off to a very auspicious beginning, but the sickness soon abated and by the middle of April the fleet began to assemble at Canso.

At Canso, Pepperrell learned that Gabarus Bay, southwest of Louisbourg where the landing would take place, was still blocked with winter ice. The ships would have to wait until the ice packs cleared. The delay, however, was taken up by prayer-meetings and military training, with the preaching loud and long and the training far from elaborate. The New England soldiers were enthusiastic, but apparently a bit reckless. One man "Carelessly handling his Gun, Shot it off, and the Bullet went thro' a Man's Cap on his head."

Commodore Warren arrived off Canso with his little squadron on 4 May, sending word ashore to Pepperrell that he was proceeding immediately to Louisbourg to block the harbour against the entry of any French ships. He assured Pepperrell that "nothing shall be wanting, on our parts to promote the Success of the Expedition, which I think of the utmost Consequence to our King and Country." Shirley had told Pepperrell that Warren, upon his arrival, was to take over command of the provincial naval force and that the cruiser officers were to take orders from the commodore. The governor urged Pepperrell to have no disagreements with Warren that might prejudice the success of the campaign.

Early in May, after nearly four weeks at Canso, Pepperrell finally received word that Gabarus Bay was free of ice. Previously, on 16 April, a council of war decided to make Canso the base of operations. It was to serve as both a place of retreat (should it prove necessary) and a place to carry the sick and wounded. Two companies of 40 men each were detailed to remain at Canso to guard against any French attack. The remainder of the men (except for Jeremiah Moulton's regiment, which had been sent to raid and burn the French settlement at St. Peters) were once again packed into the tight holds of the transports. On 9 May they sailed away on the enterprise which, if successful, "would be the most glorious and useful thing done in the war."}

**Preliminaries**

It was after sunrise on 11 May 1745 when the first colonial vessels sailed across Gabarus Bay toward a small inlet known as Freshwater Cove, about four miles southwest of Louisbourg, where the landing would be made. From the ramparts of the fortress, French soldiers watched anxiously as, one by one, the tiny transports assembled in the bay between the cove and Flat Point.

Upon the fleet's appearance in the bay, the French rang bells in Louisbourg to alert the garrison and the inhabitants of the outlying settlements. Throughout the town, soldiers went to their posts. Almost at once, the men took measures to secure the low wall at the southeast part of the fortress, working hurriedly to erect a platform of thick planks, upon which, before the day was out, they had two 24-pounder cannon mounted and firing. At the same time, soldiers mounted a number of swivel guns along the quay wall next to the harbour.

The New England militiamen on board the transports in the bay heard the bells and the cannon and saw the defensive measures being taken against them. But, undismayed, they prepared to scramble into the landing boats as soon as the signal was given.

**The Landing of 11 May**

In the confusion and excitement of the moment, few of the New Englanders who kept diaries or journals during the campaign remembered the exact time the fleet came to anchor in Gabarus Bay. Some of them believed it was 9 o'clock, while others thought it was not until 10 o'clock. Benjamin Cleaves, a clerk in Captain Benjamin Ives' company of Hale's Fifth Massachusetts Regiment, wrote that the fleet "came in fair sight of Cape Breton about 9 o'clock; Came to anchor about 10." The official account of the expedition, prepared by Pepperrell and four of his officers, places the time as between 9 and 10 o'clock. And Governor Shirley (who received his information from Pepperrell) gives the same time in a letter to the Duke of Newcastle in October 1745.

The diarists were less uncertain about the place of anchorage. Most of them agreed that it was about two miles below Flat Point or about four miles southwest of the fortress. "Here we saw the light house & ye steeples in the town," noted Benjamin Green, Pepperrell's secretary. If these observations are reliable, the place of anchorage would have been in the vicinity of Freshwater Cove, an inlet the French called Anse de la Cormorandière. Because of the many vessels involved (about 90), probably the whole area between the cove and Flat Point was occupied by the transports.

While the provincial army's presence off the coast in Gabarus Bay was far from being a secret to the French, Governor Shirley seems initially to have entertained some hope that Louisbourg
Fortifications of the town of Louisbourg in 1745, shown in a plan signed by the French engineer Verrier.

(Archives Nationales, France.)
Louisbourg and the New England positions. (Bibliothèque Nationale, France.)
could be taken by surprise. Before the Massachusetts contingent sailed from Boston, he gave Pepperrell a lengthy letter with detailed instructions on how the campaign should best be conducted (see Appendix C). Many of these instructions appear naive and impossible to execute. An early New England historian, Dr. Jeremy Belknap, writing some 40 years after the Louisbourg expedition, concluded that Pepperrell would have needed seven years’ experience as a general, the power of a Joshua, and men with the eyes of owls to accomplish what Shirley suggested. And a noted British naval historian, Admiral Herbert Richmond, called them “a perfect model of the type of instructions to be avoided.”

But while Shirley’s tactical ideas were scarcely credible, his scheme did anticipate the importance and relative vulnerability of two vital points of attack: the Royal and Island batteries.

Shirley contended that to surprise Louisbourg, the fleet’s arrival should be so timed that the landing could be made at night, “about nine of the clock.” The men were to be put ashore immediately and as quickly as possible, all the while maintaining “a profound silence,” lest they awaken the unsuspecting Frenchmen. After the men had been properly positioned around the fortress (all this to be done in the dark), at a prearranged signal they were to storm the walls. Because of the delay at Canso, however, and a contrary wind from Canso to Louisbourg, the fleet did not arrive until after daylight on 11 May, and whatever chance for surprise that might have existed had vanished.

The French probably would not have been taken completely by surprise in any case. Louis Duchambon, who had been military governor at Louisbourg a little over six months, reported that as early as 14 March ships had been sighted cruising off the fortress. (The intendant, François Bigot, confirms Duchambon’s statement.) The number of these vessels steadily increased throughout March and April and, though still in doubt as to whether the ships were French or English (the ice in the harbour and bay keeping them at a distance), the governor arranged for the safety of the inhabitants of the outlying settlements should the ships prove to be English and a forewarning of attack. He told the residents of the coastal villages near the town to be ready to obey any signal he might give them. He also called together all the residents of the town and harbour, divided the former group into four companies for defensive purposes, and instructed the latter group to repair to the Royal Battery or the Island Battery upon a signal from him.

The anonymous habitant de Louisbourg asserted that for a considerable time before the provincials appeared in Gabarus Bay, the French were not unaware “qu’il se trâmoit une entreprise secrète contre nous, à la Nouvelle Angleterre. Tous les jours nous recevions de secrets avis qu’on armoit le long de la Côte.” On 22 April, two men who had come overland from Port Toulouse told Duchambon of hearing cannon fire from Canso and that work was under way to restore the defences of that place. A third man told of witnessing a battle between French and English ships along the coast. By 8 May, Duchambon was certain that the ships off Louisbourg were English, and two days later, in the dark and fog of night, he despatched one of two ships prepared for the purpose through the blockade to France to inform the government of the colony’s situation.

Despite the apparent knowledge that “a secret enterprise” was in preparation in New England, Duchambon seems to have made little effort to meet the impending attack. He had tried to provide a large number of fagots on the quay for the use of the fire ships; he had proposed a battery on Cap Noir; and he had asked the ministry in France to send more cannon, remarking that the cannon he did have were not “Suffisant pour soutenir un Siege en form.”

His request for the additional cannon had gone out in November 1744, much too late for the ministry to send them in time, for it often took as long as a year for such requests to be acted upon. So the French government had not responded and none of Duchambon’s proposals was carried out. Even had he been able to take adequate defensive measures, it is unlikely that he would have been able to effect them satisfactorily because of the quality of the troops under his command.

Altogether, Duchambon’s force amounted to some 1,500 men of the Compagnies Franches de la Marine and militia, plus several companies of the Swiss mercenary Regiment de Karrer. (The habitant stated that this number could have been increased by 300 or 400 men who were at Ingonish and vicinity, but that by the time Duchambon decided to send for them, communications with that place had been cut off.) The militia lacked training and the Compagnies Franches which constituted about one-third of the total force, were inexperienced and disgruntled over back pay and poor food and clothing. Duchambon had inherited this discontented garrison from his predecessor, Duquesnel, who had died in October 1744. Military discipline had been so poorly maintained by Duquesnel, and Duchambon had so little succeeded in controlling the disaffection, that in December 1744 the garrison mutinied. Since then it had been in open rebellion against Duchambon’s authority. Only after the provincial army appeared in the bay was he able to harangue them into obedience, with promises that all would be forgiven if they settled down and did their duty. Even so, the habitant later admitted, “nous n’avions pas sujet de compter sur elles . . . Des Troupes si peu disciplinées n’étoient guères capables de nous inspirer de la con-
fiancée... je décidai qu’il étoit naturel de s’en défier.” It is hardly surprising that Duchambon was so ill-prepared for the attack when it came.

The only measure Duchambon could offer when the provincial fleet appeared on 11 May was to send a detachment of about 80 men to oppose the landing. This force was made up of about 50 civilians (militia) commanded by Port Captain Pierre Morpain and about 30 soldiers under Mesillac Duchambon, the governor’s son. (Another force of 40 men was already somewhere in the woods around Gabarus Bay, where they had for several days been watching vessels from Warren’s fleet which anchored in the bay from time to time.) One of the militia captains, Girard La Croix, remarked that even this action by the governor was rather futile, since the provincials were already ashore before Morpain and Duchambon could arrive.  

In Gabarus Bay, the landing signal was given and the New England troops scrambled into the landing boats. According to Pepperrell’s instructions from Shirley, the landing would take place in four divisions, three of which were to go ashore at Flat Point and the fourth at White Point farther up the coast. A council of war held at Canso on 16 April had, in effect, confirmed these instructions and the army was divided into four sections. But the council decided against making the landings at Flat and White points, choosing instead to send the army ashore some three miles from the town and four miles from the Royal Battery; in effect, between Flat Point and Freshwater Cove. As the army prepared to disembark at this point, the French force sent out by Du­chambon appeared on the beach, “marching towards the place where it was proposed to land our Troops.”  

Seeing the enemy force approach, Pepperrell, instructed to keep any resistance away from the main landing area as long as possible, sent several boatloads of men to make a feint of landing at Flat Point Cove. This “diverted the Enemy from proceeding further till they saw the Boats put back and row up the Bay.” In the meantime, the main landing had started at Freshwater Cove. It was now almost 12 noon and a high surf had developed, “which made it difficult landing,” but pulling vigorously against the breakers, a force of nearly 100 men managed to get ashore. A few provincials disappeared into the woods in search of any concealed enemy force, while the rest of the men advanced along the shore to meet the French troops, who had discovered the deception and were now racing for Freshwater Cove.  

After a brief but sharp skirmish, the French broke and ran for the woods. “These Scoundelles french Dogs,” wrote one New Englander, “they Dare not Stay to fite.” In the encounter, the French suffered a loss of about six men killed, five wounded and one civilian captured. Port Captain Morpain was also slightly wounded but managed to return to the town. The captured civilian was Le Poupet de la Boularderie, a retired officer of the Duke of Richelieu’s regiment in France. Several other Frenchmen were captured or killed in the woods before they could regain the fortress. The provincials’ loss was two or three men slightly wounded.  

The French in Louisbourg, alarmed at the easy repulse of Morpain and Duchambon, set fire to the houses and outbuildings beyond the Dauphin Gate to deny their use to the enemy. The inhabitants with their personal effects were brought into the town.  

Throughout the fighting on the beach, the provincial army continued to come ashore along the coast between Flat Point and Freshwater Cove. The high surf that continued throughout the day increased the difficulties of landing, but by nightfall some 2,000 men were ashore. Toward evening most of the transports moved up to the head of the bay, where the riding was smoother and safer.  

On shore, the undisciplined volunteers succumbed to chaotic impulse, and “Indeed! wee fill’d the Country,” noted one enthusiastic soldier. They had no specific orders as yet, but “Everyone Did what was Right in his own Eyes Among which I was one.” The men took to the hills, and soon the French saw them ranging the heights in great numbers opposite the King’s and Dauphin bastions. The provincials were within cannon shot and “at about two P.M. the cannon en barbette fired on several platoons which seemed to be marching without formation toward the far side of the bay.” One of the New Englanders on the hills that day recorded (somewhat matter-of-factly) that “one of the Balls wee took Up while it was a roalling {wee Judg’d it to be A 24 Pounder}.”  

The French saw still other men marching along the edge of the woods toward the Royal Battery. This was probably a detachment of 400 men under Colonel William Vaughan of Damariscotta, Maine, on its way to plunder and burn the storehouses and the northeast harbour. The provincials on the surrounding hills so alarmed Duchambon that “Je fis fermer Les portes, et Je fis pour­voir Sur Le champ a La Surette de la Ville et placer environ 1100 hommes, qui se sont trouves pour La defendre.” Even more alarmed was Chassin de Thierry, commandant of the Royal Battery.
The Abandonment of the Royal Battery

The relationship between the appearance of the provincials on the hills around Louisbourg on the afternoon of 11 May, and the abandonment of the Royal Battery has never been clearly defined. Many historians — those who bother to treat the subject at all — have attributed the abandonment directly to the burning of the northeast harbour storehouses on 12 May. The burning of the storehouses might well have hurried the men who had returned to complete the removal of the stores and ammunition, but the decision to abandon the Royal Battery was made on the evening of 11 May.

In the late afternoon on 11 May (probably sometime after 4 o'clock), Thierry wrote to Duchambon stressing the poor condition of the battery and stating that he did not believe it could be held if attacked. Thierry asked permission to withdraw the garrison, and he cautioned Duchambon not to let the Royal Battery fall into enemy hands. He advised that the cannon be spiked and the place blown up. Duchambon, upon receipt of Thierry’s communication, hurriedly assembled a council of war to decide what should be done about the Royal Battery. Etienne Verrier, the chief engineer, was summoned. He reported that the battery was indeed in a poor defensive condition: that some of the épaulements of the left flank had been taken down the previous year and had not been replaced; that the covered ways were not fortified, and that without reinforcements the battery could not be held against an attack of 3,000 or 4,000 men. On the strength of Verrier’s report, the council voted unanimously to abandon the battery after spiking the cannon and removing all the stores and ammunition possible. Such stores and ammunition as could not be salvaged were to be dumped into the harbour. The council also wanted to have the battery blown up, as Thierry had urged, but Verrier apparently objected so strongly that the matter was dropped.

Duchambon ordered Thierry to withdraw the garrison and abandon the battery. Thierry had, at this time, probably 200 to 300 people at the Royal Battery to be transferred. Some of these may have been residents of outlying settlements who repaired to the battery when the alarm sounded. (One account indicates that the garrison there was made up of 300 soldiers and gunners, including 90 militia under a Captain Petitpas. But Duchambon, in his report to the minister written at Rochefort, implied that Thierry’s company amounted to 200 men.) Thierry spent the remainder of the evening of 11 May attending to the cannon and arranging for the transfer of the supplies and ammunition. About midnight, he and his troops arrived in town by chaloupe.

In their apparent haste to abandon the Royal Battery, Thierry’s men had spiked the cannon poorly, had left the gun-carriages mostly intact, and had not dumped the excess shot into the harbour as the council had ordered. So hurried was the withdrawal that a barrel of gunpowder, carelessly ignited, exploded, nearly killing several persons and burning the face and robes of a récollet friar. Also in the haste, it seems that 12 men were left in each of the towers, Thierry apparently neglecting to alert them of his departure. These men found a chaloupe in a creek near the battery and arrived in town about two o’clock in the morning. The next day, 12 May, Duchambon sent Lieutenant St. Etienne and Ensign Souvigny, with about 20 men, to complete the removal of the stores and ammunition Thierry had left behind; “ce qu’ils firent” wrote Duchambon, “a L’exception de tous Les Boulets de canon et Bombes qui y ont resté n’ayant pas peu Les emporter.” The clean-up work was undoubtedly hurried by the burning that day of the northeast harbour storehouses.

The habitant de Louisbourg could not understand the decision to abandon the Royal Battery, “si ce n’est une terreur panique, qui ne nous a plus quitté de tout le Siege.” He bemoaned that “Il n’y avoit pas eu encore un seul coup de fusil tiré sur cette batterie, que les ennemis ne pouvoient prendre qu’en faisant leurs approches comme pour la Ville, & l’assiégeant, pour ainsi dire, dans les règles.” He acknowledged that a breach existed on the landward side, thus endangering the battery, but “le crime est encore plus grand, parce que nous avions eu plus de loisir qu’il n’en falloit, pour mettre ordre à tout.”

Many Frenchmen undoubtedly sympathized with the habitant’s view, but his argument that the battery could only have been taken “by making approaches in the regular way” is tenuous at best. The work was completely exposed to the heights behind it. Cannon placed on those heights by the provincials would have immediately commanded the position and rendered it indefensible regardless of breaches. In any case, by the morning of 13 May, the Royal Battery stood empty.

The Provincial Army Encamps

The evening of 11 May was pleasant for the soldiers of the provincial army encamped before Louisbourg. The weather was fair, a fresh southwest wind rustled the grass and trees, and while the men had expected a greater resistance to their landing, they were pleased with the results of the day’s activities. For hours, clusters of men had been straggling back from their first curious look at the great fortress they had come to conquer, bringing with them cows, sheep, horses, and whatever else they could drive or carry. The expedition was a magnificent adventure for most of them,
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and many believed, as did Samuel Curwen, merchant turned warrior, that "our campaign will be short, and [we] expect the place will surrender without bloodshed." In the morning, when the rest of the army landed, they would show the French how well New Englanders could fight; for the moment there was mainly "singing and Great Rejoicing."  

Their bivouac that first night was a makeshift affair, the men resting as best they could until the army could be assembled on shore. Major General Wolcott noted in his journal that "our men lay in the forest without any regular encampment." There were as yet no tents on shore and shelters were improvised from whatever materials were at hand, one soldier writing that "wee Cut A few boughs to keep Us from the ground." After the cramped holds of the transports, even this was a "most Comfortable Nights Lodging."  

The rest of the army came ashore unopposed on 12 May and about noon "proceeded toward the town & campt." A more permanent encampment was then begun, its construction taking several days. The men laboured in the woods cutting timbers for storehouses, shelters, and fires, one New Englander admitting that there were "More Conveniences for our Living on the Island Than was Represented to Us."  

Much uncertainty exists about the location of this encampment. The instructions Shirley gave to Pepperrell stated that "the first thing to be observed [after all the troops have been landed], is to march on till you can find . . . a proper spot to encamp them on; which must be as high as possible to some convenient brook, or watering place." The encampment was probably located at, or near, Flat Point. Here Flat Point Brook (called "Freshwater Brook" on contemporary maps), flowing roughly north and south, empties into Gabarus Bay and offers a considerable source of fresh water. The official account of the campaign states that "the camp was formed about half a mile from the place where they [the troops] made a feint of landing," and Benjamin Green, Pepperrell’s secretary, says that they camped "about 1-1/2 miles from the town." This would put the encampment in the vicinity of Flat Point. Benjamin Cleaves, in his journal, also hints that the encampment might have been in this area.  

There is some evidence to indicate that the camp might have been relocated soon after the army moved to the Flat Point area. Two contemporary maps show the location of the provincial camp. One map shows it on either side of Flat Point Brook; the other shows it directly on Flat Point itself. No explanation for the disparity between the two maps has been found, but Green noted that on 13 May the camp was moved, "the enemy’s balls having disturbed us the last night." The distance from Louisbourg to Flat Point seems rather far for the provincials to have been greatly bothered by cannon shot, but Cleaves confirms Green’s statement and adds that in the night a new camp was built. It is therefore possible that two camps were started – one around Flat Point Brook, and, when this camp proved to be within range of French cannon, another on Flat Point itself. We do not know where the provincials were when the French shot began to disturb them. They may have been beyond the Flat Point area and then fell back, and the disparity in the maps might be nothing more than two generalized representations of the same encampment. 

The arrangement of the permanent encampment is equally uncertain. Shirley’s instructions as to the manner of laying out the camp specified that, as soon as [a proper spot to encamp the army has been found], and the ground marked by the Quarters-Masters, who should have, each, colours to distinguish each regiment, the tents must be pitched, in the usual form and distance, if possible; and at the front of every regiment, a guard with tents, which is called the quarter guard, and mounts in the morning, as the picket guard turns out at sun set and lays on their arms.  

Whether the encampment was established precisely on the lines Shirley envisioned has not been determined, but Colonel John Bradstreet, a regular army officer who was usually very critical of the provincial soldiers because they lacked proper military training and discipline, remarked that "with as much dispatch as could be expected, all the Troops, cannon, and Baggage were landed and properly Incamped [italics mine]." Bradstreet’s statement offers a clue to the manner in which the encampment was laid out. To a regular officer like Bradstreet, being properly encamped would probably have meant encamping according to division (or, in this instance, regiment), with proper intervals between, and a protective picket line drawn up about the front and flanks to guard against a sudden attack by the enemy. This is the type of arrangement Shirley seems to have had in mind. There is, however, little direct evidence to substantiate that the encampment was so arranged. The official account merely states that at first the camp was formed "without throwing up [picket] Lines; depending only upon their Scouts and Guards [for protection]. But afterwards they encamped regularly [italics mine], and threw up Lines."  

The provincials maintained their encampment in the Flat Point area throughout the siege. While all of the regiments would have been initially assembled at the encampment, only five regiments appear to have been permanently headquartered there during the progress of the campaign. These were Pepperrell’s (including his personal headquarters), Burr’s (nominally Wolcott’s), Moulton’s
(which returned from Port Toulouse on 16 May), Moore’s and Willard’s.\textsuperscript{43} Soldiers from these regiments, however, were later posted to the ranks of the remaining four regiments (Hale’s; Richmond’s, Waldo’s and Gorham’s, plus Dwight’s artillery train), which subsequently sustained the several batteries erected against Louisbourg. These latter regiments encamped at or near the batteries they sustained. No information has been found concerning the location of Dwight’s artillery train during the siege; it, like the soldiers of certain of the regiments, probably was scattered among the various batteries.

**Duchambon Prepares for Defence**

While the provincials laboured to prepare a camp, Duchambon prepared for the ordeal ahead. He had all the entrances to the town secured; and the soldiers who had been completely out of hand for the past five months now swore resolutely to defend the fortress to the last man before they would allow it to fall into English hands.\textsuperscript{44} Duchambon posted them according to their individual commands.

Duvivier’s company, under the command of de la Vallière, was posted at the Maurepas Bastion with de La Rhonde’s company, which held the Maurepas gate near the loopholes (meurtrières). Bonnaveur’s company was at the Brûllian Bastion and the crenellated wall. With Bonnaveur were Schoncher’s Swiss companies, guarding the loopholes of the Princess Demi-bastion. At the Princess Demi-bastion and as far as the Queen’s gate was d’Espet’s company. Duhaget’s company sustained the Queen’s Bastion, Villejoint’s company the King’s Bastion, and Thierry’s company the Dauphin Demi-bastion.

De Gannes’ company held the Pièce de la Grave fronting the harbour. De Gannes retained command here until 23 June, when he transferred to the Island Battery to replace its commander, d’Ailleboust, who returned to the town because of illness. D’Ailleboust, when sufficiently recovered, would take over command at the Pièce de la Grave. Sainte-Marie, artillery captain, was in charge of the cannon, while Port Captain Morpain was given the general supervision of all the posts.\textsuperscript{45}

On 12 May, Bigot and Duchambon decided to sink all the armed ships then in port to prevent them from being captured by the provincials. Accordingly, Ensigh Verger, along with five soldiers and a number of sailors, was ordered to sink those which were opposite the town, and Ensigh Bellemont was instructed to carry out a similar operation at the back of the bay. Bellemont was also ordered to retrieve the oil from the lighthouse tower. These orders seem to have been carried out by 16 May. It was probably at this time, if not earlier, that the casemate doorways were covered over with wood timbers in preparation to receive the women and children.\textsuperscript{46}

Duchambon, realizing that his present force was inadequate to hold out indefinitely against the provincial army, on 16 May sent an urgent despatch to Lieutenant Paul Marin in Acadia to come immediately with his detachment of French and Indians. Marin possibly could have reached the fortress in 20 to 25 days, but the messenger had such a difficult time locating him that by the time Marin eventually arrived, Louisbourg had fallen. Duchambon would later claim that had Marin arrived 15 or 20 days sooner, the New Englanders would have been forced to raise the siege.\textsuperscript{47}

**The Provincials Occupy the Royal Battery**

The provincials took possession of the Royal Battery on 13 May. Governor Shirley had considered the capture of this battery to be of considerable importance to the success of the expedition. He called the work “the most galling Battery in the harbour,” and felt that its capture would expose the whole harbour to attack by sea. Shirley believed the battery to be lightly defended and that with an attack upon a low part of the wall “that is unfinished at the east end” (i.e., the left flank where the épaulements had been taken down the previous year), “it is impossible to fail of taking [it].” Colonel John Bradstreet, “with 500 Chosen Men,” was to have made the attack the night following the landing, but the attack was never made and the Royal Battery was taken without firing a shot.\textsuperscript{48}

On the morning of 13 May, Colonel William Vaughan, with a small party of men, was returning from the northeast harbour (Vaughan himself said he was trying to find the “most commodious place” to erect a counter battery) when, passing behind the Royal Battery, he noticed that there was no flag flying from the staff and no smoke rising from the barracks’ chimney. His suspicions aroused, Vaughan (according to many subsequent accounts of the incident) bribed an inebriated Indian to crawl to the battery to determine the true state of affairs. Ascertaining that the work was indeed abandoned, Vaughan and his men took possession of it. He then wrote to Pepperrell that “with the Grace of God and the courage of about thirteen men I entered the Royal Battery about nine a clock and am waiting here for a reinforcement and a flag.”\textsuperscript{49}

The manner in which Vaughan reputedly determined that the French no longer occupied the Royal Battery is open to question. It smacks of legend. The story of the Indian is not confirmed by the diaries, journals, or testimonials of men who were there at the time. Lieutenant Daniel Giddings of Hale’s regiment, along with several men from his company, had gone to the Royal Battery out
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of curiosity (independent of Vaughan and his party) and had entered it at the same time as Vaughan. Giddings recorded the incident in his journal, but made no reference to an Indian, drunk or sober. The testimonial of another witness, one John Tufton Mason, likewise fails to mention an Indian, and Vaughan himself simply states that “by all Appearances [I] had Reason to judge that said Grand Battery was deserted by the enemy,” whereupon [we] “marched up and took Possession.” Until further documentation comes to light, the story must be regarded as a tale that adds interest but little enlightenment.

Before reinforcements could reach Vaughan, four boatloads (Vaughan says seven boatloads) of French troops put out from the town toward the Royal Battery. Leaving four men in the battery, Vaughan, with eight others, ran out along the shore for “near half a Mile,” and, picking up another four men along the way, began to fire upon the French. According to Vaughan, his little group was “within point blank Shot” of the town, from which they were fired upon by cannon. The French retired to the fortress.

That this encounter was the result of a French attempt to retake the Royal Battery, as Vaughan and other provincial diarists believed, is extremely unlikely. That it was meant to be an attack at all is doubtful. French sources make no mention of such an intended attack (and there is no reason why they should be silent about it). These men were probably part of a force sent out by Duchambon to assist in the destruction of those houses of the barachois area which were not destroyed at the time of the provincial landings. One party was already at work in the area. This force included all the militia as well as 80 French and Swiss soldiers under Captain De Gannes and a Swiss officer named Rosser. Armed with hatchets and other tools, they were to bring back for use in the town whatever salvageable wood they could collect, as the supply was low. As they were finishing, according to Governor Duchambon’s report, a number of provincials appeared at the barachois and in the upper valleys (“il parut au Barrachois et dans les vallons des hauteurs”) and fired upon the French, who returned to town. Vaughan himself indicates, as does one David Woaster, then a captain of a company of volunteers, that the engagement took place some distance from the Royal Battery and “within point blank Shot” of the fortress. Since the French were approaching the “Battery-Side of the Harbour,” as Vaughan and other observers admitted, it is understandable how the New Englanders might conclude that the enemy troops were trying to retake the Royal Battery, when actually they were going to assist the militia and soldiers in the clean-up operations around the barachois.

Returning to the Royal Battery, Vaughan waited for the reinforcements and flag he had asked Pepperrell to send. In the meantime, two English ships’ flags had been found in one of the nearby houses and these were hoisted on the staff. According to some chroniclers, one William Tufts climbed the pole and fastened his red coat to the staff to serve as a flag. (At least one account claims that it was another Indian that performed this act.) This story also seems spurious, despite an obituary notice of 3 June 1771 referring to such an exploit by Tufts at the Island Battery, during the abortive 6 June attack. Perhaps the story has its origins here.

According to at least one contemporary account, Captain Joshua Pierce of Willard’s regiment was the first to raise the English colours over the Royal Battery on 13 May. Colonel Samuel Waldo, who soon moved into the battery with part of his regiment, supports Vaughan’s statement that the flag raised that day belonged to a ship’s ensign and was not Tufts’ coat. In a letter to Pepperrell dated 14 May, Waldo asks for one of the Union flags, “as the fisherman’s ensign gives a mean appearance.” We do not know what this “fisherman’s ensign” looked like, but a French militia officer who accompanied a number of men across the harbour to retrieve the oil from the lighthouse tower, noticed the flag and said that it resembled an English weathervane (“un petit pavillon comme une Girouette angloise”).

Colonel John Bradstreet soon arrived at the battery with a reinforcement, and reported back to Pepperrell that the place was in bad condition but it could be repaired. Colonel Waldo, who arrived with five companies of his regiment later that day, reported that the cannon (twenty-eight 42-pounders and two 18-pounders) were plugged up and most of the carriages damaged, “tho’ with small repairs, all capable of service.” Bradstreet requested smiths and armourers to drill open the vents of the cannon, and that “handpicks, ramers [sic], & sponges & a quantity of powder” would also be needed. Many balls and shells were found, and Bradstreet promised to have a 42-pounder ready to open fire on the town by noon of 14 May if his needs were speedily met.

They seem to have been met quickly; by 10 a.m. on 14 May, the 42-pounder he promised to have ready was cleared and had opened fire. The first shot killed 14 of the enemy. Waldo reported that 40 shot were subsequently fired against the town, while the French return fire from the fortress and Island Battery amounted to 146 shot and 50 shells. Only four of the embrasures of the Royal Battery pointed against the town, and while the fire from the Island Battery was “troublesome,” Waldo intended to concentrate his fire on the town rather than the island to aid Pepperrell’s designs against the fortress.
The Landing of the Provisions and Artillery

While Vaughan and his men were taking possession of the Royal Battery, the provisions and artillery were being brought ashore four miles to the west at Flat Point. The army that went to Louisbourg was provided with provisions for four months. Governor Shirley had asked the Massachusetts Committee of War to compute the total number of men in the army and fleet at 4,400 at least, and the General Assembly had before its dissolution empowered the committee to purchase and forward provisions for one month over and above the original four months, thus assuring provisions for five months.59

Despite Governor Shirley's efforts, supplies were deficient. At Canso, Pepperrell wrote Shirley that the provisions were inadequate; that they were far less than had been expected, and that he intended to write the war committee for additional stores. He also reported that the troops were deficient in necessary accouterments, though the armourers were fitting for service what they could. Shirley promised to look into the matter and to send Pepperrell anything that it was in his power to send.60

Whether the deficiencies were remedied is not known, and the exact nature and extent of the provisions initially sent has not been determined. No invoices for these shipments have been found. From various references in journals and letters, however, we can be reasonably certain that the men had large quantities of rum, as well as bread, pork, rice, beans, peas and molasses.61 Also, they apparently had a supply of fresh meat, since there are numerous references to cattle being butchered during the course of the siege. And the rations were supplemented by fresh lobster and trout.62

The provisions were brought ashore near the encampment at Flat Point. The landing "was attended with extreme Difficulty and Fatigue," the surf continually running high, and it was nearly two weeks before all the stores were landed. On some days, "there was no landing any Thing at all" because of the high surf, and "many Boats and some Stores were lost."63 The work was even more difficult when the artillery was brought ashore the following day, 14 May; the men were "obliged to wade high into the water to save everything that would have been damaged by being wet." The soldiers who brought the guns ashore "had no Cloathes to shift themselves with, but poor Defence from the Weather, and at the same time the nights were very cold, and generally attended with thick heavy Fogs."64

Once ashore, the cannon still had to be moved over the difficult marshy ground stretching between Flat Point and the fortress.65 While several roads ran out to the east and southeast from Flat Point (one of which roughly paralleled the coast to the southern extremity of the Green Hill range within a mile of the town), and while the provincials constructed additional roads after the landing, they proved of little use, as the official account of the siege testifies.

The transporting [of] the cannon was . . . almost incredible labour and fatigue. For all the roads over which they were drawn, saving here and there small patches of rocky hills, were a deep morass; in which, whilst the cannon were upon wheels, they several times sunk, so as to bury not only the carriages, but the whole body of the cannon likewise. Horses and oxen could not be employed in this service; but the whole was to be done by the men themselves, up to the knees in mud.66

The French had regarded the marshes and bogs to the west of the fortress as impassable, and so they might have been but for the ingenuity of Lieutenant Colonel Nathaniel Meserve of Moore's New Hampshire Regiment. Colonel Meserve believed that if the cannon were placed on flat sledges, they could be drawn across the marshes to the points where they would be required. He thereupon designed and had constructed several wooden sledges 16 feet long and 5 feet wide, by which the guns were hauled across the morass. The shot, shells and powder, in the meantime, were transported on the soldiers' backs.67

The Erection of the Green Hill Battery, 15 May

Meserve's sledges would come later, however, and on 14 May it was the brawn of the soldiers that moved the heavy guns over the marshes and inadequate roads and onto the southern extremity of Green Hill, where the first provincial battery was to be erected. For nearly two days the men laboured in the wind and mud, dragging and pushing the cannon and mortars into position. By 15 May, two 9-pounder cannon, two falconets, one 13-inch mortar, one 11-inch mortar, and one 9-inch mortar had been mounted. Five hundred men (probably Colonel Sylvester Richmond's Sixth Massachusetts Regiment) were ordered to support the battery.68

The exact location of this work (referred to as the "battery on Green Hill" or the "Green Hill battery" in the documents) has not been determined. Duchambon, who watched as the guns were mounted, says it was "sur la hauteur derriere les plaines vis a vis Le Bastion du Roy" approximately 1,500 yards distant.69 Most probably it was situated on the hill mentioned by Governor Shirley in his instructions to Pepperrell. About south-west from the citadel bastion, a large half-mile distance, is a rocky hill, which in attacking of the town, may be of great service, by covering a number of our men, and planting some cannon there, on the top; in such a manner as when you are on the spot, you may judge most advantageous; where you
may keep the bombardiers, &c. continually employed, endeavouring principally to demolish their magazine, citadel, walls, &c. which are objects sufficiently in view.

The Green Hill battery opened fire on the fortress on 15 May. Shirley’s hope that the battery would inflict considerable damage on the town was disappointed however. Duchambon later reported that while this work “napas Cessé de tirer de distance en distance . . . ce feu na fait aucun prorgés . . . et na tué ny Blessé personne.” The distance was too great. In turn, the Green Hill battery sustained little or no damage from French counterfire until 20 May, when a cannon shot fired from the town wounded five men, one of whom lost both legs and afterwards died.

With the fire from Green Hill proving ineffectual, a council of war on 16 May recommended that a battery be erected closer to the town’s west gate. Later that day the same council advised that the mortars, coehorns and cannon at Green Hill be moved to a hill northwest of the town, and that the proposed new battery be erected there. It further recommended that eight 22-pounders, along with two 18-pounders and two 42-pounders removed from the Royal Battery, also be mounted there. While the men were in the process of transferring the guns, Pepperrell and Warren were preparing a surrender summons to send into Louisbourg.

The Summons to Surrender on 18 May

On 14 May, the day the Green Hill battery was begun, Pepperrell assembled a council of war and asked it to consider whether a surrender summons should be sent to the commanding officer in Louisbourg. But the council adjourned without making a decision. The same day, Colonel Waldo at the Royal Battery wrote to Pepperrell that both he and Colonel Bradstreet believed that the governor of Louisbourg would be justified in hanging any messenger sent with a summons, unless the army could present a more formidable appearance than it so far had shown.

In council the next day, the matter was again broached. The members of the council initially voted to send the summons as soon as the gunners at the Green Hill battery were ready to open fire. But at its afternoon session, the council, possibly with Waldo’s communication in hand, decided that firing against the town should be commenced before any surrender demands were made. Finally, on 17 May, after two days of firing from the Green Hill and Royal batteries and over the objections of several senior officers who still considered it unjustified, the council voted to send the following summons to “the Commander in chief of the French King’s Troops, in Louisbourg, on the Island of Cape Bréton”:

The Camp before Louisbourg, May 7, 1745 [O.S.]. Whereas, there is now encamped on the island of Cape Breton, near the city of Louisbourg, a number of his Britannic Majesty’s troops under the command of the Honble. Lieut. General Pepperrell, and also a squadron of his said Majesty’s ships of war, under the command of the Honble. Peter Warren Esq. is now lying before the harbour of the said city, for the reduction thereof to the obedience of the crown of Great Britain.

We, the said William Pepperrell and Peter Warren, to prevent the effusion of Christian blood, do in the name of our sovereign lord, George the second, of Great Britain, France and Ireland, King &c. summon you to surrender to his obedience the said city, fortresses and territory, together with the artillery, arms and stores of war thereunto belonging. In consequence of which surrender, we the said William Pepperrell and Peter Warren, in the name of our said sovereign, do assure you that all the subjects of the French king now in said city and territory shall be treated with the utmost humanity, have their personal estate secured to them, and have leave to transport themselves and said effects to any part of the French king’s dominions in Europe.

Your answer hereto is demanded at or before 5 o’clock this afternoon.

W. Pepperrell
P. Warren

Early on the morning of 18 May, Pepperrell ordered a general cease-fire. The batteries fell silent, and as the provincial soldiers stood to arms, the walls of the fortress were crowded with women and children who joined their men to get a glimpse of the besieging army. From the provincial lines at about 11 o’clock appeared a Captain Agnue, accompanied by a drummer and a sergeant bearing a flag of truce. The captain carried the surrender summons. Entering the town through the Dauphin Gate, Agnue was met by Port Captain Morpain, who blindfolded and escorted him to the office of the Commissaire-Ordonnateur, François Bigot, where the summons was delivered to Duchambon.

Duchambon’s reply was firm, and vindicated the view of the provincial officers who considered the summons premature. He said that he would not consider any such proposition until the English army had made a decisive attack and until he was convinced that the fortress could not be held. Until then, the only answer he would offer would come from “La Bouche de nos canons.”

Duchambon’s refusal to surrender the fortress caused little disappointment among the soldiers of the provincial army. One volunteer happily wrote that “Seeing the Terms was not Complied with We Gave a Great Shout and Began to fire Upon the town Again.” They had come to fight and fight they would.
French Sortie of 19 May and the Proposed Provincial Assault on Louisbourg of 20 May

As the war council of 16 May had advised (since the fire from the Green Hill battery was ineffectual), a second battery was begun under the direction of Captain Joshua Pierce of Willard’s regiment. This work, called the Coehorn or Eight-Gun Battery, was situated approximately 900 yards northwest of the King’s Bastion. By 22 May it mounted four 22-pounder cannon, as well as the 9- and 11-inch mortars from the battery on Green Hill. Four more 22-pounders were added on 26 May, along with the 9-pounders and the 13-inch mortar from Green Hill. The provincials brought additional cannon from Flat Point, probably hauled at night on Meserve’s sledges.

On the night of 19 May, a French party made a sortie from the fortress with the possible intention of hindering the men transporting the guns to the Coehorn Battery. Very little is known about this sortie (its exact point of origin and its purpose), but it was repulsed and its failure seemed to dissuade Duchambon (at least for the moment) from making any more such attacks. Duchambon’s officers voted flatly against further sorties on the grounds that it was difficult enough to defend the ramparts with the 1,300 men they did have. The did not wish to risk them in attacks that might prove futile at best. Besides, while the soldiers professed loyalty and submitted to authority now, they still faced charges of mutiny and insubordinate behaviour. Who could tell what they might do if they had the opportunity to escape from the punishment of a crime which was rarely pardoned?

The morning after the sortie, 20 May, a decision of another sort was made in the provincial camp. Another council of war met and announced that Louisbourg would be attacked by storm that night. The soldiers learned of the attack about 10 a.m. and the subalterns objected strongly, preferring a longer bombardment of the town before considering such an assault. Great uneasiness pervaded the army as the men talked about the council’s decision. Commodore Warren, on shore with a number of his sailors who were to participate in the attack, noticed the general temper of the men and feared the consequences of an assault made by such unwilling soldiers. He talked with Pepperrell for some time, and afterward the company captains were asked to meet with the council in the afternoon and give their opinions on the proposed attack.

Apparently the captains were as much opposed to the idea as the lieutenants and enlisted men, for after the meeting the council announced that the assault had been cancelled. The council advised officially that “as there appears a great dissatisfaction in many of the officers and soldiers at the designed attack on the town by storm this night, and as it may be attended with very ill consequences because of this dissatisfaction, the present attack is to be deferred for the present.” The army would wait for the cannon to open a breach in the walls.
The Siege

The provincial army made no regular approaches to Louisbourg by trenches, but bombarded the town at random from the Green Hill and Royal batteries, as well as from additional batteries erected between 18 and 31 May. Except for the Royal Battery, all of these works were fascine batteries, protected by fagots of various dimensions made of small tree branches or brush. In some cases, as with the Advanced Battery near the Dauphin Gate (see "The Advance Batteries"), they also may have been protected by hogheads filled with earth. The batteries were reinforced by earth banked against the fascines, but in only one instance—that of a trench dug at the Advanced Battery—were they entrenched works, in the sense of being dug below actual ground level. They were all sited to the northwest and north of the fortress, because the marshy ground to the southeast precluded the construction of works in that sector. Shirley was aware that several years previously the French had built a gallery toward Green Hill beneath the glacis opposite the flanked angle of the King's Bastion. He instructed Pepperrell not to construct batteries and trenches between Green Hill and the King's Bastion, "as the glacis that lies there before the works is to be blown up." It is significant to note that no works were made in this vicinity through the entire siege, even though the gallery did not extend beyond the glacis itself.

The Provincial Batteries, their Effects, and French Countermeasures

Royal Battery

By 20 May, the gunners at the Royal Battery had been trying for nearly a week to breach the walls of the fortress, but with little success. Through the efforts of Major Seth Pomeroy and 20 "smiths," who were assigned the task on 16 May, some 20 cannon had now been cleared. While only four embrasures pointed against the town, Waldo reported that 241 shot had been fired from the Royal Battery between 14 and 20 May. The French return fire from the town and island batteries amounted to some 417 shot and shell.2

During this time, the fire from the Royal Battery had reportedly destroyed the roofs of three houses and knocked down several chimneys, as well as a number of embrasures of one of the bastions, probably the Dauphin. It was also reported that earlier, on 14 May, several shots had penetrated the roof of the barracks. Some of the shots fired from the Royal Battery struck short of the town, glanced off the water, and ricocheted over the walls.3

The French return fire against the Royal Battery during this period and throughout the siege, while at times heavy and on occasion continuing both day and night, lacked effect and caused comparatively little damage. The towers, however, did sustain heavy damage, but only one man was killed and only a few were wounded by the French fire.4

The greatest danger came not from the French counterfire but from the provincial gunners themselves, who, in moments of zealousness coupled with inexperience, overcharged the cannon and caused them to explode. On 16 May, one of the cannon was accidentally double-shotted, blew up and severely wounded five men, including Captain Rhodes, the chief gunner. The next day two more cannon burst, probably from the same cause. And again on 27 May, two cannon exploded from double-shotting and wounded two men, one of them Captain Daniel Hale, the man upon whom, after Rhodes, Waldo was most dependent to work the guns.5

Waldo’s great concern over this practice of double-shotting is revealed in his letter of 31 May to Pepperrell, in which he regretted the loss of the cannon but feared that all of the guns were in danger of the same fate "unless better regulation [is provided] than at present." The next attempt, he said, would probably be the "trying of three shott in each, which they will increase till they find their mistake . . . ." Waldo was also plagued by food and powder shortages as well as lacking trained gunners, conditions that would persist and prove troublesome throughout the siege.6

(It might be noted here that the Royal Battery served several functions in addition to being a siege battery: it was a base supplying cannon to new batteries; a point from which, after 21 May, attacks on the Island Battery were launched, and a base from which scouting parties and patrols could operate.)7

Coehorn Battery

The Coehorn Battery had been erected by order of the 16 May war council and probably was sustained by men from Richmond's regiment. The gunners at this work were as zealous as those at the Royal Battery in trying to open a breach in the fortress wall. Located beyond a small pond northwest of the King's Bastion, the Coehorn Battery began to fire on 22 May and until the day of the surrender "n'a point Cessé de tirer des Boulets sur Les Casernes, Le mur du Bastion du Roy et Sur la ville." The shot raked the streets as far as the Maurepas Gate and the crenellated wall, and damaged the barracks and the right flank of the King’s Bastion. No one was safe, in either the street or the houses. The barracks were ruined by this fire, along with several houses.8
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To counteract the fire from the Coehorn Battery, which Du-
chambon considered by far the most dangerous of the provincial
batteries, the French placed two 18-pounders on a cavalier of the
King’s Bastion. Soldiers worked hurriedly and under fire to fill two
wooden frames (coffres en planches) with fascines and earth to
form embrasures for the guns and to afford a measure of protec-
tion to the gunners. At the same time, they opened two embras-
ures in the parapet of the right face of the King’s Bastion, where
two 24-pounders were mounted. When these measures were
taken is not clear, but the work was probably done before the Ad-
vanced Battery on the heights opposite the Dauphin Demi-bastion
began to fire on 29 May.

These measures did little to hinder or reduce the fire from the
Coehorn Battery; French counterfire proved equally ineffectual
and the damage it sustained from French shot was minor com-
pared to the damage it inflicted on the walls and town. The dam-
age suffered by the Coehorn Battery was the possibly accidental
breaking of the trunnion on one of the mortars, and the wounding
of six men (one of whom died) on 24 May by the bursting of two
22-pounders. One man was killed and two were wounded by
French fire. On 5 June, the 13-inch mortar burst, “occasion’d by
some Flaw in the Shell, which broke in the Mortar,” and a gunner
was wounded. Another 13-inch mortar was brought from Boston
and mounted eight days later.

The Advance Batteries
On 25 May the ring of provincial batteries around Louisbourg
tightened further when the New Englanders raised a battery of
four guns on a hill within 440 yards of the Dauphin Gate. The coe-
horns and the 9- and 11-inch mortars from the Coehorn Battery
were removed to this work. Three days later, on 28 May, the pro-
vincials raised another battery in the same area, within approxi-
mately 250 yards of the Dauphin Gate. Although the New Englan-
ders referred to both works as advance batteries, the latter was
most commonly called the “Advanced” Battery. It was com-
manded by Captain Joseph Sherburne of Moore’s New Hamp-
shire Regiment. The work consisted of two 18-pounders and two
42-pounders brought from the Royal Battery, “upwards of two
Miles, as the Road goes, over a rough, rocky, hilly way.” The Ad-
vanced Battery, the more effective of the two works, was located
on the rise of ground (known to the French as the Montagne à
Francoeur) at the end of the glacis of the Dauphin Demi-bastion.
It began to fire on 29 May, although only one 18-pounder had as
yet been mounted. Colonel Vaughan later stated that he “staked
out the Ground [for the Advanced Battery] with his own Hands, &
directed Trench to be thrown up sufficient to cover a thousand

Men adjoining the Fascine [Advanced] Battery & fronting the
City,” and that here he “continued four successive Days and
Nights doing Duty and undergoing excessive Fatigues, scarce al-
lowing himself common Refreshments.”

Between 23 and 28 May, as a countermeasure against the ad-
vance batteries then in preparation on the heights, the French
blocked up the Dauphin Gate and the adjoining guardhouses with
about 18 to 20 feet of freestone, fascines and earth. Duchambon
later stated that had this not been done, the provincials could
have entered through the gate immediately after the advance bat-
teries opened fire, claiming that the walls of the gate were only
about three feet thick and no stronger than a porte-cochère (car-
riage gate). Nor, he added, were the sides of the gate protected,
the only defence consisting of créneaux on the guardhouse
which could not be used once they had been reinforced with
earth.

To hinder further the preparation of the advance batteries, Du-
chambon ordered his men to construct some embrasures for the
four cannon on the barbette of the Dauphin Demi-bastion, on the
soldiers’ guardhouse. They made these embrasures of sod and
earth, as there was no time to make them of stone. Duchambon
also said that the flanks of all the bastions of the fortress were
supplied with the cannon from privateers and any other ordnance
that could be found in the town.

Once the advance batteries opened fire, Duchambon reported,
they never ceased firing until the surrender, despite continual
French counterfire from the cannon on the barbette of the Dau-
phin Demi-bastion and from those of the right flank of the King’s
Bastion. Captain Sherburne stated that his post, the Advanced
Battery, was so poorly entrenched that “the most Shelter we had
from the french fire (which was very hott) was Some hhds
[hogsheads] filled with earth.” The fire of the advance batteries
was concentrated on the Dauphin Gate, in an attempt to open a
breach in that section of the wall. A number of flakes (frames for
drying fish) lay between the gate and the advance batteries, and
the provincial gunners “was forst to Beat them away with out
Shott to have a fair Sight of the Gate.”

The French soldiers at the Dauphin Demi-bastion annoyed the
gunners at the Advanced Battery with musket fire. That battery
was so near the walls that “there was no safety in loading the
Cannon, but under the fire of the Musquetry, which was very
smart on both Sides.” The French “generally open’d the Action in
the Morning with the Fire of their Small-Arms for two hours; which
we returned with Advantage on our Side.” Five provincials were
killed the first day, two by musket balls and three by cannon shot.
One of those killed by cannon shot was Captain Joshua Pierce.
The gunners at the advance batteries were “warmly entertained” by French cannon fire from a flank of the Pièce de la Grave, as well as from the cannon at the Dauphin Gate and the right flank of the King’s Bastion. To provide still more effective fire, the French cut three embrasures in the King’s-Dauphin curtain, where they mounted 36-pounder cannon. These embrasures were opened on 30 May. The guns, on the first day, demolished the embrasures of the Advanced Battery and dismounted one of its cannon, but the provincial fire went unabated and continued to wreak havoc on the buildings of the town. Among others, the houses of Messrs. Fautoux, Carrerot, Fizel, Gilbert and Prevost were badly damaged or destroyed. A shot broke the fortress bell, and the chapel was so badly riddled that the Récollet friars abandoned it and thereafter held daily services in the hospital. When the powder magazine in the Dauphin Demi-bastion became endangered, Duchambon ordered the powder removed to the postern in the curtain wall between the King’s and Queen’s bastions. He also ordered his men to destroy the drawbridge by cannon shot. The flag staff was shot away on 9 June.16

On 31 May, the New Englanders dug a trench at the south end of the Advanced Battery and mounted an 18-pounder and two 9-pounders there. The fire from these guns and those of the Coehorn Battery was concentrated on the King’s Bastion (the fire from which flanked the Advanced Battery) where several cannon were dismounted and the cannoneers forced to abandon the guns. This fire so “annoyed” the French “that they were silent the rest of the day.” On 3 June, the French mounted two new guns on the right flank of the King’s Bastion, but the shot from the advance batteries was so heavy that they abandoned them after only four hours.17

Because much damage was being done to the King’s Bastion, the French cut new embrasures in the parapet of the Dauphin Demi-bastion near the gate on 17 June to provide increased counterfire. Two cannon were mounted there, and “soon began to play with great Fury; and [the provincials] were obliged to turn Three Guns against them.” In three hours, reportedly, one of the French cannon was dismounted and the other silenced.18

Occasionally the fire would slacken and the men at the Advance Battery, which was closest to the fortress walls, bantered with the French. One such incident occurred on the morning of 1 June. The New Englanders called out to the French soldiers at the Dauphin Demi-bastion that if they would send out a flag of truce, they could have some of “King George’s bread” to eat. The French replied that they were not yet ready to surrender, nor did they wish any of the king’s bread. Other conversation followed, the provincials asking if there were any “Pritty girls” in the town; but the interlude was finished off “with 3 or 4 showers of bullets” on both sides.19

While the gunners at the advance batteries inflicted much damage on the town and fortifications, they sustained a minimum loss to themselves, suffering a total of 10 men killed and 15 or 16 wounded, several by musket balls. The damage done to the entrenchments or the batteries during the day the New Englanders quickly repaired during the night.20

Titcomb’s Battery
On 31 May, the provincials raised a fifth battery on the northwestern shore of the harbour (on what the French called the hauteur de Martissans) across a small bay known as the Baraquis, approximately 800 yards from the Dauphin Gate. This battery called Titcomb’s Battery after its commander, Major Moses Titcomb of Hale’s regiment, whose men largely sustained the work, initially mounted two 42-pounders (three more 42-pounders were later added) drawn from the Royal Battery, and was designed expressly to bombard the Dauphin Gate and the circular battery of the Dauphin Demi-bastion.21

Titcomb’s Battery opened fire on 31 May. That same day its cannon knocked down the guérite and part of the salient angle of the Dauphin Demi-bastion. The éperon near the gate, which the French had already repaired several times with freestone and earth, was demolished to the height of its embrasures. The cannon of the Advanced Battery were fired in support of Titcomb’s, and the shot soon smashed the embrasures as well, and also broke through the quay wall and dismantled its embrasures. The concentrated fire from the two batteries completely demolished the Dauphin Gate, pounded a breach in the wall of the Dauphin Demi-bastion to within 10 feet of the bottom of the ditch, and severely damaged the circular battery. Major General Wolcott recorded that by 17 June, the shot had broken down the top of the West [Dauphin] gate and the wall nigh it, as low as the glacis, and dismounted the guns at that place, and dismounted all the guns in the circular battery except three, many of the embrasures being broken to pieces and the wall in a shattered condition below, and damaged a small battery below it: they had likewise dismounted the guns planted on [the King’s Bastion] at the north-west end of the citadel, the embrasures and wall being very much shattered and broken.22

The fire from Titcomb’s and the advanced batteries demolished the embrasures on the right flank of the King’s Bastion (where the French had mounted six 18- and 24-pounders). Duchambon ordered his soldiers to construct some contre-merlons and wooden embrasures, and while this task was completed on 19 June and
the cannon once more put to use, the embrasures were again soon smashed.\textsuperscript{23}

On 15 June the provincials had given the French defenders of Louisbourg an added terror by firing red-hot shot from their mortars. The French, using some type of fire-fighting device, acted swiftly to extinguish fires in several houses, and otherwise managed to contain what might have proven a holocaust.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{Other Measures Taken by the French}

Despite constant counterfire from the cannon of the King's Bastion, the Dauphin Demi-bastion, and the \textit{Pièce de la Grave}, plus musket fire from the walls and such places as the breach in the Dauphin Gate and the adjoining guardhouses, the provincial batteries continued to rain destruction on the fortress. Fearing the New Englanders would attack the town by landing in barges along the quay, Duchambron ordered his men to construct a floating barricade of masts (\textit{estacade de mâts}) from the \textit{éperon} of the Dauphin Demi-bastion as far as the \textit{Pièce de la Grave}. The French began the barricade about 31 May and completed it on 11 June. The soldiers who built it worked under constant fire from the provincial batteries.\textsuperscript{25}

Fearing an assault through the breach in the Dauphin Demi-bastion, Duchambron ordered chief engineer Verrier to have an entrenchment built across the breach from which to defend it. This entrenchment, which stretched from the quay to the parapet at the front of the Dauphin, was finished on 24 June, the French doing much of the construction work at night.\textsuperscript{26}

Also, at some point during the siege, the French raised an \textit{épaulement} of dry stone at the king's bakery, and established a \textit{corps de garde} for the militia.\textsuperscript{27}

But no matter what measures were taken, they were not enough. By 26 June, further resistance would seem useless. "Never was a place so maulled with cannon and shells," Pepperrell would write after the capitulation. He estimated that the provincial batteries had fired into the town about 9,000 cannon shot and 600 mortar bombs. The destruction was tremendous. The streets were rent from end to end, and every building and all of the houses save one were damaged or destroyed and unfit for habitation. The right flank of the King's Bastion no longer existed, except as a pile of rubble, and the King's-Dauphin curtain was riddled with shot. The Dauphin Demi-bastion had taken the brunt of the cannonade and was badly pummeled: the Dauphin Gate had been reduced to a gaping breach; the newly cut embrasures had been knocked to pieces; all but three of the guns at the circular battery had been dismounted and the wall of the battery itself beaten down. The \textit{éperon} was completely dismantled, as were the embrasures along the quay.\textsuperscript{28} The French powder supplies were nearing exhaustion, and the garrison waited anxiously for the attack that was sure to come through the breach at the Dauphin.

\textbf{French Morale and the Capture of the \textit{Vigilant} (30 May)}

Despite the fatigues and devastation that each day brought, the garrison and residents of Louisbourg displayed a remarkable determination to withstand the onslaught made against them. They worked untiringly to clear the debris from the ramparts so the cannon might still be used. Children, 10 and 12 years of age, bore arms and stood to the walls with the soldiers, "exposing themselves with a courage beyond their years." There were exceptions, however, and deserters reported to the provincials that some of the regular soldiers were succumbing to the mounting pressures. They desired to surrender and would often refuse their duties; these disagreements, it was said, even led to frequent duels, one of which some provincial soldiers saw from a tower of the Royal Battery. Several Swiss soldiers managed to escape, and on 19 June a French soldier attempted to get out of the town with a letter from a captured provincial to his friends, but was discovered and immediately hanged. Yet most of the soldiers and residents seem to have resolved to hold out to the last extremity,\textsuperscript{29} this despite fitful and sleepless nights on the ramparts and in the casemates; with, reportedly, no meat left in the town and a diet of fish, bread and peas;\textsuperscript{30} with their powder nearly exhausted, and their last hope of succour gone with the capture of the \textit{Vigilant}.

The spirits of the defenders of Louisbourg were badly shaken by the capture of the 64-gun French man-of-war, the \textit{Vigilant}, upon which they had relied heavily for relief. The \textit{Vigilant}, manned by 500 sailors and commanded by Captain de La Maisonfort, sailed from Brest on 26 April with orders to get into Louisbourg harbour and help defend the place. Word had been received that the English were going to attack. (Only one French ship, a snow, had been able to get into the harbour since the provincial landing and she carried only supplies for the fishermen.) Should Louisbourg be blockaded, La Maisonfort was instructed to do what he could to help without needlessly endangering his ship. The \textit{Vigilant} was laden with stores for the garrison, a large number of cannon, and a great quantity of much-needed powder. She also, reportedly, carried 20 chests of small-arms, as well as stores and rigging for a privateer then being fitted out at Quebec.\textsuperscript{31}

According to the \textit{habitant de Louisbourg}, the \textit{Vigilant} came in view of the fortress on 28 or 29 May, about a league and a half distant from Scatarie Island, with a good northeast wind for her destination. The British blockading squadron was at least two...
and a half leagues to leeward, and it seemed the Vigilant would be able to slip into Louisbourg harbour without difficulty. But about noon on 30 May, La Maisonfort spotted the English ship Mermaid (40 guns), Captain Douglass commanding, close in-shore and gave chase, hoisting the French flag and pennant as he closed. The Mermaid’s stern gun opened on the Vigilant and Douglass signalled the rest of the fleet that he had sighted a strange ship. The Vigilant replied to the Mermaid with a shot from her bow cannon, and the fight was on. At 2 o’clock, La Maisonfort discovered the remainder of Warren’s squadron closing from the northward and, giving the Mermaid a broadside in passing, hoisted full sail and bore off to the southward. Douglass gave chase, and for the next four hours gave broadside for broadside. At about 6 o’clock, Captain Rous in the Shirley galley joined the Mermaid and gave the Vigilant a shot from his bow gun. The Eltham joined at 7 o’clock and Warren in the Superbe fell in an hour later. At 9 o’clock, La Maisonfort asked for quarter. The Vigilant’s rigging, masts and yards were badly damaged, and the ship itself was un­serviceable. Sixty of her crew of 500 were killed or wounded. The French were transferred to the British ships.

The next day, 31 May, Warren notified Pepperrell of the capture, advising him that he intended “to Commission [the ship] for his Majesty”; and hoped that Pepperrell would be able to furnish a crew to man her. He also told Pepperrell that as the Vigilant had been “much shattered” in the engagement, he was sending her into Gabarus Bay for repairs and refitting, “and beg that you will direct vessels to come to take the Prisoners from us . . . [as] otherwise the Cruizers will be useless, with such numbers on board.” Warren hoped that the capture of the Vigilant “will be a very happy event, for our further success.”

The Vigilant’s fate was far from a “happy event” for the French. “Témoins de sa manoeuvre,” wrote the habitant, “il n’était personne de nous qui ne donnât des malédictions à une manoeuvre si mal concertée & si imprudente.” While La Maisonfort had displayed great courage in the engagement, mais il aurait mieux valu qu’il eût suivi sa destination: c’était tout ce que les intérêts du Roi exigeoient. Le Ministre ne l’envoyoit pas pour donner la chasse à aucun Vaisseau ennemi: chargé de munitions de guerre & de bouche, son Vaisseau étoit uniquement destiné a ravitailler notre malheureuse Place, qui n’auroit jamais été en effet emportée, si nous eussions pu recevoir un si grand secours; mais nous étions des victimes devouées à la colere du Ciel, qui a voulu faire servir contre nous jusqu’à nos propres forces.

The loss of the Vigilant “ralentit le courage de ceux qui avoient le plus conservé de fermeté, . . . et plusieurs personnes furent d’avis qu’il falloit dès lors demander à capituler.” But the fortress held out. To say that Louisbourg would not have fallen had the Vigilant passed through Warren’s blockade is debatable. There are arguments for both sides of the question. The siege would have been prolonged in any case. La Maisonfort’s spirited sailors would have greatly cheered the defenders and perhaps have instilled in them added determination to resist; the cannon and powder the Vigilant carried would have been of great use to the garrison; and the broadsides of her 64 guns would have made it very uncom­fortable for the provincial gunners at the Royal and advance batteries. But the key to the Louisbourg defences was still the Island Battery, and it would probably have been only a matter of time before the provincials erected a battery to counter the fire from that work. Then Warren’s fleet could enter the harbour and, though the British squadron would have to come one at a time through the narrow north channel, neither the Vigilant’s 64 guns nor the determination of seamen would have much effect against the broadsides of 11 battleships, each averaging from 40 to 60 cannon.

The supply of powder on board the Vigilant would now be used by the besiegers, however, and, noted the habitant, “nous nous apperçûmes que leur feu avoit depuis beaucoup augmenté.”

The Attacks on the Island Battery (18 May–6 June)

French spirits were raised temporarily on 6 June, when the garri­son of the Island Battery aborted a provincial attack on that post. The Island Battery, a strong fortification defended by about 200 men and 36 cannon under command of d’Ailleboust stood defi­antly in the middle of the harbour entrance, and was the only obsta­cle preventing Warren’s squadron from entering and raking the fortress from the harbour. The provincial commanders feared that the town might not be taken unless the fleet could get into the harbour and the fortress be bombarded from land and sea. The abortive assault of 6 June was the culminating effort of several planned attacks on the island stronghold.

As early as 18 May, immediately following Duchambon’s refusal to surrender the town, a council of war advised that an at­tack be made on the Island Battery. Commodore Warren brought a number of seamen ashore to assist, and that night about 800 men, including Colonel Gorham’s regiment, were to set out for Gabarus Bay. The whaleboats, however, were late in coming and because of high surf and approaching daylight, the attempt was cancelled. Similar attempts were planned on 19 and 20 May, but
these were also cancelled, probably because of high surf. The New Englanders apparently wearied of trying to attack the island by sea, believing that the waters of the harbour afforded a safer approach, because on 21 May the whaleboats were carried overland from Gabarus Bay to the Royal Battery, whence an attack was planned for that night. Warren and his seamen were still on shore to participate, but again the attack was called off.39

On 22 May, Colonel Vaughan proposed that he be allowed to organize an attempt, but nothing came of his proposal. Warren, who for several days had been on shore to participate in the proposed attacks, ordered his seamen back on the ships on 23 May. The commodore himself returned to the Superbe “not a little dissatisfied.”40

Not until 2 June were plans again made for attacking the Island Battery, and the whaleboats were again prepared for use. About 150 men carried additional boats from Gabarus Bay, “which was the Hardest Service I’ve Ever Undergone in all my Life,” wrote one soldier, “(and So Said they all) but having a Prospect thereby to take the Island Battery made us Cheerfully Endure our burden.” Despite the men’s exertions, the attempt was cancelled, “owing to the moon & the northern lights,” and because the men who showed up for the attack were without officers and “in liquor.”41

Yet another attack, this one much better organized, was prepared for the night of 3 June. That day, Colonel Waldo sent two of his captains to visit other regiments to find suitable volunteers for the project. In a letter to Pepperrell, Waldo said that Major Thatcher of Gorham’s regiment had 15 men, including himself, willing to take part, but that he was having difficulty obtaining cooperation from Hale’s regiment. Hale’s men were using their work on the new Titcomb’s Battery as an excuse for not taking part. Waldo, however, did manage to “detach” several unwilling volunteers from Hale and wanted to get 50 or 100 more. He also felt that the services of Captain John Card’s company (of Moulton’s regiment), Elder Harnar’s company (of Pepperrell’s regiment), and Captain Terry’s men (of Willard’s regiment) would be particularly useful. Commodore Warren wrote Pepperrell that he hoped to be able to provide upwards of 200 seamen for the attempt.42

Exactly which units took part in the 3 June attempt has not been determined, but all day a great number of men were busy preparing paddles and ladders for “near fifty” whaleboats, and at about midnight some 500 men of the army and fleet embarked for the island. They were commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Arthur Noble of Waldo’s regiment and Colonel John Gorham.43

When the provincials set off from the Royal Battery, their course was illuminated by a “Remarkable Northern Twilight;” but by the time they drew near the island a dense fog had rolled in and they could not see where to land. The assault was then called off. Colonel Noble’s conduct in the affair was called into question, and Seth Pomeroy, the gunsmith, claimed that Noble could not be found at the time the attack got under way. Pomeroy implied that the volunteers went without him and that “For want of an officer the Soldiers Return’d.” The rumour of Noble’s negligence persisted and the next day a council of war examined the charges. The council, however, found no grounds to accuse either Noble or Gorham of misconduct in the affair.44

The council also announced “that if a number of men to the amount of three or four hundred appear as volunteers for [another] attack of the Island Battery, they be allowed to choose their own officers and be entitled to the plunder found there.” The prospect of plunder brought about 400 men together on 6 June. They selected Captain (Edward?) Brooks to lead them. Pepperrell’s secretary, Green, directed that all pistols in Hale’s regiment be turned over to the men volunteering for the attack. As the men assembled at the Royal Battery, Captain Sherburne at the Advanced Battery prepared to support them with diversionary fire from his cannon. The night was cool and foggy and there was a very high surf. At midnight the men climbed into the boats and rowed toward the island but, Seth Pomeroy wrote, “Providence Seemed Remarkable to Frown upon the affair.” They were discovered before all the troops could be landed.45

As the provincials began to disembark at the island, somebody yelled “Hurrah!” and the alarm went up. Some New Englanders later believed that the French had been warned of the attack and were waiting in ambush. The French gunners loaded their cannon with langrage, pointed them toward the whaleboats and opened fire, causing much disorder and confusion among the provincials but apparently doing little damage. Many of the boats were cut off by the cannon fire and turned back, but four or five beached on the island and the men scrambled ashore, firing their muskets and pistols at the shadowy figures on the walls above them. Some of the small arms misfired, the powder being soaked by the mist and by the high surf as the men jumped ashore. Several of the provincials hauled ladders from the boats and placed them against the walls, the men all the while under heavy musket fire from the ramparts above. Duchambon reported later that the commandant, d’Ailleboust, along with the governor’s son and an ensign, de La Pérelle, were the first to climb upon the ramparts to fire on the New Englanders, and that their men urged them to get back from the walls and not expose themselves.46
For two hours, the small-arms fighting continued at close quarters. Then, the situation hopeless, the provincials broke and ran for the boats. But the tide had carried off many of the boats and there were not enough left to accommodate all of the men. The remaining boats were soon filled, probably overloaded. Cannon shot cut one of them in half as it was pushed off from the island, the men drowning in the surf. The provincials in the other boats would not come to their rescue for fear they too would be sunk by cannon fire.

Some of the men went ashore at Lighthouse Point, while others made it back to the Royal Battery to carry news of the debacle to Pepperrell. "Now things lookt something dark," wrote Green. The provincial losses were about 60 men killed and from 112 to 119 captured. Some of the dead washed up on shore at the lighthouse; some of the wounded had to have limbs amputated.

"Wee have great Reason to be humble'd before God," wrote one diarist, and the next day the batteries for a time were strangely silent. "From all accounts," wrote the Reverend Joseph Emerson, "we learn the men are prodigiously discouraged."

The French, however, were cheered by the result of this encounter. They had only three men killed or wounded, and the repulse of the provincials at the Island Battery was the only real success they had experienced since the siege began. Duchambon, perhaps unwittingly, exaggerated the numbers of the provincials, reporting that 1,000 soldiers in 35 barges, with 800 reinforcements, had been driven in panic from the island that night.

To Pepperrell, the repulse at the Island Battery was doubly unfortunate, for he could ill afford the loss of so many soldiers. His army was sick with dysentery, or what was then called "bloody fluxes," brought on by fatigue, lack of proper food, and poor and unsanitary living conditions. During this period at least 1,500 men were unfit for duty. For days Pepperrell had been appealing to Shirley and the other New England governors to send more men, but he could not count on their arriving for some time yet. The troops were becoming demoralized, and the defeat at the Island Battery only added to the general despair. One volunteer wrote to his father that "I am sorry to find our New England troops... want to go home, home, is all ye cry & [they all say] if I was well at home I'd engage they should never find me such a fool again – this is the language of those who are as well used as can be." It is hardly surprising that Pepperrell wrote on 13 June that "I apprehend no further attempts will be made on [the Island Battery] by boats."

Friction Grows Between the Provincial Commanders

The Island Battery had to be silenced if Warren’s squadron was to help, and Warren himself was growing impatient. He was far from satisfied with the seemingly inactive role the navy had played blocking the harbour against French ships, and he complained that he was tired of doing nothing.

On 4 June, Warren had sent a plan ashore for Pepperrell’s review and approval. The plan had already been approved by Warren’s ships’ captains. It proposed that the Vigilant be fitted out and manned by 600 landsmen; that 1,000 men from the army embark on the other vessels of the squadron; that the harbour be forced; and that a vigorous attack on the town be made by boats from the ships. A council of war called on 5 June “maturely considered” Warren’s plan and, in effect, rejected it on several grounds: there was too much sickness in the army and the men could not be spared; Pepperrell had learned that Duchambon had sent for Marin’s detachment of French and Indians and the men must be kept at hand to meet that contingent when it arrived; the men, being unused to the sea, would soon be unfit for service by being kept on board the ships. In time, the council advised, a concerted action would be arranged, but not at the present.

The council’s decision did little to alleviate Warren’s impatience, and on 6 June he wrote brusquely to Pepperrell: For God’s sake, let us do something and not waste our time in indolence. I sincerely wish you all the honour and success imaginable and only beg to know in what manner I can be more serviceable, that in cruising, to prevent the introduction of succours to the garrison. I fear that if that be all that is expected from the ships, or that they can do, Louisbourg will be safe for some time; for my part I have proposed all that I think can be done already, and only wait for your answer thereto.

Pepperrell’s reply, which did not come until 8 June, was hardly calculated to placate the anxious Warren for it dealt, at some length, only with the army and its condition. The troops, Pepperrell wrote, had in just 29 days erected five fascine batteries, and... with 16 pieces of cannon, and our mortars mounted at said batteries, and with our cannon from the royal battery, we have been playing on the town, by which we have greatly distress the inhabitants, made some breaches in the wall, especially at the west gate, which we have beat down, and made a considerable breach there, and doubt not but shall soon reduce the circular battery. That in this time we have made five unsuccessful attempts upon the island battery, in the last of which we lost about 189 men, and many of our boats were shot to pieces, and many of our men drowned before they could land; that we have also kept out scouts to destroy any set-
lements of the enemy near us, and prevent a surprise in our camp . . . that by the services aforesaid and the constant guards kept night and day around the camp, at our batteries, the army is very much fatigued, and sickness prevails among us, to that degree that we now have but 2100 effective men, six hundred of which are gone in the quest of two bodies of French and Indians [one of which was thought to be that of Marin's] we are informed are gathering, one to the eastward, and the other to the westward.}\textsuperscript{54}

The commodore would have to wait. The council had decided not to make any more attacks against the Island Battery, and Warren's officers advised that it was not practicable for the fleet to try to enter the harbour until that battery was silenced.\textsuperscript{55}

**The Erection of the Lighthouse Battery (12–21 June)**

On 12 June, the provincials decided to erect a battery at Lighthouse Point opposite the Island Battery about 3,400 feet distant. The final decision to erect the battery came only after the repeated failures to take the Island Battery pointed up the need for such a work. Waldo on 6 June had urged Pepperell to erect a work there, and Warren on 12 June likewise pressed Pepperell to "hasten the battery at the lighthouse" because the pilots thought it "impossible to go in [to the harbour] till [the Island Battery] can be silenced."\textsuperscript{56}

Pepperrell told Warren that the battery would soon be completed, that "there are three embrasures facing the Island Battery, and six facing the sea," and that he hoped to have the cannon mounted there in two days. Transporting the cannon must have proved more of a difficulty than Pepperrell had anticipated, because it was nearly eight days before the guns were mounted. The New Englanders carried them by boat from Gabarus Bay to a point about a mile and a quarter east of the lighthouse, where they dragged them up the steep cliffs along the shoreline. By 21 June, they had mounted two 18-pounders (four were mounted on 25 June). The "great mortar" was also carried to the lighthouse and mounted. The battery was sustained by 320 men of Gorham's regiment.\textsuperscript{57}

A number of provincials (possibly Gorham's regiment) had been stationed for some time on the lighthouse side of the harbour in anticipation of erecting a battery there. Duchambon knew of their presence, and a Lieutenant Vallée of the artillery company had informed him that several 18- and 24-pounders, some still serviceable, had been buried at the careening wharf near the lighthouse some ten years previously to serve as piles (corps-morts). Duchambon feared that the provincials would find the guns and use them to equip a battery against the island. Unknown to the French, the New Englanders had already found these cannon. But on the night of 27 May the French commander set a detachment of about 100 local men and militia as well as some privateers under Beaubassin, to try to prevent the provincials from setting up a battery on that side of the harbour.\textsuperscript{58}

Beaubassin and his men set out in three chaloupes, with food for 10 to 12 days and 30 to 50 rounds of ammunition. They reached Grande Lorembec that night, came ashore, and the following morning encountered about 40 provincial soldiers near the lighthouse. The New Englanders were prepared (Bigot asserted they had been warned by a fisherman who had deserted from Beaubassin) and a sharp skirmish resulted. The French failed to press their numerical advantage, panicked, and retreated into the woods. Many, being near their homes and not wishing to be confined again inside the fortress, deserted. Others in the rush threw their supplies away and returned to the town, hungry and tired, several days later. The provincials reportedly suffered no casualties in the fight and the French loss was three men killed and several wounded. Dudley Bradstreet recorded that a French captain who was mortally wounded and taken prisoner offered 10,000 pounds (livres?) for a priest to pardon his sins. Mockingly, Bradstreet asserted that he would have been willing to do this himself, and for half the money.\textsuperscript{59}

The Lighthouse Battery was finished and opened fire on the Island Battery on 21 June. The shot swept the west platform of the French fortification and prevented the gunners from working the cannon. When the large mortar began to fire, 17 out of 19 shells reportedly fell within the work, one of them upon the magazine. "And this together with the Fire from our Cannon, to which the enemy was very much exposed, they having but little to shelter em from the Shott, which rang'd quite thro' their Line of Barracks, so terrified 'em that many left the Fort and ran into the Water for Refuge." The provincial fire soon knocked holes in the barracks and the bakery (both of which had been reinforced with wood from the store of a M. Dacarrette), nearly ruining these buildings. The French responded to the bombardment, but the Lighthouse Battery was so placed that they could not bring an effective counterfire against it.\textsuperscript{60} The Island Battery was rapidly becoming untenable, and it was only a matter of time before Warren's fleet would be free to enter the harbour.

**The Proposed Assault of 26 June and the Surrender of Louisbourg**

The time was not long in coming. By 26 June the New Englanders had readied a general assault by land and sea. Between 21 and 26 June Warren and Pepperrell had been in constant correspond-
ence with each other and had held numerous joint councils. The records of the correspondence and councils between the two commanders indicate that, of the two, Warren was the more anxious for the attack, while Pepperrell, mindful of the disastrous results of the 6 June attack on the Island Battery, relied more upon the siege guns to gradually wear down the French defences.  

The Lighthouse Battery was effectively reducing the Island Battery, and Warren was able to win Pepperrell over to the scheme for a combined attack on the fortress. The preparations for the attack had been completed. The fleet, now numbering 11 warships and several armed New England vessels, had been cleared for action; the spare timbers and masts had been removed and the decks barricaded with moss as protection against small-arms fire. Six hundred men of the army supplemented the crews of the warships. Provision for three large beacon fires had been made on three hills west of the fortress. When ignited, these fires would serve as guides for Warren’s ships as they entered the harbour, possibly indicating that a night attack had been planned. Ladders and fascines for filling the ditch and scaling the walls had been carried to the Advanced Battery, where Captain Sherburne by 12 noon had “got all our platforms laid, ambrazures mended, Guns in Order, Stock of Cartridges, Shot in Place, Gunners Quartered, Dined, & matches Lit,” ready for the signal to attack. Commodore Warren was on shore and the troops drawn up on parade heard him proclaim that “He’d Rather Leave his Body at Louis­bord, than not take the City.” Everyone was ready; all that was needed now was a favourable wind.

The French in Louisbourg looked apprehensively on the preparations for the assault they knew they could not withstand. By 26 June they were dispirited and fatigued from the rigorous defence they had made, from much work and no sleep. Now they began to question whether further resistance was justified. The Island Battery was a shambles; its fire was slack and ineffective and would no longer keep the enemy fleet out of the harbour. The town was in ruins, the fortifications were breached, and of the 1,300 men who had undertaken the defence of the fortress, nearly 50 had been killed, another 80 to 95 had been severely wounded, and several had succumbed to utter exhaustion. Reportedly the French had not changed their clothes since the day the provincials landed in Gabarus Bay. The capture of the Vigilant had removed all hope of succour, and Duchambon had heard nothing from Marin’s detachment, which he had sent for on 16 May. It was a time of great despair, and the habitant wrote that “Les Conseils étoient plus fréquents que jamais . . . ; on s’assemblait sans trop savoir pourquoi, aussi ne sçavoit-on que résoudre.” He continued,

J’ai souvent ri de ces assemblées, où il ne se passoit rien que de ridicule & qui n’annonçât le trouble & l’indécision. Le soin de notre défense n’étoit plus ce qui occupoit. Si les Anglais eussent su profiter de notre épouvante, il y aurroit eu long-temps qu’ils nous auroient emportés, l’épée à la main. Mais il faut convenir à leur louange qu’ils avoient autant de peur que nous.  

Now it seemed that the English were no longer afraid, and while the soldiers might be willing to fight on, the residents had had enough. On the morning of 26 June they petitioned Duchambon to surrender. They pointed out that since the enemy force both on land and on sea was increasing daily, and since the French had obtained no aid and could not hope to defeat the New Englanders, Duchambon and his officers should ask for terms so the residents might keep what little property remained to them. Duchambon asked Verrier to report on the state of the fortifications; he made a similar request of Sainte-Marie about the status of the ammunition. These reports were rendered and a council of war was called, the members voting unanimously that, because of the growing enemy force and the condition of the fortifications, ammunition, and town, it would be best to capitulate. After the council’s decision, Duchambon composed the following note to Pepperrell and Warren:

Desirous of putting a stop to acts of hostility; and prevent the effusion of blood on one side and on the other, I send you an officer of our garrison to deliver you the present [letter], in order to desire you a suspension of arms, for so long a time as shall be needful for me to make proposals to you, upon the conditions of which I shall determine to deliver up to you, the place which the King my master has entrusted me with.  

Ensign de La Pérelle, who had recovered from a wound received during the 6 June attack on the Island Battery, was designated to carry the letter to the provincial commanders. At 4 o’clock in the afternoon, the ensign appeared at the Dauphin Gate under a flag of truce. He was met halfway between the gate and the Advanced Battery by Captain Sherburne, who then escorted him to Colonel Richmond at Green Hill. There he was either met by or taken to Pepperrell and Warren, to whom he handed over Duchambon’s letter. The provincial commanders granted Duchambon until 8 o’clock the next morning (27 June) to present the terms upon which he would surrender the fortress. A general cessation of hostilities was called.

Duchambon submitted his terms between 8 and 9 o’clock on the morning of 27 June. These terms, carried to the provincial lines by Bonnaventure, were not accepted by Pepperrell and Warren, who then sent in their own terms for the capitulation (see Appendix D). The articles were basically the same as those con-
tained in the summons of 18 May: that the inhabitants and their effects would be transported to France and, if needed, vessels would be provided for the purpose; that the officers and inhabitants would be permitted to remain in their houses and enjoy freedom of religion without molestation; that the non-commissioned officers and soldiers would be placed on board British ships and transported to France; that the sick and wounded would be cared for; that two covered wagons could be sent off under the inspection of only one provincial officer who would search only for warlike stores, and that anyone who so desired might go off masked. This last condition was one that Duchambon initially asked for and raises the suspicion that, for various reasons, there were persons in the fortress who wanted to leave without being seen – perhaps a New Englander who had deserted to the French, or a privateer or contraband merchant who might have been recognized by certain members of the provincial army.

In return for these terms, the governor was to see that the surrender took place as soon as possible, that the Island Battery or some other battery, along with all its artillery and ammunition, was turned over to provincial soldiers that day, that Warren's fleet was permitted to enter the harbour unmolested, that officers, soldiers, and residents of the fortress would not take up arms against the English for 12 months, and that all British subjects then in the town were immediately delivered up. These conditions were to be met by 6 o'clock that evening, or the provincials threatened to decide the matter with their arms.

The terms made no allowance for the "honours of war," that is, the troops being permitted to march out bearing arms, with drums beating and flags unfurled, and Duchambon refused to consider them unless that provision was included. He wrote two letters, one to Pepperrell and another to Warren, saying that he could not allow the troops to leave the fortress without these honours, that they were honours due to soldiers who had done their duty, and that once the provincial commanders agreed to that provision, he would agree to the rest.

On 28 June Pepperrell informed Duchambon that both he and Warren would allow the French troops to march out with the honours of war. The officers and other inhabitants, he wrote, should repair to their houses where they would be safe, and the arms should be put in a safe magazine and would be turned over to the French soldiers the day they marched out of town. With this, Duchambon accepted the terms and formally ended the siege of Louisbourg.

The siege had lasted 47 days, and the number of casualties sustained on either side seems incredibly low. The French claimed that 50 men had been killed and from 80 to 95 severely wounded, while the provincial losses were estimated at 100 men killed by the French and 30 others who had died of sickness. No mention of the number of wounded has been found.

The Island Battery was delivered up to Warren by M. de Gannes on the morning of 28 June, and the English colours were raised on the flagship. At 2 o'clock that afternoon, Warren entered Louisbourg harbour at the head of his squadron, "which made a beautiful Appearance." When the ships were sufficiently moored, a broadside salute was fired and the soldiers and sailors gave three cheers.

At 4 o'clock, several regiments of the army advanced toward the town to take possession. At the head of the column marched Colonel John Bradstreet, followed by Pepperrell and his officers. They entered through the Queen's Gate and, as the New Englanders moved toward the parade ground where the French were drawn up in order, Girard La Croix noted the flags flying, the drums beating, and the odd combination of sound offered by the trumpets, flutes and violins that accompanied the tread of the victorious provincials. The French men and women who watched "looked very sorrowful," one witness remarked. At the parade ground, the officers of the two armies exchanged the usual salutes, "every Part being performed with all the Decency and Decorum imaginable," and the town was officially surrendered.

Guards were posted to prevent looting, but they had little effect. The New Englanders, decried the habitant, "contre la foi dûe à notre capitulation ... se jetèrent dans nos Maisons & y ont Pris tout ce qui les accommodoit." Bigot also accused the provincials of "beaucoup de pillage et d'insultes" to the inhabitants after the surrender. But there was no recourse against the violators.

Conclusions

The outcome of the siege both surprised and shocked French officials in Paris who found it difficult to understand how an amateur army of undisciplined volunteers could capture the "strongest" French fortress in North America. The New Englanders, however, who from the beginning were supremely confident of success, were not at all surprised at the outcome. They had come to capture Louisbourg and this they had done; it was as simple as that. If asked for specific reasons for their success, however, most of them probably would not have been able to respond adequately. Many attributed success to the will of God, of whom they were the instrument designed to rid the continent of a great "Stronghold of Satan." Others would not know why they had succeeded, but thought it was "the most glorious and useful thing done in the war."
Obviously, the reasons for the New England victory at Louisbourg go far beyond the simple explanation that it was the “will of God,” and, indeed, beyond any single factor. In searching for answers to the question it is useful to recall the words of Captain H.F. Thullier, R.E., who, in his book The Principles of Land Defence (1902), cautioned:

Nothing is more difficult than to correctly analyse the causes of success or failure in the attack and defence of fortresses in past times. The reason of this is that the causes are, as a rule, very complex, . . . . There are a great number of conditions which enter into each case, and many, or all of them, may have had a bearing on the result. The activity of the garrison, the organization of the defence, the ability and resolution of the commander, the relative power of the ordnance, the sufficiency of the supplies, all these and many other causes may have important effects upon the results of sieges; and also the fate of the fortresses is often influenced by the tactical methods and energy of the attackers, as well as by external strategic considerations, such as the movements of other bodies of troops elsewhere. It is seldom too that complete data on these heads are available, so wrong conclusions are often arrived at on this account. It therefore often happens that a false importance is given to one or other of the conditions in a particular case, and wrong deductions are made from the erroneous premise thus set up. It is thus seldom safe to seize upon particular events and deduce therefrom particular theories.  

With this admonition in mind, a few of the more patent factors that contributed to the provincial success might be suggested. Among these factors must be placed the provincial occupation of the Royal Battery early in the siege. Possession of this battery not only gave the New Englanders effective control of the inner harbour but also provided them with a much-needed supply of serviceable heavy calibre cannon, left behind when the French abandoned the battery. The New Englanders never adequately utilized their control of the harbour to launch an attack by water against the town (although several attacks were directed against the Island Battery), but the surplus cannon were used to strengthen the armament of the several batteries raised against the fortress.

Other factors were, first, the erection of the Advanced and Titcomb’s batteries, and then, near the close of the siege, the erection of the Lighthouse Battery. Pepperrell and his officers, though ignorant of the fine points in the art of siegework, clearly realized the necessity of effecting a breach in the fortress walls before the place could be taken. The Green Hill Battery, raised soon after the landing, was of little use in this respect because of the excessive range. The Coehorn Battery, composed mostly of mortars, proved equally ineffective on the fortifications, although it did cause great destruction to the interior of the town. Not until the Advanced and Titcomb’s batteries were formed, mainly of cannon removed from the Royal Battery, were the New Englanders able to greatly neutralize the French defence and breach the walls, thus preparing the way for a land assault.

Perhaps the French could have withstood a land assault. The erection of the Lighthouse Battery, however, soon added another dimension to the threat — an attack by sea. One of the key works in the French defence system was the Island Battery, standing athwart the harbour entrance and effectively barring the entry of the British fleet. Both Warren and Pepperrell feared that success would not be assured until the Island Battery was rendered impotent and the ships were permitted to enter the harbour for a combined land and sea assault on the town. Pepperrell was slow to realize the need for the Lighthouse Battery, preferring initially to launch boat attacks against the island stronghold. Not until the abortive attack of 6 June did he concede the folly of such strategy and push forward the completion of the Lighthouse Battery.

The New Englanders soon realized the value of that battery. After only two days of firing, it effectively silenced the Island Battery. Duchambon must have known that while a land attack might be repulsed, a combined land and sea assault could prove disastrous. He could not risk subjecting the inhabitants and garrison to the destruction such an attack would bring. Surrender seemed the only course open to him.

The importance of the Advanced, Titcomb’s, and Lighthouse batteries cannot be over-emphasized. Without them, ultimate success would surely have been delayed and perhaps lost. Samuel Waldo was forcibly impressed by the contribution these works made to the reduction of Louisbourg, and on 7 November 1757, he advised Secretary of State William Pitt of the great benefits to be derived from the erection of similar batteries, should England contemplate another attack on the fortress.  

Of equal, if not greater, significance was Louisbourg’s very poor defensive position. Surrounded on the landward side by dominating heights, its security would be threatened by an enemy occupying those heights. The French seem to have given little serious consideration to the dangers thus posed, nor, indeed, to the prospect of an enemy attack at all. If they had given serious thought to preparing an adequate defence, they might have constructed outworks to retard or prevent an enemy from occupying the high ground north and west of the fortress. Although some works apparently were projected, none was constructed.
The French should have been particularly concerned about the rise of ground located about 250 yards northwest of the glacis at the Dauphin Demi-bastion and known to them as the Montagne à Francoeur. This height was a very commanding position and posed great dangers to the fortifications in this sector. An enemy battery situated on this hill could quite easily breach the walls. The French should have placed an outwork on this height to prevent it being occupied, or, at the very least, should have levelled it to diminish the advantage it would afford an enemy. Neither of these expedients was taken. The provincials soon raised here the Advanced Battery and effected the breach in the Dauphin Demi-bastion that opened the way for a land assault.

Duchambon recognized early that to withstand a siege he would have to have some form of external relief. With very few exceptions, as the history of siege warfare reveals, no fortress has been able to resist a resolute besieging army indefinitely without some form of external aid. To quote Captain Thullier again:

*However strong the works and powerful the armament, however complete the organization and ample the supplies, a fortress will never, if invested by superior and resolute forces, be able to achieve its own deliverance without external help. This external help may take the form of an army advancing to its relief by driving off the besiegers, or it may be the effect of successful strategical action in other parts of the theatre of war, which results in the withdrawal of the assailing force; but failing these it is absolutely necessary that the external communications of the fortress should be kept open so that fresh supplies and munitions can be received. Without this it is a mere question of time till the garrison are forced to lay down their arms from starvation or lack of cartridges. On the other hand, with open communications there is no reason why a properly defended fortress should not be able to hold out for an indefinite time against a greatly superior force.*

Early in the siege Duchambon doubted his ability to withstand a siege with the force under his immediate command and sent for Marin’s detachment to come and drive off the New Englanders. Marin, however, failed to arrive in time. With supplies of food and powder dwindling rapidly and the situation looking bleaker each day, the French attached great hope to the arrival of the *Vigilant* for the much-needed relief. But Warren’s fleet had effectively blockaded Louisbourg’s sea communications and captured the *Vigilant* before she reached her destination. Her capture doomed Louisbourg’s chances for relief. With no hope for a successful outcome of the contest, the inhabitants petitioned Duchambon to surrender.

The war between Britain and France did not end with the capture of Louisbourg; it continued for another three years. But the Louisbourg campaign was the most significant and dramatic event of the war in the North American theatre of operations. At the peace conference in 1748 England returned Louisbourg to France, much to the anger and protests of the New England colonies. In 1758, during the Seven Years’ War, the French fortress was again besieged, this time by regular troops of the British army. It is significant that the pattern of operations during the siege of 1758 very closely paralleled those carried out 13 years earlier. Perhaps the provincials were not such amateurs after all.
Appendix A. Chronology of the Siege of Louisbourg, 1745.

May 11 (Tuesday)
Fair and pleasant; high surf about 11 a.m. Between 9:00 and 10:00 a.m., the provincial transports anchor in Gabarus Bay. French force sent from town to oppose landing. The provincials make a feint of landing at Flat Point while actual landing begins at Freshwater Cove. A brief skirmish ensues with small losses on both sides. About 2,000 provincial soldiers are landed by nightfall. The Royal Battery is ordered abandoned and in the early morning of May 12, Thierry transfers his troops to the town.

May 12 (Wednesday)
Wind southwest; fair. Remainder of provincial troops landed, and the army marches to the general area of Flat Point and begins to encamp. A detachment of men advances to the Northeast Harbour and burns French houses and storehouses. Lt. Saint-Etienne and a group of Frenchmen return to the Royal Battery to complete the removal of stores.

May 13 (Thursday)
North by west wind; cool. Royal Battery occupied in the morning by small group of provincials. French burn houses in the Barachois area. The landing of provisions begun at Flat Point area. Surf still running high.

May 14 (Friday)
Southwest wind in the morning; limited visibility: “Look’t like dirt.” The provincials begin to land artillery at Flat Point area in the high surf, and to transport it to the Green Hill range where they begin to erect their first battery against the fortress. Several of the guns at the Royal Battery, which were hurriedly spiked by the French when they withdrew, are cleared and fire against the town.

May 15 (Saturday)
Fair; wind southwest. Green Hill Battery completed and begins to fire. Fire continues between fortress and Royal Battery.

May 16 (Sunday)
Southwest wind; fair. Provincials continue to transport artillery. The fire from the Green Hill Battery proves ineffective and council orders another battery erected closer to the town. A cannon at the Royal Battery bursts due to accidental overcharging — the first of many such mishaps. The guns at the Royal Battery still being cleared.

May 17 (Monday)
Fair and warm. Transporting of artillery continues. Coehorn Battery begun approximately 900 yards from the King’s bastion. Two more guns burst at Royal Battery. Scouting party goes to Northeast Harbour from Royal Battery.

May 18 (Tuesday)
Cloudy, dry and warm; east wind. Summons to surrender sent into Louisbourg. Surrender refused. Provincials plan attack on Island Battery but plan is cancelled. Guns still being transferred to Coehorn Battery.

May 19 (Wednesday)
Foggy with south wind. Cannon bursts at Royal Battery. French make a sortie in the afternoon with possible intention of hindering the transfer of cannon to Coehorn Battery. Sortie is repulsed.

May 20 (Thursday)
Foggy with south wind. Provincials plan assault on town but it is called off when officers and soldiers appear unwilling and voice disapproval.

May 21 (Friday)
Fog cleared off; wind hard and cool west by north. Whaleboats carried overland from Gabarus Bay to Royal Battery, from whence attack is to be made on Island Battery. Attack is cancelled. Party of provincials attacked by Indians about six miles from Royal Battery.

May 22 (Saturday)
Morning cool with northwest by north wind; cloudy. Coehorn Battery begins to fire.

May 23 (Sunday)
Wind from north; cool. Another fascine battery begun approximately 440 yards from Dauphin Gate. French fire is light this day.

May 24 (Monday)
Cloudy, cold; strong east wind. More cannon burst at Royal Battery. Dysentery among provincial soldiers begins to increase. French ship runs past blockade into the harbour. Attempt by provincials to destroy the ship in the afternoon by using a fire ship fails.
May 25 (Tuesday)
Snow, hail and rain; north wind. Fascine Battery begun May 23 is finished. Cannon fire light. Small arms fire concentrated by French against the fascine battery. Royal Battery fires on the French ship that came in May 24 in attempt to sink her, but fire has little effect.

May 26 (Wednesday)
Cool overnight; ground frozen; morning fair. Another fascine battery (to be called Advanced Battery) is begun approximately 250 yards from Dauphin Gate.

May 27 (Thursday)
Fair, raw and cold; south wind. More guns burst at Royal Battery. Island Battery silent. A number of French cannon found near the lighthouse by the provincials.

May 28 (Friday)

May 29 (Saturday)
Wind northeast; fresh and cool but fair. Musket fire between French and provincials in area of Dauphin bastion. Fascine and Green Hill batteries under heavy French fire.

May 30 (Sunday)
Northeast wind in the morning; east wind and foggy in the afternoon. Much cannonading of both sides. Also small arms fire. The French man-of-war Vigilant is captured after a fight at sea.

May 31 (Monday)
Cold, easterly fog. Titcomb's Battery erected to fire on the Dauphin Gate and circular battery. Fire from this battery and the Advanced Battery soon opens a breach in the Dauphin bastion.

June 3 (Thursday)
Moderate and fair with southeast wind. Another attempt on the Island Battery fails to be put into effect. Charges of misconduct laid against Captain Noble, the officer commanding the force making the attempt.

June 4 (Friday)
North wind; brisk gale and cool. Council of war clears Captain Noble of misconduct charges. Fire ship sent into harbour by provincials in the afternoon.

June 5 (Saturday)
Warm. Woods on fire. Scouting party brings in a number of French prisoners. Brisk cannon and small arms fire.

June 6 (Sunday)
Southwest wind; warm in the morning; evening cool and foggy. Provincials attack Island Battery but are repulsed with heavy losses.

June 7 (Monday)
Foggy with southwest wind; some rain. Powder short at some provincial batteries. French prisoners brought in.

June 8 (Tuesday)
Southwest wind in morning; foggy and cool; evening fair with west wind; moderate. A scouting party sent out from Royal Battery encounters large party of French and Indians. Skirmish of several hours. French retreat. Heavy cannonading from provincial batteries.

June 9 (Wednesday)
Southeast wind; fair and moderate. Scout sent to Scatarie. French flagstaff shot down.

June 10 (Thursday)
Foggy with southwest wind. Vigilant sent to Gabarus Bay to be refitted. Diminished fire from provincial batteries due to want of powder.

June 11 (Friday)
Foggy with south wind in the morning; west wind with fog cleared off in the afternoon. Many provincial soldiers sick with dysentery. Two cannon planted by French during the night on new works at Dauphin Gate are knocked out by provincial fire.
June 12 (Saturday)
Foggy with east wind. Small arms fire between provincials and French at Dauphin Gate. Heavy cannon fire from provincial batteries. French fire declines.

June 13 (Sunday)
Cloudy, cool with north wind; evening rain and fog. New battery being raised at the lighthouse by provincials. Island Battery gives heavy but ineffective counterfire.

June 14 (Monday)
Wind north by east; cool and cloudy. Provisions and powder arrive from Boston. "This put new life and spirits into all of us."

June 15 (Tuesday)
Southwest wind; fair and warm. Red-hot shot used by provincials. More French prisoners brought in. Provincial camp security tightened as parties of French and Indians are expected.

June 16 (Wednesday)
Fair with north wind in the morning; cloudy in the afternoon.

June 17 (Thursday)
Fair and pleasant with northwest wind. French fire two newly erected cannon from right flank of King's bastion. Sailors taken on board Vigilant are transported to Boston.

June 18 (Friday)
South wind; calm and moderate. Royal and other batteries "fired smartly" against the town.

June 19 (Saturday)
Southeast wind; heavy rain. Flag of truce sent into the fortress with letter from the captain of the Vigilant, about treatment of English captives.

June 20 (Sunday)
West wind; scattered showers. Little firing on either side. Two Swiss deserters.

June 21 (Monday)
Northwest wind; fair, warm and pleasant. Lighthouse Battery begins to fire against Island Battery.

June 22 (Tuesday)
Northwest wind; pleasant. Island Battery returns the fire of the Lighthouse Battery but proves ineffectual. The provincials hold celebrations, with violin, flute and vocal music, plus a generous allowance of rum, in honour of the birthday of King George II.

June 23 (Wednesday)
Cool but pleasant, with northeast wind. Preparations underway for a combined land and sea attack on the town. Heavy firing from French batteries but with little effect.

June 24 (Thursday)
Fair, pleasant and moderate; southwest wind. Ships being cleared for entering the harbour. Soldiers are enlisted to go on board ships for the attack. Ships barricaded with moss.

June 25 (Friday)
Southeast wind and fog; southwest wind in the afternoon. Heavy fire from provincial batteries. Beacon fires erected on hills west of the city to serve as guides for Warren's fleet. Ladders and fascines being taken to Advanced Battery to storm the walls the following day if wind permits the fleet to force the harbour. French return a heavy fire on Advanced Battery but with little effect.

June 26 (Saturday)
Fair with southwest wind. Flag of truce from fortress asking for time to consider surrender terms. All firing ceases.

June 27 (Sunday)
Foggy and cool with east wind. Surrender terms agreed upon and siege officially ended.

June 28 (Monday)
Hard rain in the afternoon. Provincial army takes possession of town and Island Battery.
MEMO. In order for the attacking of Louisbourg this Spring by surprise, it is proposed that 3000 troops should embark from hence in sloops & schooners and proceed for canso, well armed which should be the place of rendezvous it being within 20 leagues of Louisbourg; and its being uncertain that so many vessels should be able to keep company together when they are arrived at said port, to take a favourable opportunity to sail from thence in order to be at Gaberus point by dusk, from whence it is but 3 leagues from Louisbourg, then to push into the bay, and as soon as said vessels are at an anchor to man as many whaleboats as they have & send them along the shore as near as possible, which will make it the more difficult for them to be discovered, & when they come to the cove which faces the low part of the wall, there to land if the sea will permit and scale that place if possible, & if otherwise as the wall breaks off a little on the other side of the east [maurepas] gate, not far from that there are pickets put for a considerable distance across a pond over to the wall on the beach on the other side of the pond, and as this pond is frozen all the month of March it is not very difficult to get over them: but if the weather will not permit their landing in the above place, let them proceed along the shore till they come to a long range of rocks that goes towards the island, at the end of which is a passage where the shallows go through, let them go in there and follow the ledge of rocks right back again, then they will land right against the east gate on a point [rochefort point], and as there are some houses there, it will hinder their being seen, but one boat ought to go first & surprise the people in those houses a little time before the others come up. Each whale boat must have two ladders in them of fifteen foot long which may be put in the middle of the boat without hindrance to the men; but the boatmen must lay still at this point till they think the main body is got near the town, & that a party of as many men as shall be judged proper shall be ready to attack the grand battery, its necessary it should be low water if no drift ice aground along the shore.

The remainder of the men are to go round the pickets by the north gate [porte frédéric], and when they get round with ladders of 15 feet long, they can scale the wall facing the harbour which is a quarter of a mile round, and it will be absolutely necessary to appoint a time to strike the blow all at once, which can be done by agreeing upon a certain hour just before day, which is the sleepiest time, and the commanding officer of each detachment to know the time, and when the time comes by his watch to begin without further ceremony; the enemy finding themselves attacked at so many different places at once its probable it will breed such confusion among them that our men will have time to get in unmolested; & it is to be observed that as the men march from the above point the low wall is on the left hand of the gate, and the pickets on the right hand; as all the enemy's troops are in the citadel except a small guard or two it will be a considerable time before the men are drest & got ready to march out, and even then it is quite in the other end of the town.

This is what probably may succeed, but least any accident should happen to prevent it, it will be necessary to provide accordingly & in case our people should be discovered & repuls'd the above number of men being sufficient to command the field, it will be necessary in order to reduce the place to have what shipping can possibly be got to cruise off the harbour's mouth in order to intercept their provision vessels which they expect early being at this time very short of provisions, as likewise to take any transports with men if any should come, and that our men may not be discourag'd at being repuls'd once, it will be necessary to send 12 nine pounders & two small mortars with shells, &c. and a quantity of provisions; so to bombard them & endeavor to make breaches in their walls & then storm them; and should the shipping be so lucky to take their provisions and the land forces take all their cattle & keep them constantly employed, it will be impossible for them to hold the place till the last of July for want of provisions.

In order the better to secure the retreat in case a superior naval force to ours should come from France & drive ours off the coast, it will be necessary to have two small vessels with about two hundred men at canso, & the day after the fleet is sail'd for louisbourg for them to sail so as to get in by night, and it being but six leagues from canso to st. peters they can get there before day & surprise that place, which is an exceeding good harbour for small vessels, but has not water sufficient for vessels of that size which will be able to drive ours off the coast, so that the vessels for the retreat will lay there safe, and the troops be able to go to them by land; there will be an advantage beside this in surprising this place as there is always a number of indians with their families which keep with the french priest at a small distance from the french inhabitants, and the booty taken there will pay the expense & more in taking it. It is to be observed that during the time our troops lay siege to the town, it will be in their power to send parties and destroy all their fishery on the island as well as the north side of the harbour which would ruin their fishery for four or five years; and as it is impossible to fail of taking the royal battery at least, that would in a great measure lay open their harbour exposed unto an attack by sea from england, as the new batteries in the town in the greatest part of the ambro-
ziers, there are no guns & there are two gates that are made in Diamond fashion facing the Harbour that can be beat down in an instant the pieces not being but two Inches and an half thick.

N.B. The full complement of the Troops is 700 out of which deductions must be made of 50 for each of the two Batteries, viz. the Royal & Island Batteries, and 50 for Death, sickness &c. which reduce them to 550, and the other fighting men in the town do not exceed 300, and that the Swiss Troops which are their best Troops are exceeding Discontented and mutinous; also that at St. Peters there may be about 200 men in scatter’d houses, and in the suburbs of the Town of Louisbourg without the Walls about 200. it is improbable that more than two 30 or 40 Gun ships should come with Mr. Duvivier who may be expected the first with Recruits and supplies, and in case the naval Force, that our 3000 men would command the Field, and continue so till they could be protected and Reinforc’d from England.

Endorsed: Governour Shirley’s letter and scheme dated 29th January 1744 [O.S.]

Appendix C. “Instructions given by William Shirley, Governour of Massachusetts, to William Pepperell, Lieutenant General of the forces raised in New-England, for an expedition against the French settlements on the Island of Cape Breton.”

SIR

The officers and men, intended for the expedition against the French settlements on Cape Breton, under your command, being embarked, and the necessary artillery, ammunition, arms, provi­sion, &c. shipped for that purpose; you are hereby directed to repair on board the snow Shirley Galley, Captain John Rouse command­er, and by virtue of the commission you have received from me, take upon you the command of all and every the ships and other vessels, whether transports or cruizers of this and the neighbouring provinces that are appointed for this service; and of all the troops raised for the same service, by this or any other of the neighbouring governments; and to proceed with the said vessels and forces, wind and weather permitting, to Canso, which place it is absolutely necessary should be appointed a rendez­vous for the fleet. On your arrival there, you are to order two com­panies, consisting of forty men each with their proper officers, on shore, to take possession of the place and keep it; appointing one of the two Captains commandant of the whole; which party is to have orders, without delay to land and erect a block house frame, on the hill of Canso, where the old one stood, and hoist English colours upon it; enclosing it with pickets and pallisadoes, so that the sides of the square may extend about one hundred feet, for which it is presumed there are garden pickets enough there left standing. This party is also to plant there eight nine pounders, for the security of the harbour; and build a sod battery, where it shall be judged most convenient; keeping the stores, &c. in the block house, or some shed, or other conveniency, built for that purpose, within the pickets: And must have necessary tools left with them; as also a carpenter or two, and a mason, if none among themselves, to build a shimney and other conveniences. An Cap­tain Donahew and Captain Becket, with their vessels, to attend them; who are to have directions, to follow from time to time the commandant’s orders, unless countermanded by yourself, after they have been, with an additional party of two hundred men more, and the transports they are on board of, to St. Peter’s, on the island of Cape Breton, and destroyed that settlement in which place you will be pleased to note, for your government, there are about two hundred inhabitants, and a number of Indians, all in straggling houses, without any regular defence: which additional party, having completed your orders, at St. Peter’s, are to follow and join the fleet at Chappeaurouge [Gabarus] bay, to which
place you are to proceed, with the fleet from Canso, in order to attack the town of Louisbourg, which is has been thought may be surprized, if they have no advice of your coming. To prevent which, Captain Donahew and Captain Becket are gone before you, to cruize from Cape Canso to Whitehead and thereabouts; that no shallop or other vessel, either fishing or fowling, may be on that coast, to discover the approach of your fleet, and escape with intelligence; and if you have good reason to think you are hitherto undiscovered, and you prosecute the design of surprize; to effect it, your proceedings from Canso must be such as to time your arrival at Chappeaurouge bay, about nine of the clock in the evening, or sooner, or later, as you can best rely on the wind, weather, and darkness of the night; taking care, that the fleet be sure of their distance eastward, and at the same time far enough in the offing, to prevent their being seen from the town in the day time; and in the evening they are to push into the bay, as far at least as to be able to land at a cove called Anse du Point Plat, or Flat Point Cove; in four separate divisions; each division if possible together, to prevent disorder; and as soon as the transports are at an anchor, the troops who must be ready with their accouterments, are to be immediately, by the whale boats, landed in the best manner that the necessary haste can allow; so as to keep the four detachments each together, in a separate corps; who are to be marched on as soon as may be in this manner. — Three divisions, consisting two of six hundred men each, and one of four hundred men, are to march as near as they can guess, to the back of a range of hills, about west from the town, about one mile and a half; and here the two detachments of six hundred each are to halt, and keep a profound silence; while the other detachment of four hundred men pursue their march, following the range and under cover of the said hills, round to the north west and north, &c. till they come to the back of the grand battery; where they are also to halt, till a signal agreed on be given, for them to march immediately to the said battery, and attack it; at which signal the other two parties are to march on, as fast as they can, towards the west gate of the town; till they come up to the houses, and then one party is to proceed without regard to the houses, to the said gate, and attack there; while the other marches on to a hill, about south west from the town wall (securing such of the inhabitants as will fly that way from the houses when they find our party betwixt them and the gate) and there post themselves behind said hill, to secure, if need be, the retreat of the attacking party. In the interim, the fourth party proposed is to consist of six hundred men, who are in the whale boats, to be landed at a point of land, called Point Blanche or White Point; from thence they are to proceed along shore, till they come to the low wall of the town, that is close into the sea on the south easterly part of the town, which if possible should be first attempted. Here this party are to scale the wall, and enter the town if possible; proceeding as fast as can be towards the citadel; securing a guard house, between them and the citadel guard house, and so on to the citadel guard house; and here if the enemy’s troops are not drawn out, they are to secure the avenue from the citadel, by placing themselves on the glacis, on each side; securing the windows of the Governour’s apartments, that open on the ramparts, at the south east end of the citadel; while a party goes to the west gate guard, and secures that; which done, the wicket at least, if not the gate, must be got open, for the party posted there to enter. If they fail of their attempt in scaling at that place, which they are to endeavour by getting round the works at the west gate, by the water’s edge, to the [quay] wall on the north side of the city, fronting the harbour; where they are to scale as nigh the guard house battery, as possible; to prevent annoyance from the north east [Maurepas] bastion, who by firing on our men there will endanger their own guard and gate. Here, if they enter, they are to secure the guard, and open the wicket or gate; and give signal of their success, so far, to the party marching on towards the hill, and proceed towards the citadel, &c. as before directed, to the other party. The difficulty here will be, in getting round a number of pickets, or over, or through them, which run from the angle of the work, into the harbour, and may be cut down with ease, if low water; or hauled down by main strength, with such grapplings and hooks as are sent for that purpose; and if either of these parties are lucky enough to get into the town; it may be secured; but if they both fail, they are to retreat to the back of the hill, where the other party is posted to cover and receive them.

The attack at the grand [Royal] battery you must order, Sir, to be, by entering at a low part of the wall, that is unfinished at the east end; for which fascines and ladders are sent on purpose, though they may perhaps not be wanted; as also longer ladders for scaling the dead wall, or back of the barracks of said battery, if occasion; which must be transported by the party, ordered on the attack, as the necessary ladders for scaling, &c. must be by the other two parties. For your government here be pleased to note there are in this battery a Captain and fifty men at least.

If you attempt this surprise, you must by all means secure the out inhabitants in the suburbs, from reinforcing the city (women and children excepted, who may be all sent in, if the enemy will receive them) whether the attempt to surprize be successful or not; and if it is not, you must then secure the troops in the best manner the ground will admit of, till you can get the artillery, bombs, &c. transported from Chappeaurouge bay to the army: to
expedite which, as much force as can be spared must be there left to secure the landing of what is necessary, and assist the officers, &c. of the train of artillery, and an immediate reinforcement sent them from the main body, as soon as you give up the surprise of the town, that you may be the sooner enabled to annoy the enemy’s works, &c.

If the situation of affairs be such, that intelligence or discovery influence you not to attempt the surprise; and you find the enemy alarmed; you will doubtless think it necessary, to prevent any accident before the troops are landed, to send out a proper number of scouts; who, if they discover any ambuscade, or preparation to receive you, must give you due notice thereof, either by signals or by not returning; which will have its due weight with you; and if there be no opposition in landing, it will be best, for order sake, to land the men, regiment by regiment; who may be formed and drawn up into order, at proper distances, as they land, till the whole is completed. But if you should meet with opposition, and the landing be disputed, or difficult, you must then make a false descent, in order to draw off the enemy from the spot, designed for landing, or at least to divide their force; and then, according to the depth of the water, some of the vessels, either by riding broad side to the place, or by bringing a spring on their cables, will cover the landing, both by the execution they may do on the enemy, and the smoke of their powder.

If it be impracticable to think of surprising the town, and you resolve on the surprise of the grand battery; let the party designed for attacking the grand battery be first landed, and next the party to cover them, agreeable to directions for that purpose particularly, which you have with you; and march on to the hill, at the west of the town, before mentioned; where the covering party is to halt, and observe the motion of the enemy; who, if they make a sally from the town, are to be suffered to get so far as that this party then may get between the town and them; and keep them between two fires, and cut off their return; or if no such necessity, may serve as a defence from any sally from the town, towards Chappeaurouge to hinder our landing: In this case the grand battery is to be attacked as before directed, if the night should so favourably concur as to incline you to order an attack of the island battery also, (which would be an affair of the utmost consequence to us to carry) you must let this be attempted by a number of whale boats; who must land a party of three hundred men, on the back of the island; or in a little well known beached cove at the south-easterly point, just within the breaking point of rocks, which runs off; from either of which places, in a very calm time they may enter successfully, and if so, immediately order a bomb, &c. there to play on the town, and garrison the battery, with as many men as you can spare, and will be wanted there to fight the guns, in case any enemy should approach afterwards by sea.

When you have all the troops on shore, the first thing to be observed, is to march on till you can find out and secure a proper spot to encamp them on; which must be as nigh as possible to some convenient brook, or watering place; and as soon as this is done, and the ground marked by the Quarter-Masters, who should have, each, colours to distinguish each regiment, the tents must be pitched, in the usual form and distance, if possible; and at the front of every regiment, a guard with tents, which is called the quarter guard, and mounts in the morning, as the picket guard turns out at sun set and lays on their arms. The captains of the artillery and Commissaries of provisions, must be supposed to be all this time employed, in getting ready to land what is under their charge, or such part as they have your orders for; which must be, first of all, the field pieces, by help of gin triangles and other necessary purchases, which they have with them; the co-horn mortars and their appertunances, to keep the enemy off, and prevent their reconnoitering your camp near. And when you are settled in your camp, the first thing that will naturally offer itself to the consideration of you and your council, will be on what operation, or design to proceed, and the proper steps to accomplish it; and as at this time your enemy will be on their guard, if the grand battery be not already taken, that must at all hazards be now effected; and when so, you will be soon able to judge if it be tenable, by a party of our men’s being secure there or not; and if the guns from the town render our men’s holding impracticable, and the men are not safe there, you must order what immediate damage can be done with it, to be effected, by firing on the town, and island battery, as long as may be; and then demolish the back of it, that at least we may have at times, these guns, to command the entry of the harbour, open to a party posted on the back of the hill, behind it, out of reach from the town, so as to give them occasionally some diversion; or else, if it cannot be kept in one shape or the other servicable to you, demolish the whole; burning the carriages, nailing up the guns, and knocking off the trunnions, &c. But as this battery will be of infinite service, in case it can be held, keep it as long as possible. Your destroying their fishing vessels, houses, stages, flakes, &c. (N.B. These last may serve for fascines, if wanted, and therefore should not be burned immediately) must require your next attention. In doing which, you must take care to keep your flying parties as well covered as possible, or as the nature of their enterprises for this effect may require; and as this will throw into your hands some prisoners, from whom you may possibly gather some information, to be relied on (although you must in this case, use all necessary caution)
this may lead you to undertake things of greater consequence so as to block up the town by land. In order to which it will be absolutely necessary to bring your camp as near the besieged as you can, without exposing it to their random shot; the consequences of which you will be able to judge of in your approaches. And it is the general opinion, the hill before the west gate will be the best place to fix on; but then let it be so far at least beyond the hill, as not to let the besieged know the particular spot. About south-west from the citadel bastion, a large half mile distance, is a rocky hill, which in attacking of the town, may be of great service, by covering a number of our men, and planting some cannon there, on the top; in such manner as when you are on the spot, you may judge most advantageous; when you may keep the bombardiers, &c. continually employed, endeavouring principally, to demolish their magazine, citadel, walls &c. which are objects sufficiently in view. But by all means you are to forbid any approaches between the wall of the city and that hill, as the glacis that lies there before the works is to be blown up; but if you can, under cover of the houses, rubbish, &c. get a small battery to play on the west gate, you may hope for success; as the wall there is weak, and a breach may be made, of which when you come to view the place, you will better judge of its practicableness and consequence.

As it is not doubted but that the party which goes to St. Peter’s will be successful, you may rely on it, that a number of French and Indians, as many at least as escape here, will fly towards Louisbourg for shelter; for whom you will be pleased to order a good look out, by all parties abroad, as well as for a number of inhabitants and soldiers, who it is reasonable to expect are in the woods, cutting timber, palisadoes, &c. to the north-west of the grand battery.

When the transports are discharged at Chappeaurouge bay, at which place it will be proper to detain them as long as they can lay in safety; and it is necessary for them to put out of the bay, they must have your orders to repair to Canso; there to lay in the pond for your farther commands; and there they must be under inspection of a cruizer, who must cruize in such manner, as to be sometimes off the harbour of Louisbourg, with the others; and as the wind will permit, go there and look at them.

As it will be of the utmost consequence that I should be advised of your proceedings, and the situation of your camp, you must employ three or four of the best going transports, in running backwards and forwards calling upon the commanding officer of Canso, for his intelligence also; ordering the masters of said advice boats or packets from time to time, on arrival here, to stop at the castle, and forward his packets to me, by the castle boat; and keep himself ready to depart again, as soon as he has his dis-patches from hence, for you; which I shall take care to have sent him, without loss of time. By this means, you will have it in your power to let me know what materials, ammunition, &c. you may have occasion for, more than you have with you; and the troops will remain the better satisfied, when they are sensible their situation is known here. Suitable men for this packet service will be captain Joseph Smith, captain Michael Hodge, and captain Moses Bennett, with such other as you may think best.

Whether the transports quit Chappeaurouge bay or not, let them have your positive orders to refit all their empty water casks; and if they do, and go to Canso, to assist in carrying on the works there, always holding themselves in readiness to sail as soon as your orders reach them.

Immediately on your arrival at Chappeaurouge bay, and have a transport discharged, send her away express to St. John’s in Newfoundland, with my packets for the captains of men of war, that may be on that station; and as soon as the grand battery is taken, order an express here, with the news, and if you are likely to succeed, send another with an express to England; directing your packet to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle; ordering the master to call upon Christopher Kilby, Esq. agent for the Province, with it, as soon as he arrives in London; and in case of Mr. Kilby’s absence, let him go directly to the Duke of Newcastle’s office.

As to what prisoners you take at Louisbourg, &c. you must forward them up here, in the best manner you can, as soon as may be, that they may not be an unnecessary trouble to you, as well as to keep what provisions you have for the troops only.

On all emergencies it will be necessary for you to convene a council of war; and most expedient to act agreeably to their advice; and this council is to consist of yourself (as President) and the other general officers, the colonels of the several regiments, their lieutenant colonels, and the captain of the train of artillery, under your command, five of whom to make a quorum of said council. A register to be kept by your secretary of all the proceedings of such councils of war.

Wishing you all success in his Majesty’s service,
I am Sir, your assured friend and servant, W. SHIRLEY.

Boston, March 19, 1744–5 [O.S.]
To the Hon. William Pepperell, Esq.
Lieutenant-General of the forces raised in this and the neighbouring governments, for the expedition against the French settlements on Cape Breton.
Appendix D. Terms for the Surrender of Louisbourg, June 27, 1745.

A
Camp before Louisbourg, June 16, 1745 [O.S.]

SIR
We have before us yours of this date together with the several articles of capitulation on which you have proposed to surrender the town & fortifications of Louisbourg with the territories adjacent under your government to his Britannic Majesty's obedience to be delivered up to his said Majesty's Forces now besieging said place under our command which articles we can by no means concede to but as we are desirous to treat you in a generous manner, we again make you an offer of the terms of surrender proposed by us in our summons sent you 7th May last, and do further consent to allow and promise you the following articles, viz:.

First that if your own vessels shall be found insufficient for the transportation of your persons and proposed Effects to France, we will provide such a further number of vessels as may be sufficient for that purpose, also any provisions for the voyage that you cannot furnish yourselves with

Secondly that all the commissioned officers belonging to the garrison and the inhabitants of the town may remain in their houses with their families and enjoy the free exercise of their religion and no person shall be suffered to misuse or molest any of them till such time as they can be conveniently transported to France

Thirdly that the non-commissioned officers and soldiers shall immediately upon the surrender of the town and fortresses be sent on board some of his Britannic Majestys ships till they can also be transported to France

Fourthly That all your sick & wounded shall be taken tender care of in the same manner with our own

Fifth That the commander in chief now in the garrison shall have liberty to send off two covered wagons to be inspected only by one officers of our that no warlike stores may be contained therein.

Sixth That if there are any persons in the town or garrison which you shall desire may not be seen by us, they shall be permitted to go off masked.

The above we do consent to & promise upon your compliance with the following conditions, viz –
First That if said surrender & due performance of every part of aforesaid premises be made & completed as soon as possible

Second That as a security for the punctual performance of the same the Island Battery or one of the Batteries of the town shall be delivered with all the artillery & warlike stores thereunto belonging into the possession of his Britannic Majestys troops at six o'clock this afternoon.

Third that his Britannic Majestys ships of war now lying before the port shall be permitted to enter the harbour of Louisbourg without any molestation as soon after six o'clock this afternoon as the commander in chief of the ships shall think fit.

Fourth That none of the officers, soldiers nor inhabitants in Louisbourg who are subjects of the French king shall take up arms against his Britannic Majesty nor any of his allies until after the expiration of the full term of 12 months from this time.

Fifth That all subjects of his Britannic Majesty who are now prisoner with you shall be immediately delivered up to us; in case of your non-compliance with these conditions, we decline any further treaty with you on the affairs & shall decide the matter by our arms.

W. Pepperrell
P. Warren
Mons Du Chambon

B
Camp before Louisbourg, June 16, 1745 [O.S.]

SIR
I have yours by an hostage signifying your consent to the surrender of the town & fortresses of Louisbourg & territories adjacent, &c. on the terms this day proposed to you by Commodore Warren & myself excepting only that you desire that your troops may march out of the garrison with their arms and colours – to be them delivered into our custody till said troops arrival in France at which time to have them returned to them which I consent to & send you an hostage for the performance of what we have promised & have sent to Commodore Warren that if he consents to it also he should send a detachment on shore to take possession of the Island Battery.

Wm Pepperrell
Mons Du Chambon
Endnotes

Preface
1 With regard to dating, throughout the text New Style dates are used even though England and the American Colonies did not adopt the Gregorian calendar until 1752.

Background
2 Timber in this context refers to charpente construction. “Picquet” or piquet buildings were constructed of vertical posts set side by side and placed in the ground or on wooden sills.

2 For a detailed discussion of the establishment and early history of Louisbourg, see John Stewart McLennan, Louisbourg From Its Foundation to Its Fall, 1713–1758 (London: Macmillan, 1918), pp. 1–127. Walter L. Dorn, Competition for Empire, 1740–1763 (New York: Harper and Bros., 1940), p. 165, writes that “Louisbourg, more useful as a naval base than as a fortress... was admirably placed for raids on the American coastal trade, but its great importance lay in the fact that it stood at the gate of the St. Lawrence, the natural highway into the heart of Canada.” Gerald S. Graham, Empire of the North Atlantic: The Maritime Struggle for North America (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1950), p. 116, says Louisbourg promised to be “a natural base for the protection of the profitable French fisheries, a distributing centre to rival New England’s Boston, and a springboard for the oft-dreamed recovery of Nova Scotia.”


9 John Stewart McLennan, op. cit. p. 133.


18 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 2.


28 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 2–3; Seth Pomeroy, op. cit., p. 15.
29 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 6.
30 Ibid., p. 185.
32 Ibid., Series 6, Vol. 10, p. 4.

Preliminaries
1 William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 149; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 68, 75, 112; William Pepperrell and others, op. cit., p. 10; PAC, MG1, Depot des Fortifications des Colonies (hereafter cited as DFC), Ordre 216, fol. 5(v), "Rapport de Girard La Croix."
3 William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 149; a contemporary map of the Gabarus Bay area found in the Louisbourg project archives shows the transports at anchor between Freshwater Cove and Flat Point.
4 MHSC, Series 5, Vol. 2 (1833), p. 126, Dr. Jeremy Belknap to Ebenezer Hazard, 10 May 1782; Herbert Richardson, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 211. Shirley himself seems to have had reservations about the efficacy of his instructions, and in a subsequent letter to Pepperrell authorized the general to act according to his own discretion in an emergency. See MHSC, Series 1, Vol. 1 (1806), p. 13, Shirley to Pepperrell, 22 March 1744–45 (O.S.).
6 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 272, "Duchambon au Ministre."
7 PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot, "Relation du Siège de Louisbourg," 1745.
8 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols., 272–4(v), "Duchambon au Ministre."
9 George M. Wrong, op. cit., pp. 11–12; PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 273(v), 274(v)–5, "Duchambon au Ministre."
11 George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 31; PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 293, "Duchambon au Ministre"; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot "Relation du Siège de Louisbourg," 1745.
12 John Stewart McLennan, op. cit., pp. 116, 123, 148; George M. Wrong, op. cit., pp. 21–2, 33; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot, "Relation du Siège de Louisbourg," 1745; "When we received the first intelligence of the preparations making in Boston last Spring, we were informed by our spies that the [provincial] fleet was intended, in the first place for Louisbourg, and that the English would come next to Quebec. We had the more cause to apprehend this, as according to what Messrs. du Chambon and Bigot had written us on the 13th of April respecting the disorders among the garrison of Isle Royale, that place was, through the defection of the troops, untenable." Edmund B. O'Callaghan, ed., Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York (Albany: Weed, Parsons, 1853–87), Vol. 10, p. 15, de Beauharnois and Hocquart to Maurepas, 12 September 1745.
13 George M. Wrong, op. cit., pp. 32, 35.
14 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 275(v)–6, "Duchambon au Ministre"; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot "Relation du Siège de Louisbourg," 1745; ibid., Ordre 216, fol. 5, "Rapport de Girard La Croix."
15 William Shirley, "Instructions," pp. 6 and 7; MHSC, Series 6, Vol. 10 (1899), p. 4; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 68.
17 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 84.
19 PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 216, fol. 5, "Rapport de Girard La Croix."
20 While there is no explicit written evidence to substantiate this view, it is unlikely that all the troops went ashore only at Freshwater Cove; the cove is too small to accommodate that many men. A contemporary French map of the Louisbourg-Gabarus Bay area, however, does indicate that the provincials came ashore at several places between the cove and Flat Point (see Figs. 5, 7, and 8).
21 William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 149; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 112; William Shirley, Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 274, Shirley to Newcastle, 28 October 1745 (O.S.).
22 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 10 and 11; PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 276(v)–7, "Duchambon au Ministre."
23 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 276(v); Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 75; John Stewart McLennan, op. cit., Appendix I, pp. 362–3. "Many that was there..." [at the northeast harbour] was much blamed for destroying so much of what we had got in possession and I think very
justly – for I can’t suppose they had any prospect of doing good there­by, altho wee generally thou’t afterwards it was a means of the French’s deserting the Grand Battery and if so, was to us gain”;
Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 11.

24 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 276(v)–7, “Duchambon au Ministre.”
25 This was not true of Francis Parkman, who did understand the se­quence of events. (See Francis Parkman, A Half-Century of Conflict [Boston: Little, Brown, 1903], Vol. 2, p. 100.) It has been suggested that William Wood, The Great Fortress: A Chronicle of Louisbourg, 1720–1760 (Toronto: Glasgow, Brook, 1915), is the source of the mis­understanding, but this is not necessarily the case. Wood certainly failed to grasp the actual sequence of events and contributed little to clear up the matter. He claimed that the smoke of the burning houses in the northeast harbour drifting over the Royal Battery precipitated its abandonment. Wood, however, merely repeats an account that appeared in the February, 1864, issue of Harper’s New Monthly Magazine, p. 358. The possible source of the misinterpretation of the sequence of events can be traced to “A poetical essay on the reduc­tion of Cape Breton . . . 1745,” appearing in the April 1746 issue of Gentlemen’s Magazine, p. 214, n.(m).

29 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 418, Duchambon to Thierry, 11 May 1745; ibid., fols. 277(v), 281(v), “Duchambon au Ministre”; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 216, fol. 6(v), “Rapport de Girard La Croix.”
30 Ibid., fols. 6(v)–7; George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 40; PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 277(v)–8, “Duchambon au Ministre.”
31 George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 39.
33 Roger Wolcott, op. cit., p. 150; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 10.
34 William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 149; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 11.
36 See Figs. 5 and 6.
37 William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 150.
38 Benjamin Cleaves, op. cit., p. 117; Francis Parkman wrote that “Those [regiments] on the east [of Flat Point Brook], in some cases, saw fit to extend themselves towards Louisbourg as far as the edge of the inter­vening marsh, but were soon forced back to a safer position by the cannon-balls of the fortress.” (Francis Parkman, A Half-Century of Conflict, [Boston: Little, Brown, 1903], Vol. 2, p. 103.)
40 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 175.
43 Contemporary written evidence does not indicate which regiments encamped at Flat Point during the siege. Contemporary maps, however, indicate that these five regiments were located there. (See plans 1745–5, 1757–12 [Fig. 6] and 1745–1 [Figs. 5, 7, and 8], Fortress of Louisbourg archives.) Written sources do indicate the locations of the remaining four regiments, and provide some basis for accepting this cartographic evidence until further documentation is found.
44 PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot “Relation du Siège de Louisbourg,” 1745.
45 PAC, MG1, C11C, Vol. 16, pp. 26 ff, “Duchambon au Ministre,” 23 September 1745; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 216, fol. 5(v)–6, “Rapport de Girard La Croix.”
47 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 305–305(v), Duchambon to Marin, 16 May 1745; ibid., fols. 419–419(v); ibid., fols. 279–80, “Duchambon au Ministre.”
50 Daniel Giddings, “Journal Kept by Daniel Giddings . . . during the Expedition Against Cape Breton in 1744–45.” Historical Collections of the Essex Institute, Vol. 48, No. 4 (October 1912), p. 298.
52 Ibid., p. 363; William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 150; see also Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 11–2, 69, 75.
56 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 18; MHSC, Series 6, Vol. 10 (1899), pp. 139–40, Waldo to Pepperrell, 3 May 1745 (O.S.); PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 216, fol. 8, “Rapport de Girard La Croix.”
The Siege

1 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 56; William Shirley, "Instructions," p. 10.
3 James Gibson, op. cit., p. 13; PAC, MG11, PRO, CO5, Vol. 900, fols. 183–5, Pepperrell to Shirley, 12 May 1745 (O.S.), as found in John Humphreys, op. cit., p. 78; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 12.
6 MHSC, Series 6, Vol. 10 (1899), p. 194, Waldo to Pepperrell, 20 May 1745 (O.S.); ibid, pp. 141–5, Waldo to Pepperrell, 3 May 1745 (O.S.); ibid., pp. 157–9, Waldo to Pepperrell, 8 May 1745 (O.S.); ibid., pp. 166–8, Waldo to Pepperrell, 13 May 1745 (O.S.); ibid., pp. 190–1, Waldo to Pepperrell, 20 May 1745 (O.S.).
7 For a more detailed discussion of these functions, see John Humphreys, op. cit.
8 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 280(v)–1, "Duchambon au Minstre"; William Pepperrell and others, op. cit., p. 14; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot, "Relation du Siège de Louisbourg." 1745.
9 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 281, "Duchambon au Minstre"; William Pepperrell and others, op. cit., p. 16.
10 Ibid., pp. 14–5. See also Roger Wolcott, op. cit., p. 151.
testimonial of Captain Daniel Woaster, 28 October 1745 (O.S.), in ibid., p. 367, further states that Vaughan "was the Director of the advance Trenches & most indefatigable in Duty with common Soldiers almost Day & Night."

12 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 281(v)–2, "Duchambon au Ministre"; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot, "Relation du Siége de Louisbourg," 1745.

13 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 282–282(v), "Duchambon au Ministre."

14 Ibid., fol. 282, William Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 56.

15 William Pepperrell and others, op. cit., p. 18; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 19 and 56.


20 William Pepperrell and others, op. cit., p. 19; PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 286(v), "Duchambon au Ministre."

21 Ibid., fol. 287(v); William Pepperrell, op. cit., pp. 156–7.


26 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 291, "Duchambon au Ministre."

27 PAC, MG1, C11B, Vol. 12, fols. 191, 193(v).

28 MHSC, Series 1, Vol. 1 (1806), p. 52; Pepperrell to Shirley, 4 July 1745 (O.S.); ibid., p. 46; Pepperrell to Shirley, 18 June 1745 (O.S.); the habitant believed that "More than three thousand five hundred [shots] must have been fired against us" (George M. Wrong, ed., op. cit., p. 68); Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 120; PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 291(v)–292(v), "Duchambon au Ministre"; Roger Wolcott, op. cit., pp. 152–3.


30 James Gibson, op. cit., p. 30. Bigot (PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218) reported that the following foodstuffs remained in storehouses at the end of the siege: 2,500 cwt. of flour, 200 cwt. of bread, 300 cwt. of bacon, 500 cwt. of vegetables, 300 barrels of molasses, 100 or more barrels of wine. These were possibly consigned goods left locked up to protect some merchant(s)’s interest, and therefore not meant to be used.

31 Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 19, 196; Warren to Pepperrell, 20 May 1745 (O.S.); George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 47; PAC, MG1, C11B, Vol. 82, pp. 111, 131; William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 153; James Gibson, op. cit., pp. 14, 18; William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Mich., Louisbourg Siege, 1745, Papers, W. Waldron to Richard Waldron, 7 June 1745 (O.S.). In the night of 24 May the New Englanders caulked up a French schooner that had sunk in the harbour the previous year, filled it with combustibles, set them on fire, and sent the schooner across the water between the Island Battery and the town in an attempt to destroy the French snow. The schooner was sunk by French cannon fire before it reached the snow. (PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 282(v), "Duchambon au Ministre"; James Gibson, op. cit., pp. 14–5.)

32 George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 46; John Stewart McLennan, op. cit., Appendix A, p. 177.

33 Ibid., pp. 156, 177–8.


35 George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 48.

36 Ibid., p. 49.

37 Ibid., p. 48.

38 Ibid., p. 30; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot, "Relation du Siége de Louisbourg," 1745; Roger Wolcott, op. cit., p. 152.


43 James Gibson, op. cit., p. 20; MHSC, Series 1, Vol. 8, p. 121, Waldo to Noble, 23 May 1745 (O.S.); ibid., Series 6, Vol. 10 (1899), pp. 20–1, Council of War, 24 May 1745 (O.S.); Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 77.

44 Ibid., p. 21; James Gibson, op. cit., p. 20; Seth Pomeroy, op. cit., p. 27; MHSC, Series 6, Vol. 10 (1899), pp. 20–1.

45 Ibid., p. 21; William Shirley, Correspondence, Vol. 1, pp. 277–8, Shirley to Newcastle, 28 October 1745 (O.S.); William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 158; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 58; John Stewart McLennan, op. cit., p. 158; Seth Pomeroy, op. cit., p. 28.


47 William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 159; Seth Pomeroy, op. cit., p. 28; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 21–2.


50 George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 51; PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 288, "Duchambon au Ministre."


54 Ibid., p. 35, Pepperrell to Warren, 28 May 1745 (O.S.). See also John Stewart McLennan, op. cit., p. 160.

55 Ibid., p. 41.


57 Ibid., p. 38; William Pepperrell and others, op. cit., pp. 22–3; Roger Wolcott, op. cit., pp. 132, 152.


62 James Gibson, op. cit., pp. 32–3; William Pepperrell, op. cit., p. 164; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., pp. 25–6, 60, 72, 78–9; Seth Pomeroy, op. cit., p. 35.


65 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 317–8, 321–2; ibid., fols. 293(v)–4, “Duchambon au Ministre.”


67 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fol. 294, “Duchambon au Ministre”; Louis Effingham de Forest, op. cit., p. 60; Roger Wolcott, op. cit., p. 139.


70 PAC, MG1, F3, Vol. 50, fols. 294(v)–5, “Duchambon au Ministre.”

71 MHSC, Series 1, Vol. 1 (1806), p. 45, Pepperrell to Duchambon, 17 June 1745 (O.S.); William Pepperrell and others, op. cit., p. 4.

72 James Gibson, op. cit., p. 36.

73 Dudley Bradstreet, op. cit., p. 435; James Gibson, op. cit., p. 36; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 216, fol. 22, “Rapport de Girard La Croix.”

74 James Gibson, op. cit., p. 36; George M. Wrong, op. cit., p. 65; PAC, MG1, DFC, Ordre 218, Bigot, “Relation du Siège de Louisbourg,” 1745.


Appendix B

Appendix C
1 MHSC, Series 1, Vol. 1 (1806), pp. 5–11.

Appendix D
1 William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Mich., Louisbourg Siege, 1745, Papers. The more obvious spelling errors and word abbreviations, as copied by W. Waldron, have been corrected.
Bibliography

American Historical Register
"A Registry of Commissions in the Army under the Command of the Hon.
William Pepperrell, Esq., for an Expedition Against the French Settlements
on Cape Breton." In The American Historical Register and Monthly Ga­
zette of the Historical, Military and Patriotic-hereditary Societies of the

Bartlett, John Russell, ed.
Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in
New England. A.C. Greene and Brothers, State Printers, Providence,

Bidwell, Adonijah
"Expedition to Cape Breton: Journal of Rev. Adonijah Bidwell."
New-England Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. 27 (1873), pp.

Bouton, Nathaniel, ed.
Documents and Records Relating to the Province of New Hampshire from
1738 to 1749. Orren C. Moore, State Printer, Nashua, 1871. Vol. 5, Pro­
vincial Papers.

Bradstreet, Dudley
"Dudley Bradstreet Diary." Massachusetts Historical Society,

Burrage, Henry Sweetser

Canada. Public Archives.
Report on Canadian Archives, 1886. Queen’s Printer, Ottawa, 1887.

Canada. Public Archives. Manuscript Division.
MG1, C1'B, Correspondance Générale, Ile Royale
MG1, C1'C, Vol. 12, Ile Royale, 1714–1757; Vol. 16, Ile Royale, Ile Saint-
Jean, 1696–1771
MG1, F3, Vol. 50, Ile Royale, 1686–1666
MG1, Dépot des Fortifications des Colonies, Ordre 216, “Rapport de Gir­
ard La Croix”; Ordre 218, Bigot, “Relation du Siège de Louisbourg.”
1745
MG11, PRO, CO5, Vols. 5, 900
MG12, Admiralty Records

Chapin, Howard Millar
"New England Vessels in the Expedition against Louisbourg, 1745."
New-England Historical and Genealogical Register, reprint ed., Vol. 77
(January–April 1923). Boston.

Cleaves, Benjamin
"Benjamin Cleaves’s Journal of the Expedition to Louisbourg, 1745."

Colden, Cadwallader
"Cadwallader Colden Papers." New-York Historical Society, Collections,

Colony of Connecticut
Hartford.

Crowley, Terence
"A French Colonial Administration at Louisbourg. 1713–1758: An
Introduction." Manuscript on file, National Historic Parks and Sites
Branch, Parks Canada, Louisbourg, 1969.

Curwen, Samuel
Journals and Letters of the Late Samuel Curwen. Ed. George Atkinson

de Forest, Louis Effingham, ed.

Dictionary of American Biography

Dorn, Walter L.

Douglass, William
A Summary, Historical and Political, of the First Planting, Progressive Im­
provements, and Present State of the British Settlements in North

Dunn, Brenda
"Block 2, Lot G, Property of the Commissaire Ordonnateur." Manuscript
on file, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Louis­
bourg, 1969.

Durand, Nicole
"Etude de la population de Louisbourg, 1713–1745." Manuscript on file,
National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Louisbourg,
1970.

Emerson, Joseph
"Diary of Rev. Joseph Emerson." Massachusetts Historical Society,

Fairchild, Byron
Messrs. William Pepperrell: Merchants of Piscataqua. Cornell University

Fortier, John
"Military Studies Number 1: French Flags of the Eighteenth Century
(1660–1780)." Manuscript on file, National Historic Parks and Sites
Branch, Parks Canada, Louisbourg, 1966.

"Military Studies Number II: The French Infantry and its Colors." Manu­script on file, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada,
Louisbourg, 1966.
Foster, Wayne

Francis, Dilys

Franklin, Benjamin

Gentleman's Magazine
1746.

Gibson, James

Giddings, Daniel

Graham, Gerald S.

Harper's Monthly Magazine

Hoad, Linda

Humphreys, John

James, Charles

Labarre, Leonard W.

Larochelle, Johanne

Lavoie, Rodrigue

Law, Jonathan

Laws, A.R.M.
"Outline Record of Various Royal Engineers' Companies." Manuscript on file, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Louisbourg, 1965.

LeGoff, Tim

Massachusetts Historical Society Collections
Series 1, Vol. 1 (1806); Series 5, Vol. 2 (1833); Series 6, Vol. 10 (1899). Boston.

Massachusetts. Secretary of the Commonwealth. Division of Public Records
Court Records

McLennan, John Stewart

Murdoch, Beamish

New-England Historical and Genealogical Register
Vol. 23 (1869), Vol. 25 (1871). Boston.

The Waldron Papers

Vol. 13, Transcripts from Papers of the Massachusetts Government Relating to Nova Scotia between 1745–48

O'Callaghan, Edmund B., ed.

Parkman, Francis
Parsons, Usher

Peckham, Howard H.

Pepperrell, William, Bart.

Pepperrell, William, Bart., and others

Pomeroy, Seth

Rawlyk, George A.

Richmond, Herbert

Rose, Paul

Rutledge, Joseph Lister

Schutz, John A.

Shirley, William


Stanley, George F.G.

Thériault, Yvette

Thibault, H.-Paul

Thullier, H.F.

Wheelwright, Edmund M.

William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Louisbourg Siege, 1745, Papers

Wolcott, Roger

Wood, William Charles Henry

Wrong, George M., ed.
*Louisbourg in 1745: The Anonymous ‘Lettre d’un Habitant de Louisbourg’ (Cape Breton), Containing a Narrative by an Eyewitness of the Siege in 1745.* Warwick Bros. and Rutter, Toronto, 1897.
The Construction and Occupation of the Barracks of the King's Bastion at Louisbourg
by Blaine Adams

Canadian Historic Sites
No. 18

61 Abstract
62 Preface
62 Introduction
66 Chronology of Construction
66 1717–19
67 1720
71 1721
72 1722
72 1723
73 1724
75 1725
80 1726
80 1727
82 1728
82 1729–30
82 1731
84 1732–34
84 1735–39
87 1739–45
88 1745–48
88 1749
89 1750–58
89 1758–68
91 Life in the Barracks
91 Introduction
92 North Half of Barracks
92 North wing (pavillion droit)
93 Soldiers' Barracks
94 Soldier's Furnishings
95 Soldier's Daily Life
98 Soldier's Mutiny
99 Guardrooms and Guard Duties
101 Armoury
101 South Half of Barracks
101 Chapel
102 Chaplain's Room
103 Officer's Quarters
104 Governor's Wing
106 The Governor's Wing During Saint-Ovide's Occupancy
108 The Governor's Wing During de Forant's Occupancy
109 The Governor's Wing During Duquesnel's Occupancy
110 Attics
110 Bedroom
112 Dressing Room
112 Cabinet
112 Wardrobe
113 Office (Serving room)
114 Cook's Room and Linen Armoire
114 Kitchen
114 Chief Steward's Room
114 Garde-Manger (Pantry)
115 Basement
115 Yard During Duquesnel's Occupancy
117 English Occupation: 1745–49
118 French Occupation: 1749–58
121 Appendix A. Yearly salaries and allowances in livres, sols and deniers of selected officials in Louisbourg for 1744.
122 Appendix B. “Etat de l'habillement, munitions de guerre et autre effets qui se sont trouvés dans les magasins du Roy le premier août 1724.”
124 Appendix C. Duquesnel Inventory and Sale.
137 Endnotes
145 Bibliography

Abstract
The first chapter of this study outlines chronologically the mechanics of construction of the barracks of the King’s Bastion at Louisbourg. It is based primarily on plans, work accounts, repair bills and official correspondence. Some plans of the building have never been found, and indeed were missing in the 18th century; in 1752 some fortification and town plans were sought and it was reported that a search of the papers of the late engineer Etienne Verrier revealed nothing.1 The second half of this paper deals with the use of the building, including an analysis of its contents, and with the life of those who occupied the barracks. Unfortunately, the documentation for this section is not as extensive as that for construction; only one of the several inventories that were compiled exists today; few personal correspondence and journals have survived from this period, and there is a paucity of the kind of information required for any exhaustive analysis of day-to-day living.

Submitted for publication July 1971, by Blaine Adams, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada.
Preface

Although a considerable amount of research has been done on the construction and furnishings of the barracks of the King’s Bastion, there has been no adequate over-all survey of the history of the building and its inhabitants. This report, which attempts to provide such a history, is based upon the excellent notes compiled by Yvette Thériault for her report on furnishings. Further research clarified points raised in the notes and filled in gaps not already covered. As is often the case, this in turn led to further studies on related topics. Though not all problems have been solved, a considerable amount of new material has emerged.

I am indebted to my fellow researchers at Louisbourg who shared with me any information they found on the barracks. In particular I made ample use of John Fortier’s notes on English sources, and Charles Lindsay’s work on guardhouses.

Introduction

The barracks of the King’s Bastion was part of the land defence system which stretched across the mouth of the Louisbourg peninsula. This defence consisted of two full bastions and two demi-bastions at either extremity; the barracks spanned the gorge of the King’s Bastion and combined with it to serve as a citadel, a fort within the fortress, from which a last stand could be made should the walls of the city be breached. It was never tested in this regard for when a stand was contemplated during the British siege of 1758, the citadel was in such poor condition from enemy fire that the area around the Princess Demi-bastion in the south end of town was the only area considered defensible if the enemy assaulted.¹

The barracks building was known by many names. In official correspondence it was most often simply called the casernes (barracks) or, in combination with the King’s Bastion, the “citadel.” Sometimes the various parts of the building were referred to by name: the officers’ quarters, the chapel, the governor’s (or government) wing or soldiers’ barracks. The terms fort and chateau were used, though less frequently.²

The building sat on the highest point of land in the peninsula and closed off the King’s Bastion from the town. A dry moat added to its isolation, and the only access to the building was over a drawbridge at the centre which led to the terreplein or courtyard of the King’s Bastion and to the doors leading into the various rooms themselves.

The concept of barracks as housing for the military was relatively new to 18th-century France and its colonies, and the barracks constructed in Louisbourg was one of the few in French North America. The most common method of housing soldiers was billeting in private homes, a method preferred by the soldiers who were thus away from the control of their officers and could lord it over their hosts. To rid themselves of the soldiers, the townspeople often raised money, usually through a consumption tax, to build and maintain barracks for the soldiers. The government rarely built barracks, but had begun the practice of buying or renting empty houses for use as military dwellings, and this remained the most common method for housing troops in 18th-century France.³

The colonial troops were not part of the army but came under the Département de la Marine and were referred to as Troupes de la Marine or Compagnies Franches de la Marine as opposed to the Troupes de la Terre of the army. The Département de la Marine had been subject to various administrative reorganizations in the 17th century and it was not until 1689 that a royal ordinance finally established the organization and procedures to be
The reconstructed King's Bastion barracks. a, south half; b, central passage, armoury and clock tower; c, north half; d, governor’s wing; e, officers’ quarters; f, chapel; g, guardrooms and soldiers’ quarters; h, north wing; i, guardhouse.
followed in this ministry. Another ordinance the following year dealt specifically with the raising and discipline of soldiers on ships, and in 1695 rules were issued for companies serving in Canada. Many aspects of military life in the Marine were not covered by these decrees; nevertheless, in 1720 officials at Louisbourg were rather haughtily informed that the ordinance of 1689 foresaw everything and that it had only to be read and applied to the letter. Ten years later officials were told that, if the Marine ordinances did not apply, the compilation of military regulations, the Code Militaire of 1728, was to be used. In some cases, as in the questions of deaths and inventories, the Marine ordinance of 1689 and the military ordinance of 1731 were both applied to find a solution.5

Where no regulations applied, a pragmatic approach was adopted. Barracks, for example, were not mentioned in the 1689 ordinance, in which it was assumed that soldiers would be billeted in private homes. Yet when the first Louisbourg settlers and soldiers arrived from Newfoundland, which had been lost to France by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, no houses were available. A barracks was the obvious solution to military housing, but there were no rules or specifications outlining what should be included or how one should be built.6 The first contract for works at Louisbourg was a nine-page document outlining what was to be done, but a contract some 18 years later had grown to 24 pages and was much more precise and detailed.8 With few precedents to follow, officials had many difficulties establishing procedures for the construction and occupation of the main barracks in Louisbourg.

Of course, other factors contributed to problems with the barracks during its construction. Despite optimistic first indications, local building materials were not readily available. The first engineer at Louisbourg reported with characteristic overstatement, but also with some element of truth, that firewood was more expensive than the best French wood.9 Difficulties were encountered with masonry: unless the sand was thoroughly washed, the salt from the sea water acted as a corrosive in walls exposed to the weather, and the mortar failed to act as a proper binding agent. Other building materials, slate, stone and brick, were of poor quality or in short supply.

There was also the problem of the short construction season. The chief engineer reported that there were seven months of snow or harsh weather leaving only five months in which building could be carried on. Omitting Sundays and holidays and at least 20 stormy days, this left, he calculated, only 93 days in the year during which there could be effective construction.10

There were constant difficulties in obtaining qualified and competent craftsmen. Engineers spoke of the carelessness, laziness and indolence of workers paid by the day,11 and a new contractor, in 1726, complained of the lack of skilled workmen for the elaborate woodwork in the chapel.12 There were lamentations that the men who came to Louisbourg were not good physical specimens.13 Little is known of the average workers’ age, but in a group of 40 new arrivals in 1726, who were referred to as being a good lot, the majority were 15 to 16 years old.14 Drunkenness among the workers was a constant problem; the governor once complained that when the men were paid they left their work in spite of all he could do. Numerous ordinances were issued regulating taverns and their hours,15 but the repetition of these prohibitions throughout the history of Louisbourg indicates that they were not easily enforceable.

Finally, work on the barracks was hampered by conflicts among the senior officials of the colony. In the early years at Louisbourg there was more than the usual amount of bitterness in relationships between the military administrators and the builders. The leading officials of the colony were the governor, who was the principal military officer, and the commissaire ordonnateur (often simply called the ordonnateur), the chief civil and financial officer. Both reported individually to the ministry of marine in France, and, on matters of mutual concern, wrote joint reports. Without a clear delineation of functions, quarrels were inevitable, especially with regard to the barracks which was within the jurisdiction of both officials. To complicate matters, the chief engineer was in frequent opposition to one or both officials. The chief engineer’s function was to draw up plans and supervise construction. He was a member of the engineering corps, a separate department whose members were attached to military units where needed. Being more familiar with land forces, the first engineer was criticized for not doing things the Marine way. In an effort to mitigate this difficulty a special memorandum describing work procedures was prepared in consultation with all parties.16 Most of the officials in Louisbourg were of the nobility, some from established families (d’épée) and others from recently ennobled ones (de plume); a Mémoire du Roi of 1718, probably issued in reaction to reports of friction, urged both groups to get along for the good of the service.17 Also involved in the construction was the contractor who arranged for materials, provided some of the workmen, and had to have his work approved by the other officials before he received his money.

Before considering the construction and occupation of the building, some discussion of the building practices is necessary. At the start of each major undertaking, the ministry of marine, in a
document called the *Devis et Condition*, outlined in general terms the kind and extent of work to be done and specified the standard of work expected and quality of materials to be used.\(^{18}\) The contractor then submitted a bid listing his unit price for each item in the construction. The bid for a fireplace, for example, would not give a total estimate for the finished product, but rather would quote a price per cubic foot of masonry. The contractor would then be paid that unit price times whatever cubic measurement the engineer or his assistants calculated for the feature. Labour was not a factor in these contracts, and the contractor had to ensure that his quoted price covered this expense. In some cases, as in masonry wall construction, the contractor was paid for the entire wall even though there were openings for doors and windows which did not contain masonry. The extra payment in this case was to compensate for the labour involved in fashioning these features. Similarly, chimney stacks were considered to be full blocks of masonry to compensate for the labour it took to make the flues. Transportation of materials in the first Louisbourg contract was at royal expense though this was modified in later contracts.\(^{19}\)

The ministry then told the officials on the site how work was to proceed. In a memorandum in the summer of 1718 it was stated that nothing was to be done without orders or approval from France.\(^{20}\) Once work was approved, the estimates were to be prepared by the *ordonnateur* from the work orders submitted by the engineer and were to be calculated in his presence as well as that of the governor. At the end of each year, the engineer was to prepare for the *ordonnateur* and the governor an account of work done that year. This account would be forwarded for payment minus the sums the contractor had already been paid. The engineer was to be given every assistance, including the troops and officers he required. The contractor would pay the troops according to a scale worked out between them. If an agreement could not be reached, the governor, *ordonnateur* and engineer would decide on a pay scale. The sub-engineers, who, like the engineer, were military men, were responsible only to the engineer.

In the early years at Louisbourg recruitment of workers was divided between the king and the contractor. For example, in 1719 the king was to provide 10 masons and two stonecutters and the contractor was to provide carpenters, a locksmith, and two diggers. All were given free passage to Louisbourg.\(^{21}\) There appeared to be no fixed system of wage payment. Because of the short season, craftsmen charged five *livres* per day in order to earn enough to live for the whole year.\(^{22}\) Other workers who knew the French colonies by experience or reputation demanded 80 *livres* per month.\(^{23}\) It was expected that the men would do piece work, but it appears they had a choice. In any case those who came were hired for three years and then could settle in the colony with free grants of land or return to France with free passage.\(^{24}\) It was hoped that the colony would soon produce its own workmen who would charge less. Workers were solicited from Quebec; presumably they would also have been less expensive than those from France.\(^{25}\) This situation was slow to improve, however. In 1725 the contractor complained that the workers charged too much and did little, but since there were no others they were able to have their way.\(^{26}\)

The labouring jobs were done mostly by soldiers. In 1720, for example, 78 soldiers were employed in excavation, 14 in what was called simply labouring, 4 hauling cut-stone, and 3 hauling limestone.\(^{27}\) Here, too, there were shortages. In 1722 the engineer complained that there were only 198 soldiers available for all the work at Louisbourg; 36 more men were required for the King’s Bastion and barracks alone. Even the 200 men promised for the following year would not be enough for all the pressing work.\(^{28}\) However, sometimes when men did arrive they could not be fully employed because of poor planning, as in 1723 when six carpenters arrived to make gun carriages only to find that the proper wood had not been collected.\(^{29}\) The list of soldiers who were working on the bastion-barracks complex in 1724 gives the distribution of workers and shows that some of the soldiers were skilled: terracers, 41; labourers, 33; sand haulers, 16; flatstone workers, 5; limestone workers, 7; gatherers of fascine for lime kilns, 5; sawyers, 3; carpenters (heavy timber), 4; carpenters (fine work), 4; ironmongers, 2, and boatmen, 4. In addition there would have been a number of civilian workers, as well as engineers and sub-engineers supervising the work. In all probability about 150 men worked on this complex during the peak of construction.
Chronology of Construction

1717–19

The engineer appointed to begin work at Louisbourg was Jean François de Verville, whose service with the corps of engineers in France had begun in 1704. Ten years later he was appointed chief engineer at Douai in Flanders, and in 1717 came to Ile Royale as chief engineer and director of fortifications, having turned down a post in Spain, a decision he probably regretted later. From the beginning he alienated many of the officials in Louisbourg. In that first year de Verville complained that officers were losing their time and fortunes in commerce, and the following year recommended that officers be prohibited from engaging in fishing, a recommendation that was soon implemented. The officials resented that de Verville was responsible for gathering all the material concerning the choice of the site for the fortifications, and had their own complaints against the engineer. Both the governor, Joseph de Monbeton de Brouillan, dit Saint-Ovide and the ordonnateur, Pierre-Auguste de Soubras, criticised de Verville’s preliminary plans as impractical for that part of the world.

In this heated atmosphere preparations for construction were undertaken. De Verville put forward a number of recommendations to streamline work and, at the same time, to improve his position. He wanted full control over the workers and even the officers, including the power to imprison soldiers. He wanted better quarters for himself and his draftsmen and a guard for his papers. When he was away for the winter in France, he proposed that the governor not interfere with work in progress and that the sub-engineers not be taken from supervisory work to write memoranda or do drafting. All these conditions were agreed to by the ministry in France, but agreement probably did little to improve de Verville’s relationships with other officials.

The contractor, Michel-Philippe Isabeau, a veteran builder from France who had favourably impressed the governor and ordonnateur on his first visit in 1717, was awarded the contract for work at Louisbourg in 1719, but he, too, had complaints. In wage disputes he claimed the officers sided with the soldiers and allowed them to go and work for townspeople so he could not get on with construction. He also voiced the familiar complaint that the soldiers’ wages were being squandered on drink and smoke to the profit of the officers and their taverns, and the detriment of the work.

During the summer of 1719, de Verville went to France to discuss construction plans and returned that autumn with the new ordonnateur, Jacques-Ange Le Normant de Mézy, who immediately created an unfavourable impression prompting strong reaction from both the engineer and the governor. Saint-Ovide accused de Mézy of wanting to rule the colony absolutely – it was, he said, impossible to live in peace – to which de Mézy retorted that he was not a clerk. Perhaps as a concession to the engineer to gain his alliance against this new threat, Saint-Ovide reported that henceforth only de Verville would decide on the allocation of construction funds.

The engineer was also troubled by de Mézy and wrote to France asking if this ordonnateur had any other rights in the construction except to approve the bills and work orders. De Verville, in another letter to France, suggested that de Mézy might have felt that he was usurping some of the ordonnateur’s functions; he assured the ministry of his loyalty and service, and added in a rather condescending tone, il est excusable a des personnes de parler d’un métier qu’ils ne saovent point, la speculation et la pratique pour estre bien mariées doivent se trouver dans une seule personne pour porter le fruit de l’exécution.

The engineer was surprised to discover that contrary to instructions from France, Saint-Ovide had ordered certain works during his absence and without his approval. The ministry, when informed of this, indicated its surprise at the expense involved. Since the works had been done “without [the king’s] orders and perhaps without necessity” de Verville was ordered to check into the accounts and pay only those workers who had done necessary work. Presumably, the governor would have to pay for those accounts not deemed necessary.

The first indication of what was intended as a barracks for Louisbourg came from a report by de Verville in 1717. The main fortified place in Louisbourg was to be: une forte Redoute Bastionnée Exécutée en Maçonnerie... A La gorge de L’ouvrage, on fera un corps de Casernes Capable de Contenir au moins quatre Compagnies d’Infanterie avec les officiers, autour de Ce Corps de Casernes, on fera un petit fossé ou un chemin Couvert ou bien les deux Ensembles.

It was estimated that the building would cost 36,441 livres. All of this seemed to be quite modest in intent and the first barracks plan (Fig. 2) was in keeping with this intent, showing a rather simple structure with a mansard roof. There was little elaboration, and no indication that it was to be used for anything beyond housing troops and their officers. Sometime between 1717 and the beginning of construction three years later, the concept was changed, probably during de Verville’s visit to France in the winter of 1718–19. No reasons have been found for the changes reflected in an undated plan (Fig. 3) from the pre-construction period. The new concept showed the same general foundations as
the first plan, but featured a continuous ridged roof rather than a mansard roof, and fireplaces had all been moved from the long centre wall to the short partition walls.

By the time construction began in 1720 another more basic change had been effected, probably the result of de Verville’s first winter spent in the colony. The building itself had a new foundation plan (Fig. 4), the long narrow wings of the first two plans becoming almost square, and another storey added. The elaborations in the cellar, shown in 1718, were eliminated except for the bake-ovens. No excavations were to be made beneath the chapel, which was larger in the new plan, and the altar was moved to the opposite end (Figs. 6 and 8). The small bell tower of the original plan was replaced with a large impressive clock tower centred over the entrance, and large windows were added in the chapel.

In the earlier plan the masonry partitions had created 42 small and 22 large rooms, but by 1724 there were only large rooms, 52 in all, plus a long narrow room over the central passageway (Fig. 8). The counterforts shown in 1720 (small buttresses along the courtyard north wall seen in Fig. 4) did not appear in the later plans, but four were uncovered in excavations. A provisional work account referred to seven of these counterforts and gave the measurements as 2 pieds by 2 pieds by 8 pieds, including the foundation. Apparently this area, which had deeper bedrock than the southern half (see dotted line in elevation on Fig. 2), needed these counterforts for support.

**1720**

The first stone of the barracks was laid with the “usual ceremony” on 29 May 1720 by Governor Saint-Ovide and the commissaire ordonnateur, de Mézy. Work had begun in the latter part of April despite heavy frost, but soon the progress of construction was marred by wage disputes. De Verville had recommended a wage of 20 sols (1 livre) per day for excavation work, but because of protests and disturbances, as well as interference from Saint-Ovide (so de Verville said), the price had to be raised, thus increasing the cost of excavation. A marginal note on this letter, written by an official in France, indicates that the governor was to be asked not to meddle in wage disputes. Giving his side of the story, Saint-Ovide felt that the price of excavations (which he quoted as 4 sols per cubic toise) was too little, especially since the contractor received free the rubble stone which was uncovered and could use it, at a saving to himself, in the masonry walls. The final agreement seems to have been a scale of prices per cubic toise of excavation, which increased as the work became more difficult.

The governor and the contractor disagreed again when the latter wanted 10 soldiers to unload a ship for 18 sols per day. The governor replied that the contractor would have to use townspeople, provided there were any who would work for such a small sum.

By the beginning of the summer 64 toises (approximately 420 feet) of excavation had been completed and de Verville enclosed a map (Fig. 5) to show the progress. He planned to schedule the work so that by the following year a good part of the barracks would be at full height along with a portion of the fortifications. De Verville was limited because he had 117 men instead of the 240 he wanted; however, a marginal note written in France indicates that Saint-Ovide was to be asked to give him as many men as possible.

There were more difficulties. In a scarcely veiled reference to the governor, he reported that more work would have been done if there had been less interference. There certainly was no possibility of occupying the barracks that year, and de Verville urged that officers and their families who were anxious to move to Louisbourg from one of the outposts, should remain where they were until the following year.

De Mézy reported that the work was going well enough but that there were too few workers and the soldiers were not accustomed to the work. The relationships with the governor showed no signs of improvement. Saint-Ovide complained of the frustration he felt because of de Mézy’s independence and determination to control everything, even the military.

A second ceremony took place that summer to commemorate the beginning of construction. In July, six silver and twelve bronze medals were minted and shipped to Louisbourg. The profile of King Louis XV was on one side, with a conjectural view of the new fortified town and the date 1720 on the other. There were also Latin inscriptions which, translated, read “Louis XV by the Grace of God King of France and Navarre,” and “Louisbourg Founded and Fortified MDCCXX.” In November, under de Verville’s direction, Saint-Ovide placed six of the medals in various foundations. These medals had been prepared by the Académie des Belles-Lettres in Paris and carried the signature of T. Le Blancan. Recent archaeological excavations in the barracks and King’s Bastion area uncovered one silver and two bronze medals in a lead box with a wooden lining (Fig. 7).

During the summer a change in priorities, decided upon by de Verville, resulted in men being removed from the barracks to work on the right flank and casemates of the King’s Bastion (Fig. 6). The joint report of the governor and the ordonnateur found them in agreement and vigorously protesting this action: “Nous de-
2 First barracks plan, 1718. Note the dotted line along the foundation (top elevation) showing the level of bedrock. (Archives Nationales, Paris.)
3 Barracks plan, probably from 1719. (Archives Nationales, Paris.)
4 Floor plan, 1720, generally adopted for the barracks. (Archives du Comité Technique du Génie, Paris.)
5 Plan showing the beginning of excavations for the foundations of the barracks in 1720. The governor lived in building G during this period. (Original source unknown.)

6 Plan showing completed excavations and the foundations of six rooms in the north wing, 1720. Note that the chapel was not excavated. (Archives du Comité Technique du Génie, Paris.)

7 Louisbourg commemorative medals (1720) and cedar-lined lead case. They were found in 1963 near the northeast corner of the barracks.
mandons Instament que l'Entrepreneur commence L'année prochaine par le Corps de Cazernes par preference a Tous pour pouvoirs Contenir le Troupes et Les mettre a Couvert.” 33 Saint-Ovide was convinced that most of the barracks would have been ready to house the soldiers that winter if work had continued, and he thought that de Verville appreciated the need for these quarters, after having spent a winter in Louisbourg, seeing first-hand what the conditions were. Saint-Ovide protested: “jen’ay Jamais peu penetrer les raisons que cet ingenieur a pour avoir Suspanda entierement ces ouvrages alain dumois deJuin pourfaire travail­ler aux fondations du flanc dubastion.” 34 De Verville, frustrated by the opposition he was encountering, wrote the king that he would not have believed that such precise instruction as he had received from the court could be so often contradicted. He expressed the hope that he would be well regarded for his hard work and would not regret having come to Louisbourg instead of staying in Spain.35

Two disputes reflected the difficult division of powers between the governor and the engineer. The first concerned a soldier who had been issued with shoes and stockings and had sold them for a drink. On the governor’s order, the soldier was arrested and punished on the wooden horse in order to discover who had purchased the goods. De Verville protested the punishment of one of his workers without his order.36 The governor was further annoyed when, at the end of the construction season, the engineer left for France without giving over the plans and work orders so Saint-Ovide could have some inkling of what was supposed to be done during the winter.37

Letters from the ministry were quite specific about procedures for that winter. While in France, de Verville was to give a general report on work at Louisbourg. He doubtless had an explanation for his change in the work plans but there is no record of it. On the ship he was given a good room with a window so he would be able to prepare the necessary plans and memos.38 De Mézy and Saint-Ovide were specifically forbidden to change anything while de Verville was away, and the sub-engineers and the contractor were to follow whatever instructions he had left behind. De Verville in turn was urged to prepare for his absence so that work at Louisbourg would not fall behind.39

In their annual reports, all of the officials restated their versions of the year’s events, justifying their positions and assuring the king of their loyalty and hard work. De Verville reported that the contractor and some of the engineers were bedridden, victims of the inhospitable Louisbourg climate, and that a tent had been put up at the construction site to allow some shelter from the elements.40 The governor and ordonnateur decried the lack of co-operation from the engineer and contractor. Specifically, they were annoyed at the opposition to their proposals to withhold the workers’ pay, to be returned to them in the winter, and to pay them only every 15 days to reduce drunkenness;41 de Verville’s responses to this are not recorded. Finally, the contractor Isabeau wrote to de Verville in France that, since he had left, officers had made him work on their own dwellings and the ordonnateur had instructed him to supply lime to the townspeople.42 With these complaints the first troubled year of construction on the barracks came to an end.

1721

Seven masons and two stonecutters arrived the next summer to add to the skilled work force. The two stoncutters were from Paris, six of the masons were from central France and one was from northern France. Two of the men brought their wives.43

In Paris de Verville must have mentioned Isabeau’s complaint about interference from officers because instructions from France again forbade work on buildings other than those authorized, and prohibited any change in plans. Numerous thefts from the contractor were reported and a mémoire du roy urged stricter stores control for the contractor’s as well as the king’s supplies. The latter were to be distributed only by a bill from the engineer and an order from the ordonnateur. Lodging was also a concern, and a house in which the king’s lieutenant was living was ordered vacated in favour of the contractor, who had been housed uncomfortably in the stores building.44

This last suggestion was undoubtedly one of de Verville’s, a fact which would not have escaped notice in Louisbourg. Saint-Ovide was quick to claim he had been misrepresented by de Verville in France, and even claimed to be surprised that there were reports of any difficulties between them, believing that their relationship was honest and amicable.45 However, he did acknowledge the “severe reprimands” and said he would conform to orders, namely that de Verville have complete control over the fortifications and troops and de Mézy control of the money and justice. Saint-Ovide further reported that he was ordering the soldiers not to work for anyone other than the contractor, and that he was trying to eliminate the taverns and the resulting drunkenness on paydays.46 He issued an ordinance prohibiting the sale or distribution of liquor to soldiers or workmen on working days, and forbade the soldiers to remain in taverns after the retreat had sounded.47

The original specifications for construction at Louisbourg called for shingle roofs,48 but de Verville recommended slate, pointing out that the 14 separation walls would have to be raised above
roof level to prevent any fire from spreading if shingles were used. The proposal was approved and 60,000 slates were sent from St. Malo in the summer of 1721. The shipment was not up to the highest standards and the engineer reported:


Slating proved to be a wise precaution for when the roof was hit during the 1745 siege it did not catch fire. In the repairs which followed the slate was replaced with shingles except for the governor’s wing. During the 1758 siege when the building caught fire, the flames stopped only at the slated wing.

During that summer the governor’s wing was readied to receive its roof, and about 43 feet of the barracks proper was up to first floor level. This was a long way from the previous year’s predictions, which foresaw a major part of the barracks completed by this time. Saint-Ovide was certainly not satisfied with progress and noted that most of the barracks had no roof and, lacking floors and ceilings, was a sea of mud when it rained.

### 1722

For the first time, dispatches from France displayed impatience with the rate of construction in Louisbourg. De Verville was sent a carefully worded letter:

*Le Conseil vous recommande de presser autant que vous le pour-rés le nouveau corps de Cazernes, de manière que les Soldats les Suisse[s] les mineurs puissent y être logés à la fin de l’automne, il Seroit même à Souhaiter qu’on y pût loger une partie des officiers, en même tems.*

Separate letters were sent to de Mézy and Saint-Ovide. The former was told it was the king’s intention that the works at Louisbourg proceed without a single change. The latter, who had complained about the miserable conditions in which the soldiers were lodged, was assured that de Verville would complete enough of the barracks to house them.

On the first of August, de Verville, feeling the sting of this re-buke, informed the ministry that the sub-engineers had vigourously carried on the construction, that the barracks all had their foundation, and that the governor’s wing was partly slated. However, in September he was again complaining of the lack of workmen and claimed that if extra men were sent on the first ships leaving France for the next two years, he would be able to do three years’ work in two. The king’s lieutenant, acting in the absence of the governor, who with de Verville had left for France, reported at the end of the year that only ten rooms for the troops had been finished. He assured the minister: “j’ay pressé autant qu’il n’a Esté possible L’Entrepreneur de faire mettre en Estat des chambres pour Loger Le peu de troupes qu’il reste dans ce port pour monter La garde.”

### 1723

When requesting his leave for the winter of 1723, Saint-Ovide had said that certain family affairs were in jeopardy, but it is obvious that he would take full advantage of the sojourn to advance his cause both at the ministry and in his personal affairs. In Paris he met a former ensign of his company at Placentia, Gratien d’Arrigrand. Saint-Ovide encouraged him to try for the contract for work beyond the barracks and the King’s Bastion, obviously in hopes of winning it away from Isabeau. D’Arrigrand began to make inquiries and was soon to be given an opportunity of taking over work at Louisbourg.

When Saint-Ovide and de Verville returned from France that summer, both were chagrined to see that so little had been accomplished during their absence. The governor was particularly unhappy since he had no place to put the 60 new recruits he had brought back: “J’ay été fort Surpris d’avoir reveu ce Batiment, . . . dans l’état ou je l’avois laissé l’automne dernier.” In the end he lodged them in the attics of the finished rooms, which were hardly suitable since they were not intended for this purpose and had no fireplaces. The only work done in the barracks was on the walls which had been started the previous year and raised to door height. In four rooms the construction of fireplaces had begun. De Verville felt he had to justify the lack of progress and reported that the contractor and engineers had been ill. He added that Isabeau was the only one able to carry on construction and that even his detractors admitted not being able to produce a replacement. He followed this with the familiar request for more men and money.

Nor did work progress smoothly that season. Pierre-Jérôme Boucher, a sub-engineer, reported to the minister that though money from France had arrived three weeks previously, the workers had not been paid and there was unrest which might lead to a work stoppage. Saint-Ovide had his own complaints. De Verville, he said, had ignored instructions from France about communicating a work account at the end of each year, and had even hidden the plans for winter work from de Couagne the senior engineer who was, he felt, the governor’s ally. Saint-Ovide also charged that de Verville was spending much time and money on
houses for Boucher and de Verville's son, who was also an engineer, adding:

"Et le peu d'ouvrage qu[i] a esté fait Cette année au Corps de Cazernes a esté Dans Une Saison Sy Retardée ou les Coups de Vens Et les pluyes Sons Continuelles Ce qui fait Craintre avec Raison pour [l'a] Solidité de Cest Ouvrage, il est meme tombé Une Cheminée peu de jours aprés quelle a esté faite."  

DeMezy also faced a charge of non-cooperation for not making himself available to write their joint report. The report, finally written on 29 December, contained a manoeuvre aimed at removing de Verville from effective control of day-to-day construction in Louisbourg. It was suggested that Boisberthelot de Beaucours, the king's lieutenant, be made chief engineer resident in Louisbourg and that de Verville become full-time director of all fortifications on the island. In addition it was requested that an inspector-general be sent to examine the works at Louisbourg with regard to cost and quality, implying that the performance of the engineer and contractor left much to be desired.

This suggestion was supplemented by a damning document from another ally, the surveyor Charles Vallée, on the state of the building. Vallée reported that the walls were beginning to crack and develop holes due to the badly positioned rubble stone and the use of a considerable amount of pebbling. These holes were filled with iron bars in an attempt to strengthen the walls. The brick window surrounds disintegrated to a powder when touched because of the corrosive action of the salt air. Wood in the roof and flooring was rotting, being only half-dried pine, and poorly cut. Good ash or other hard wood was available and should have been used, as well as a cornice on which to rest the beams rather than having a few beams sealed into the walls and the rest tied to them. As a result, the floors were so weak they could not support any heavy burden, and Vallée predicted that both walls and floors would have to be rebuilt in seven or eight years. The roof was also poorly constructed and, aside from showing light in a thousand places, would topple over in a strong wind. The report was overly pessimistic – the roof did not fall nor the floors collapse – but it did point out the basic weakness of the building, and the problems of weak walls, rotten floors and a leaky roof persisted throughout the life of the building.

1724

The reports of 1723 were not without effect in France. Though the ministry did not remove de Verville from active control of work at Louisbourg, a new engineer was sent from France with him in the spring. It was not said that de Verville was leaving, but obviously a change was pending. Probably the constant criticism by the governor and ordonnateur had finally convinced the ministry that, if de Verville was not incompetent, harmonious relationships between these officials were not possible and his removal was the best solution.

Another change in France at this time very possibly had ramifications in Louisbourg. The old head of the Marine, the Comte de Toulouse, retired, and in his place came the young and vigorous Comte de Maurepas. Only 22 when he took office in 1723, Maurepas soon assumed active control of the ministry and remained in the post for 26 years. De Verville fell out of favour quickly after this change while de Mézy, his foe, seems to have been highly regarded. In one letter Maurepas quoted de Mézy as saying that de Verville's estimates were not to be trusted. Another, to de Verville, Maurepas reported bluntly that he had heard a rumour that de Verville intended to leave without finishing a certain plan; Maurepas ordered him not to leave without completing it.

The new engineer, Étienne Verrier, had already served 17 years in the royal corps of engineers before his appointment to Louisbourg, and four years previously had been awarded the Cross of St. Louis. The two engineers travelled together to Louisbourg so they could consult during the crossing. Arriving on 30 July 1724, Verrier was impressed: "La fortification de cette Ville marquée paru si Entendue dans toutes ses parties que Le Roy peut Comter avoir La plus forte place de toute L'amerique." From de Verville he received the plans and drawings as well as the original memorandum from the king concerning construction. De Verville thought that the barracks were well advanced, and also had a favourable opinion of Verrier, whom he found talented and zealous.

By mid-November, Verrier was able to report that the masonry was at full height with the exception of the separation wall of the main entrance and the guardhouse to the right. The chimney stacks in the officers' and governor's quarters were not completed, but slating was in progress. With good weather that winter, Verrier hoped to be able to complete the roof so the building would be liveable. Fifty Swiss soldiers arrived that summer and were housed temporarily in the barracks, but the lack of finished fireplaces forced them to find other quarters for the winter. Verrier made a point of saying that he got along well with the governor and ordonnateur. As de Verville had done before him, he requested and was granted a place for his son on the engineering staff at Louisbourg.

The year-end reports were much more encouraging than in 1723. De Mézy, especially, reported that a considerable amount of work had been done on the barracks, but he could not resist a comment on what he called de Verville's wasteful work.
8 De Verville’s final plan, 1724, of the King’s Bastion and barracks. (Archives du Comité Technique du Génie, Paris.)
engineer, on his part, wrote a long final memorandum of accusations, defences and recommendations. His view of the reasons for the constant delays was revealing:

"Le retardement des affaires par le gouverneur après l'avoir été encore plus par l'ordonnateur Les frequentes entreveues des Ingenieurs chez le premier qui n'ont rien determiné, les fatigantes courses eloignées du second en lassant les ingéniers et l'Entrepreneur sans produire aucun bien ont enfin fait perdre la moitié de la Campagne."

He was graphic in describing the plight of the contractor, whose money was often withheld: "des officiers du Vaisseau du Roy on veu comme moi avec beaucoup de douleur cet entrepreneur en gemissement et sa soeur en larmes ne Sachant ou trouver pour eux mêmes de la farine pour vivre pendant I hiver." According to de Verville, the contractor had given all the money and provisions that he had to the workers. In addition Isabeau was often stricken with symptoms of paralysis, and the surgeon had recommended a trip to France. The governor and ordonnateur opposed it, but de Verville urged otherwise, saying Isabeau would be "en danger de perir faute d'un prompt Secours."

The memorandum included the usual recommendations to have the chief engineer assume full control of funds, wages, justice on the site, and even the date of departure of the ships. He criticised the other officials for having other and often conflicting interests outside of their governmental functions, and reported proudly: "cest une satisfaction pour moy de pouvoir dire avec seureté que les ingenieurs sous mes ordres ne font aucun trafic n'y commerce." (The governor's personal ship was given as an example of this conflict of interest.) De Verville had no doubt about what he could have accomplished without outside interference: "j'aurois fait faire en Cinq annees en paix, ce qui m'en a couté huit avec beaucoup de désagrement."73

Both de Verville and Isabeau returned to France that fall. The former was appointed director of fortifications at Valenciennes near the Belgian border. The premonitions about Isabeau were fulfilled when the ailing contractor died on board ship a few days after leaving Louisbourg.74

It is difficult to assess de Verville's performance in Louisbourg. Certainly the complaints against him resulted in part from his opposition to the misuse of materials by the officers and other officials. De Verville himself was not immune from this charge, for in 1723 Saint-Ovide had carried the rumour to the ministry that the engineer had a stake in the contractor's work,75 and, after both had left Louisbourg, he claimed that Isabeau had made a profit of 200,000 livres with de Verville's help.76 These charges were never substantiated and, considering the bias of their source, were probably not true.

De Verville's effectiveness was certainly curbed by the opposition he encountered, and it was some time before even routine work procedures were established. He was not as rigorous with the contractor as he should have been, but it was obviously wise to have Isabeau as an ally, seeing that they had to work together. Nor were conditions at Louisbourg ideal with regard to materials, climate or workmen. It is doubtful that any engineer with a background of construction only in France could have dealt effectively with the situation at Louisbourg, but there is no indication that de Verville experimented with new techniques to improve building. He must bear part of the responsibility for the shoddy workmanship which was revealed in later years. Yet his imprint on the barracks is unmistakable; though the building was later modified, the basic design is his. The main criticism of its architecture centred on the impracticability of the layout of the building, though this was never elaborated and, in his defence, the few other barracks constructed during this time employed roughly the same floor plan. Some modifications were made by Verrier and will be discussed later.

1725

Official notice that Verrier was to take charge of the works at Louisbourg arrived on 1 May 1725. The same mail also brought news of Isabeau's death to the colony, though the inhabitants had already known by way of a privately owned ship. De Mézy had gone to Isabeau's sister, who was his procurator during his absence, and had her turn over to Verrier all the plans and drawings in her possession. He then asked Verrier to make out a general account of all work done by Isabeau, but the engineer refused to do so without an order from France. The instructions soon arrived but Verrier did not get around to making the account until the next winter, and it was years before the affairs of the estate were settled.77

At this point Gratien d'Arrigrand made his entrance into Louisbourg affairs. His background reveals the motivations of a particular type of person who came to the colonies. When he had served in Placentia he was not without connections; his uncle Daniel d'Auger de Subercase had been governor first of Placentia, then of Acadia. D'Arrigrand served in Saint-Ovide's company until 1705 when he returned to France where he later left the marine for the army. When his father died he was given charge of the estate and hoped to eventually purchase his own company. Meanwhile he became involved in unsuccessful speculations. In a letter
Verrier's first plan, 1725, of the King's Bastion and barracks. (Archives Nationales, Paris.)
10 De Mézy’s plan, 1725, for a terrace around the barracks roof. Note the considerable number of dormers with the terrace projecting beyond them. Twenty-five of the dormers were later removed. (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.)
written almost 30 years later he described what happened afterward, using the third person form often employed at the time: Paris étoit brillant les plaisirs de Capoue l'entrainerent comme bien d'autres. Il se trouva en 1723. n'en avoit presque plus rien, sans n'avoir du regret; adieu par consequent la compagnie, adieu le Service; d'aller en province apres cette perte cela ne Se pourroit; avec Un peu de talent, La geographie, un peu de mathématiques, et Les campagnes . . . Il cherchoit dans son idée a remplacer Ses fonds. Il avoit toujours vécu de relation avec ses anciens amis de la marine, il y en avoit beaucoup à Paris cette année la . . . entre autres, Le Sr. de St' Ovide gouverneur de l'île royale, tous le plaissant, d'avoir perdu une partie de son bien Un jour qu'ils étoient plusieurs à manger ensemble ils luy proposeront de s'en aller avec M. de St' Ovide, . . . que dans une nouvelle Colonie, il y avoit toujours quelque bons coup à faire, ils luy proposeront même de faire faire les fortifications, ce que le supp'. refusa, sur ce qu'il ne luy convenoit pas d'être entrepreneur, sur quoy ils luy dirent, qu'ils ne l'entendoient pas de meme mais seulement de trouver Un architecte dans Paris qui paroitroit, et que je m'asso­cierois avec luy.

The partnership was secret so that only the new contractor’s name, François Ganet, appeared on the legal documents. D’Arrigrand made it seem as though he had been doing the king a favour by taking over construction in Louisbourg and freeing it from the abuses of the past. “Le Roy avoit déjà dépensé un mil­lion en fortifications et il n’y avoit pas pour cent mille livres d’ouvrage, c’étoit un pillage.” In order to ensure his investment, d’Arrigrand also formed a partnership with Jacques d’Espiet de Pensens, then a captain at Louisbourg, who could assure the smooth running of the contract in Louisbourg. Saint-Ovide was not mentioned as one of the participants in the venture, but years later he would be accused of and deny complicity in these arrangements.

Isabeau’s death made possible the securing of the contract for work in Louisbourg. Ganet offered his services to the ministry, which was anxious that there be as little disruption in the works as possible, and was given a contract for work not included in Isabeau’s agreement. Madame Planton, Isabeau’s sister, had been left in charge of her brother’s affairs in Louisbourg; both de Verville and Isabeau’s father recommended to her that she make an agreement with the new contractor for the completion of Isabeau’s contract. Ganet then sent word to Charles Vallée, a surveyor in Louisbourg who was acting as his agent, to try and do as much building as possible until he could arrive. Vallée’s position in this contract is not evident, but it is known that he was a friend of Saint-Ovide, and probably was considered not too involved to have an open connection with the contractor.

Ganet was told that he would have to pay the transportation costs of material necessary for his own contract as well as for works he would do for Isabeau’s contract. The officials at Louis­bourg were instructed to watch that he did not use Isabeau’s ma­terials for his own work. The transition to a new contractor was not to be an easy one.

A preliminary agreement was reached between Ganet and Madame Planton, but was rescinded on the advice of de Mézy, who accused the new contractor of trying to ruin the poor woman. So that the season would not be lost and the barracks ruined, Ganet finally agreed to a set of propositions drawn up by de Mézy, but after that he wanted no further dealings with the Isa­beau estate. Isabeau’s father, meanwhile, had second thoughts about his approval of this new contractor, claiming that Ganet had wanted all the estate in return for completing the work. He decided to send one of his sons to finish the contract.

The settlement of the estate produced the three major toisés or work accounts relating to construction of the barracks, all of which were compiled under the supervision of the engineer Verri­er. One of the accounts dealt with work done by Ganet from 1725 to 1727 for Isabeau’s heirs, and was chiefly concerned with the south half of the barracks. A second was the definitive statement of work done by Isabeau from 1719 to 1724 and by his heirs from 1725 to 1730, covering not just the barracks and bastion but other government structures, most of which were temporary. The third statement recorded work done in the same period as the second, but dealt only with those items, such as slate, not pro­vided for in the original contract. These statements, compiled long after the fact, were not without error, but they do give an excellent picture of the work and materials which went into the barrac­ks. They are divided into headings concerning the type of work done; excavations, masonry, wood, iron, lead, locks and glass. All the phases of construction were included under these ti­tles. In the two accounts which deal with Isabeau’s work, the di­mensions of the masonry walls were given and such details were mentioned as the door from the governor’s basement to the ditch, the ovens in the basement of the soldiers’ barracks, the use of two-inch pine planks for floors, the number and size of dormers, the paving stones in the basement of the governor’s wing and even the loss of a dugout canoe during construction. The double main doors, bunk-beds for the soldiers, a balustrade for the chap­el, a rack for the armoury, a grinding table for flour, and a desk for papers of the superior council are additional details recorded in these documents.
How did construction proceed during this year of change at Louisbourg with a new engineer and contractor? Letters in the spring from Maurepas indicated he was anticipating the early completion of the building. The storekeeper at Rochefort was ordered to choose an appropriate painting to be mounted over the altar in the chapel, and to have the design cut which de Verville had prepared for the coat of arms over the main doorway, along with a marble plaque commemorating the founding of the town in 1720. Unfortunately the barracks was far from finished. Verrier reported he was still at work on the officers’ quarters and hoped to complete them before the year was out. The governor, he said, had asked that the officers’ quarters be completed before his own.

The delay was caused by the lengthy procedures involved in plastering. Generally, three types of wall finishing were used at Louisbourg. For exterior walls, mortar was applied only to the jointing so that the stone of the wall protruded. In the interior a rough mortar coat was applied, followed by a finer coat using well-sifted sand. If a very smooth finish was required, a plaster coat using no sand was employed. Ganet indicated that the first type of finish would be used for all the exterior of the barracks, the second for the guardhouse and “some rooms” and the third for an unspecified location. Because of the dampness in Louisbourg, lime mortar required even more time to set than normal.

Bricks and masonry continued to be a problem, and Ganet reported he had taken the liberty of ordering some good bricks from Boston. He also voiced the old complaint that there were not enough workers and he requested at least 60 more including 15 masons. In Ganet’s opinion the masonry work had been badly done, and many of the walls were out of plumb.

Ganet also blamed Isabeau for his current losses. The former contractor, he asserted, had done the major work on which there was considerable profit, and had left the smaller, more time-consuming jobs. Ganet now had to do these at a loss. Saint-Ovide added his observation that Ganet’s masonry work seemed much better than that which had been done in the past.

Verrier was now in sole charge of construction at Louisbourg, and the changes he effected in the barracks show that he was not altogether satisfied with the interior arrangement of rooms. Though the soldiers’ quarters were well on their way to completion, the south half was in a state to allow considerable modifications (Fig. 9). Here Verrier scrapped de Verville’s plan which required that entrances to the back rooms be through the rooms which opened on the courtyard. By moving stairs and cutting new doors he was able to provide direct access to all the rooms. In the central passage Verrier changed the guardroom and the tower.

The old guardroom to the right of the central passage had an open face of four arches behind which was a gallery, with doors at either end leading to the officers’ and soldiers’ guardrooms. No reason was given for the renovations, but Verrier probably felt that the walls as they existed would not support the tower which was to be built over this central area. He therefore built a wall behind the arches and carried it all the way up to the roof. (The wall of the chapel also was thickened to increase its bearing capacity, and a door was cut to give access from the passage.) Two doorways were made in the new wall of the guardroom; the arches and interior partitions of the old guardrooms were then removed. This left a long narrow room directly off the central passage. A narrow masonry wall was constructed to divide the room roughly into the ratio of two to one, and a supporting arch was added where the centre wall would normally have been. The window which opened onto the terreplein of the bastion from this new officers’ guardroom was blocked in, and a spiral staircase was added to give access to the upper rooms. The other room nearest the main door and drawbridge, without a fireplace, was the soldiers’ guardroom.

In December there were varied reports on progress in construction for 1725. Verrier stated: “Il y a vingt chambres d’officiers dans les Casernes tant occupées qu’a occuper.” In an aside he requested that he be made director of fortifications and not just chief engineer, and he sought a commission for his 12-year-old son who would then apprentice with him. De Mézy gave a different picture: only five officers were housed in the barracks and the rest would have to wait until spring when the plaster had dried, although the drawbridge, door, guardroom, clock tower and chapel were completed. Ganet complained about the dozens of small details such as jambs, sills, and lintels which he had to finish before work was complete, and he sought to consolidate his position by giving up all claim to Isabeau’s work and requesting a direct contract with the king for any further work. Saint-Ovide wrote a detailed report on the state of things; the soldiers’ quarters were in a poor condition, many of the rooms being merely a shell lacking any finish, there was no plaster, many rooms had no fireplaces, and there were no proper stairs for the upstairs rooms, only narrow ladders. In many places the floor was open, and he could not resist a parting comment on the former engineer: “Cependant monsieur Deverville pronoit a la Cour que Cest ouvrage estoit finie a quelque chose prés.”
1726

The first letters from Maurepas in the spring of 1726 attempted to sort out the contract situation. Ganet was told that good reports had been received concerning his work, and it was hoped that an agreement could be reached with Madame Planton. Maurepas, fearing that the work would collapse if the widow Planton continued alone, instructed the governor and "ordonnateur" to seek a suitable accord or at least obtain a guarantee from her, adding that he himself could do little since this was a matter to be settled on the spot. Both officials were urged not to show any favouritism in the matter, undoubtedly a reference to the fact that de Mézy had acted as the widow’s agent previously. To Verrier, Maurepas indicated that he understood Ganet’s point about the losses incurred in finishing the work. He felt that the engineer was in the best position to work out a solution fair to both parties, but Verrier had to report that no agreement was possible between Ganet and Madame Planton. The contractor returned all the effects he had been given from Isabeau’s stocks, and he was paid for the work he had done on the barracks. If this amount was more than the estimates, the balance was to come from the royal treasury, which in turn would be reimbursed from Isabeau’s estate. On the question of guarantees, Verrier reported that the sister had no security, and neither did Ganet and Isabeau. The best security was the fact that if the work was not completed, the money owing the estate would not be paid. Both Verrier and Saint-Ovide agreed that if Ganet had continued to work by his previous agreement, he certainly would have suffered.

Regarding the work done the previous year, Maurepas told Verrier that he was pleased the officers were now housed and that he was sending funds for completion of the governor’s wing and other works so that “par ce moyen ce Batiment Sera dans La perfection.”

During the summer of 1726, most of the time was spent completing the south half, and by October Verrier wrote an enthusiastic report. The good weather all summer had permitted continuous work. All the officers’ rooms were in use and the governor was in his quarters which, however, did require more work. In the chapel only the reredos and the balcony remained unfinished, but services were being held there in spite of this.

Saint-Ovide and de Mézy in their joint report provided further details. Eighteen officers’ rooms were done, the chapel and sanctuary floors were in place, the plastering and windows completed and the governor’s wing finished. The engineer, they said, had done all he could for this half of the barracks, but the roof was too flat to be repaired adequately. “Il pleut dans Les Cazernes comme dehors.” There were several other complaints: the soldiers’ rooms were damp, smoky, and badly laid out. The bake- ovens in the basement were flooded by a foot and a half of water for half the year. The armoury, over the central passage, was plastered but still lacked its door and window as well as ceiling panelling and racks for guns. Three rooms in the north half of the barracks were without fireplaces and all but two were without plaster. The stairs which had been added cut down the floor space in the rooms. Saint-Ovide elaborated on his own accommodation:

Quoique cet ingenieur ay fait tout de qu’il a pu pour tascher de le rendre un peu commode, il ne S’y trouve aucune commodité par la mauvaise distribution qu’ay esté faitte dans Sa fondation je ne Scariois mesme trouver dans tout ce Logement un Endroit a pouvoir mettre mon Lit a couvert de la pluye. Les officiers, et Soldats qu’ay sont Logés dans ce Corps de Cazernes Sont encore beaucoup plus mal que moy, puisque ces derniers n’y peuvent conserver leurs armes ny leurs habillements. In all of this complaint there was criticism of de Verville’s plans and competence. At one point Saint-Ovide said he had resigned himself to the fact that he would have to speak again of the former engineer’s poor work.

Verrier, meanwhile, modified his earlier assessment of the governor’s wing, saying that “il a esté nécessaire de faire quelques ouvrages de plus dans ce pavillon pour le rendre un peu plus logeable.” The central passage tower remained unfinished, and Verrier proposed that it should incorporate a light to serve as a beacon for the harbour, thus saving the expense of constructing a separate lighthouse.

1727

All these problems were given prompt attention by Maurepas. With regard to the Ganet-Planton affair, he approved the cancellation of the agreement and the decision that Isabeau’s sister would continue the contract herself. Sieur Boevin, Isabeau’s brother-in-law, was on his way to carry on the work, and officials in Louisbourg were instructed to watch that work was well done. Verrier was to prepare a statement of the work which Ganet had done for Isabeau since 1725, and a new and larger contract was made with Ganet, whose prices were the same as Isabeau’s for the majority of items. This statement, one of the three important construction documents mentioned above, was concerned mostly with the south half of the barracks and gave important information concerning the governor’s wing and the officers’ quarters. In its 150 pages, specifications were given for the balcony which opened from the governor’s bedroom onto the left flank rampart, for the widening of fireplaces, a buffet in the dining room, paving in the central passage, a buffet, sink, drain, and
warming oven in the kitchen, a library in the governor’s wing, locks and bolts, and even fire ladders on the roof.\textsuperscript{112}

Maurepas approved that Verrier had only worked on the south half of the building the previous year, but he urged him to give attention to the other half, especially to the roof and water problem. Verrier was also to make any necessary repairs and, where they were the result of Isabeau’s negligence or poor workmanship, was to charge the cost to the estate. The engineer was urged to be fair in his assessment, and compensation was to be given Ganet for damage caused to his warehouse by a storm the year before.\textsuperscript{113}

Little new work was undertaken in 1727 and Verrier recorded only a number of repairs. The level of the ditch was lowered in an attempt to prevent water from seeping into the various basement rooms, and stone floors were added to make them more usable. Fireplaces and a stairway were added to the three rooms of the north half of the barracks, providing quarters for a whole company of troops. The panelling in the armoury over the central passage was extended to cover the walls as well as the ceiling in an attempt to prevent dampness, but the clock tower still only had a temporary roof and would not be safe until a permanent tower was erected. Because of their smokiness, the bays of the fireplace were widened “pour que la plus grande partie des Soldats d’une Chambrière puisse Se chauffer.” Broken shutters, damaged windows and door frames Verrier blamed on the carelessness of the soldiers. He also did not accept Saint-Ovide’s criticism of the poor distribution of the barracks.\textsuperscript{114} It was, he said, a good solid building laid out the same as those in France, though much later, in 1739, he thought the fireplaces should have been built in the middle wall to support the ridge. (The first of de Verville’s plans included this feature.)

Verrier had a number of proposals for the building. To alleviate the water problem, he suggested raising the ridge of the roof three pieds, thus steepening the slope so rain and snow would not blow back under the slates so easily. He also felt that some of the problem was caused by leaky dormers, and 25 were eliminated while he tried to seal the others with plaster and lead. By enclosing a plan for a lighthouse to be built on the point opposite the channel into the harbour, he apparently abandoned the idea of a light over the clock in the barracks, de Mézy claimed that it would easily be serviced from this terrace.\textsuperscript{115}

By this time the situation in Louisbourg had resulted in new alliances. De Mézy obviously had some sort of association with Madame Planton. Though he had signed joint reports which criticized her brother’s work he had not complained of it in his private letters to the king and had lately taken to blaming the weather for the faults in Isabeau’s construction. Verrier supported this position and also backed de Mézy in some other projects. As he had from the beginning, Saint-Ovide usually opposed de Mézy, and of course supported the present contractor. D’Arrigrand returned to France in this year leaving Ganet alone in Louisbourg. The partnership was not functioning smoothly, and was not renewed when it expired in 1730. D’Arrigrand later accused Ganet of playing politics while he was away. What actually took place is not known, but the result was that Ganet got a new contract by himself in 1730 and d’Arrigrand, inevitably, sued. This, however, was not the end of d’Arrigrand’s involvement in Louisbourg; he was to return in the 1730s.\textsuperscript{120}

In December, an unsigned memorandum, probably written by Saint-Ovide, complained that most of the floors of the soldiers’ barracks were rotten, that plastering was still not done, and that stairs, beds, windows and shutters still were needed. For the first time, a criticism of Verrier was recorded: “Il est absolument nécessaire que Monseigneur donn[e] Ses ordres a m Verrier pour commencer par mettre le Corps de Casernes en cet etat de pouvoir y Loger les off[iers] et les troupes, a Couvert de l’Injure dutem.”\textsuperscript{121}

Verrier reported some problems of his own. He requested a shipment of cut-stone from Rochefort to replace the brick door and window surrounds which were deteriorating quickly and could not hold their pintles.\textsuperscript{122} The major work remaining undone
was the tower for the clock, but it was several years before this feature dominated the horizon of Louisbourg.\textsuperscript{123}

\textbf{1728}

Maurepas' opening correspondence in 1728 rejected the plan of a separate lighthouse and returned to the original idea of a light in the tower over the barracks.\textsuperscript{124} He also ordered that a final accounting be made with the Isabeau heirs. Verrier, whom Maurepas believed, had a reputation for honesty and who was experienced in these matters, was instructed to reach an agreement with them.\textsuperscript{125}

In Louisbourg, Verrier was determined to have his separate lighthouse, and he informed Saint-Ovide and de Mézy that the clock tower, having only two arches, could not support a light. He admitted that de Mézy's terrace proposal would indeed save on wood, but this saving would be cancelled out by the amount of lead needed to seal the new roof.\textsuperscript{126}

De Mézy, meanwhile, had another project which would affect the barracks. He wanted to build a new bakery in the town near the stores building, but he was told that this could be postponed because the 1727 repairs had alleviated the water problem in the barracks bakery. The ordonnateur did not appreciate the cancellation of his plans and presented new objections to the present location. The room was so low that the bakers had to work bent over, in poor light, with great difficulties in transporting wood and flour. Its location was also a temptation for the soldiers who habitually congregated there.\textsuperscript{127} Sabatier, a treasury official in Louisbourg, supported de Mézy, adding that the bakery was a fire hazard and that it should only be used during a siege.\textsuperscript{128}

There was another difficulty in the barracks. Both de Mézy and Verrier reported that the armoumy was leaking in spite of the temporary roof, and that the tower should be completed as soon as possible.\textsuperscript{129} The following year Sabatier carried the idea one step further and recommended that the armoumy, which was under the control of the ordonnateur, be moved to the upper floor of the storehouse so as to be closer to the official in charge.\textsuperscript{130}

Finally, for this year, Verrier reported that four soldiers' rooms still had no beds, but that these were in the process of construction -- a far cry from the optimistic hopes of 1723 which had anticipated an early completion of the soldiers' lodgings. The rotten windows were being replaced, Verrier added, and he again defended de Verville's work.\textsuperscript{131} There were serious money difficulties in 1728, the current cash having run out, and Saint-Ovide had to postpone his trip to France, at Verrier's request, because the soldiers would have refused to work in his absence.\textsuperscript{132}

\textbf{1729–30}

1729–30 was a relatively quiet time during the construction of the barracks. Madame Planton died in July 1729,\textsuperscript{133} which meant that her estate also had to be settled, but this could not be done until her brother's estate had been properly inventoried. As was the custom after a death, seals had been placed on all the goods belonging to the deceased, but the manager of the estate received permission from de Mézy to have them lifted so he could continue the work which was still under way.\textsuperscript{134} A complete inventory of all the effects including papers was not undertaken until January 1731. More than 2,000 bills and accounts were found dating back to the earliest days of Isabeau's work in Louisbourg. There were numerous registers as well -- in all a formidable amount of documentation and a sizeable headache for Verrier who had to supervise the final accounting of this part of the estate.\textsuperscript{135}

Maurepas finally agreed that the light in the barracks tower and terrace on the roof were impractical.\textsuperscript{136} Estimates for work necessary in 1730 mentioned the replacement of brick with flat stone in the chimney flues which projected above the roof. The same material was to be used for the raising of gables which formed the kingposts of the roof. The cost of replacing the shingles with slate as a protection against fire and snow (one of de Verville's most persistent recommendations) was calculated at 26,800 livres,\textsuperscript{137} only 10,000 livres short of the original estimate for the whole building in 1718. Fifty thousand slates had been shipped in 1726 and 1729, and three times as many in 1730,\textsuperscript{138} along with 54 rolls of lead for sealing joints, a barrel of nails and two cases of bolts.\textsuperscript{139}

Verrier supported de Mézy's idea for a new bakery, but perhaps as a concession to Maurepas, who wanted to cut expenses, said that it could be deferred for a year or two, and other works including the barracks should take precedence.\textsuperscript{140}

In 1730 Ganet returned to France and obtained a new contract for continuing construction at Louisbourg with the same prices he had used in the 1725 bid. D'Arrigrand, this time backing another architect, claimed to have presented a bid which was 20 per cent less than Ganet's but which was refused. Moreover, the minister asked d'Arrigrand not to proceed with his suit until Ganet was free from his Louisbourg commitments so as not to interfere with work in progress.\textsuperscript{141}

\textbf{1731}

Though the barracks was not yet completed, 1731 marked the beginning of a number of changes which further altered the original plan of the building. The major undertaking was the raising of the roof of the governor's wing in an attempt to prevent the leak-
Plan and elevation of the barracks, ca. 1729. (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.)
age as well as provide room for servants in the attics. This involved rebuilding the walls of the second floor of the wing, thus allowing the replacement of the brick window surrounds with more durable cut-stone. On these higher walls a new roof structure was built which had a much steeper slope than the original. Fireplaces were added to the attics so living quarters for servants could be fashioned there. These changes are reflected in Figure 11 which dates from about 1729, and Figure 12 which dates from 1731. The new slope is best seen in the profile in Figure 12. Also evident are the altered windows and added fireplaces. All the chimneys of the building are taller in the latter plan, and this change was probably effected during the reconstruction of the flues in flat stone. Part of the materials used in these changes, especially planks and timber, was obtained from English ships which were frequenting Louisbourg in increasing numbers.

At the end of the year Saint-Ovide reported that he was at last pleased with his lodging: "le Pavillon Des Cazernes [que] J'habite a esté mis dans sa perfection ce Logement est presentement beau & Commode." Verrier elaborated on the work which had been done. Aside from the roof being raised, the wing had been slated and the fireplaces widened. Verrier hoped to slate the rest of the building the following year, widen the fireplaces and replace the jambs as well. Sensing Maurepas' impatience with the prolongation of work on this building, he added that these works would be done "afin que votre Grandeur n'entendre plus parler al'avenir des Casernes."

In the final accounting of Isabeau's estate, completed at this time, the heirs received 17,641 livres, 7 sols. From this they had to pay other creditors the sum of 10,239 livres, 6 sols, leaving just over 7,300 livres. It had taken seven years after Isabeau's death for the estate to be settled, but this was not uncommon given the communications and ponderous legal procedures of the time.

1732–34
These years witnessed a change in administration. De Mézy had gone to France in 1731 and his son, Le Normant, carried on in his stead. The father retired in 1733 and Le Normant was confirmed in the position of commissaire (but not ordonnateur) by Maurepas, who observed that the son seemed willing to get along with Saint-Ovide, a condition which was absolutely necessary for the good of the service.

Maurepas also had another reason to be pleased with the situation at Louisbourg. To Saint-Ovide he wrote "Je Suis bien aise que vous y Soyés a present convenablement et commodement [housed]." Changes similar to those made on the governor's wing were contemplated for the wing which had originally been designated as the residence of the commissaire-ordonnateur, but Verrier was ordered to suspend them pending an examination of cost. These quarters were to come under considerable scrutiny during the next few years as Le Normant sought to avoid living there. In the end only a few partitions were changed as well as a stair and a fireplace, and four subalterns lived there along with the soldiers.

The small quarrels which accompany any large undertaking were certainly still present at Louisbourg, but it was a relief that the rancour and bitterness of the Isabeau-de Verville days were gone. Le Normant and Saint-Ovide had their differences concerning administrative procedures, and both complained that Verrier did not turn over all his work accounts and that he was taking the contractor's part in wage disputes. Le Normant, however, assured Maurepas of his intention to live in harmony with Saint-Ovide, and Maurepas, for his part, took a firm hand with Verrier telling him not to interfere in wage disputes but to let the workers and contractor come to their own agreement.

English goods continued to come into the colony, and in 1732 a list was made of all the ships arriving that year. A considerable number of planks, bricks and shingles as well as finished goods were unloaded from the 39 ships that came, and some of this material undoubtedly found its way into the barracks.

Also at this time many of the small details in the building were nearing completion. The armoury was finally dry and could contain 1,000 guns, but it was moved to a new location above the new bakery in 1733. This second armoury held 3,000 guns and Verrier said that the old one had been much too narrow and could not be used. Slatting of the officers' barracks and the north wing was set for 1733. In 1732 Verrier submitted a drawing for a bell tower (Fig. 13) which was built in 1733, but it was not until the following year that a three-foot bell along with a clock and ringer arrived from France. More deterioration was reported by Sabatier: the barracks floors were almost all rotten because of the humidity from the basements, which required vents; the stairs in the soldiers' barracks were also in a poor state.

1735–39
On 31 March 1735, 15 years after construction had begun, a small ceremony was held to bless the bells for Louisbourg, one of which, called Saint-Louis, was destined for the bell tower of the barracks chapel and marked the completion of the building.

There was still work to be done, however, and it was not until the fall of 1736 that the north wing was reported ready, the delay being blamed on the shortage of roofers. The rotting floors
12 The barracks in 1731. Compare height of wings, plan of stairway in governor's wing, and guardrooms to the right of the drawbridge with Figure 9. (Archives du Comité Technique du Génie, Paris.)
The clock tower, 1733. (Archives Nationales, Paris.)
were still a worry, and Sabatier maintained that even some of the floors in the upper rooms would have to be redone.\textsuperscript{164} Maurepas believed that filling in the basements was the best solution since they were not used and proved injurious to health,\textsuperscript{165} but this was not practical since the basement walls were not strong enough to withstand the pressure without counterwalls.

Brick and plaster needed attention during this period. The outside walls of the barracks were replastered,\textsuperscript{166} and it was reported that this repair would have to be done every three years.\textsuperscript{167} Verrier reported that the brick from Port Toulouse (an outpost of the colony near Canso) which had been used by de Verville in the cordons and angles of buildings as well as in window jambs, was rapidly deteriorating. In the past, he recalled, chimney stacks and several doors and windows had been redone in flat stone. He recommended repairing the angles with well-baked bricks from New England because using stone would necessitate too many alterations. Only the outer facing of bricks to a thickness of four pouces had to be replaced.\textsuperscript{168} It was also recommended that all wood exposed to the air be painted to help preserve it; as with other recommendations, it was several years before this was done.\textsuperscript{169} Finally Verrier, who had expended so much energy in getting the governor’s wing ready, expressed the opinion that: “Mons de Brouillan [Saint-Ovide] doit avoir lieu d’estre Contant en ce qui regarde les lieux quil occupe, il ne devoit pas appreander que Son logement fut neglige.”\textsuperscript{170} Presumably this referred to unspecified repairs which were made to the wing at that time.

Two changes in 1736 affected construction in Louisbourg. D’Arrigrand had not been idle since his departure from Louisbourg; in 1734 he secured a concession on Ile Royale for which he hired, as manager, an architect from Dijon, Bernard Muiron. When Ganet’s contract came up for renewal in 1736, d’Arrigrand allowed Muiron to submit bids for it. In the first presentation of prices Muiron’s bids were consistently higher than Ganet’s,\textsuperscript{171} but, as d’Arrigrand later wrote, he authorised Muiron “de faire une grosse diminution, uniquement pour lors, dans la vué d’oter le St’. Ganet desd. fortifications, et par la l’obliger de revenir à Paris, à portée de luy faire rendre compte.”\textsuperscript{172} This time d’Arrigrand was successful in removing Ganet.\textsuperscript{173} However, the new contract did not include regular maintenance work, and a series of contracts was passed with various Louisbourg tradesmen for repairs in their various skills. Thus Jean Bernard was given the contract to maintain the roofs and chimneys, Jean Durand was responsible for timber work, Louis Logier was to maintain carpentry and windows, and Jean Claparede the locks and iron work.\textsuperscript{174} The repairs carried out under these contracts were extensive and showed just how much care the building required. Locks were re-

1739–45

In 1739 there was a major change of personnel in Louisbourg. Saint-Ovide, who had been summoned to France in 1738, had an unpleasant interview with Maurepas who accused him of having a share in Ganet’s contract.\textsuperscript{176} Despite his denial, Saint-Ovide was retired with a pension, and Isaac-Louis de Forant, a ship’s captain, was sent to govern Louisbourg. He arrived with a new ordonnateur, Francois Bigot, Le Normant having been promoted to the intendency of Santo Domingo.\textsuperscript{177}

The new governor was not impressed with his lodgings and one of his first acts was an offer to turn over the wing as soldiers’ quarters and move into Verrier’s house. Verrier himself was returning to France for the winter; in that way de Forant said, he would also be nearer what concerned the town and port – hardly a credible reason.\textsuperscript{178} He found many inconveniences in the building and, while waiting to see if his suggestion would be adopted, ordered doors changed, panelling put in, partitions added, and the kitchen supplemented.\textsuperscript{179} He thought he had found a solution to the constant wetness in the governor’s wing by demolishing the two chimney stacks from the attic fireplace. The fireplaces which Saint-Ovide had put in at considerable expense were thus rendered impracticable. De Forant felt that these stacks created a trough where water gathered only to be blown back under the slates; “j’ay p[ensé] qu’il valoit mieux Sen passer que drete inondé a la moindre pluye.”\textsuperscript{180}

De Forant did not live to enjoy the changes he effected. In May 1740 he died and was replaced in November by another ship’s captain, Jean-Baptiste Louis Le Prévost Duquesnel. This new official, as well, was not satisfied with his quarters and ordered more changes, including panelling in a cabinet and another room, an oven, an enlargement of a fireplace with a stone base beneath, and a stable and a pigeon roost in the courtyard.\textsuperscript{181} Only a total cost of these items was given so the quality of the various works cannot be assessed, but Maurepas was not pleased with this expense or the fact that work was done without permission; he wrote to both Duquesnel and Bigot, who had also made considerable changes in his lodgings, that it was forbidden to make alterations without express permission except for simple maintenance repairs.\textsuperscript{182}

Internal changes were made in other parts of the barracks. Work orders were submitted for changing the soldiers’ guardhouse to a prison, and six leg and hand irons were ordered for...
this new prison. A new masonry guardhouse was built across the ditch on the townward side a few feet from the drawbridge.

General painting, which had been recommended in 1738 to preserve all exposed wood, was not accomplished until 1744. One of the reasons for the delay was that in 1743, the shipment of linseed oil, once a necessary ingredient in paint, was improperly loaded and the oil leaked out during the journey. Paint was added to the new contracts beginning in 1742, and it became the responsibility of the contractor to preserve all the wood by this means. The colour used was dark red made from red ochre.

More than the usual number of repairs were recorded in 1744. The floor of the governor’s kitchen required a new beam and the fireplace and oven were redone in cut-stone. One of the walls of this wing was in danger of collapsing so one of the angles was rebuilt and three windows above in the council chamber were replaced with cut-stone. In the barracks only a general list of repairs using masonry, plaster, cut-stone and wood was given, but these appeared to be extensive. In October, 1744, Duquesnel died suddenly. The governor’s wing was vacant, allowing time for repairs to the collapsing wall so the quarters would be in a state to receive the new governor. Bigot expressed the hope, which must have been shared by officials in France, that the new governor would be happy with his quarters, otherwise there would be new expenditures. However, the new governor never saw his quarters. In the spring of 1745, Louisbourg was placed under siege and capitulated to a volunteer force from New England on 26 June.

1745–48

During the siege in 1745, the roof of the barracks suffered considerable damage and the chapel was eventually abandoned. The bell in the tower suffered a direct hit, but the clock was undamaged. William Pepperell, the New England commander, reported in 1747 that the barracks in general was “much out of repair, tho’ that at the Citadel is otherwise a very good and strong Building of Brick and Stone.”

Reports by Hopson in 1749 indicated that a new roof had been built and shingled, with the exception of the governor’s wing which retained its slate, and that a whole new set of windows including arches, jambs and sills had been put in as well as quoins and pilasters. The inside roof of the chapel was repaired and two galleries were added, presumably on either side of the altar. The whole of this room was filled “with proper Seats and Pews.”

The governor’s wing was repaired and some chimneys added. These chimneys may have been those which had been blocked out by de Forant in the attic and were now being restored to use. There is no evidence that any major alterations were made in the barracks, however, and none is mentioned in the French documents during the reoccupation.

1749

On 24 July 1749, the French officials, having settled the terms of transfer of the colony back to its former possessors, went on a tour of the fortifications. Boucher, now the acting engineer-in-chief, recorded that the barracks a été retably dans toutes les parties ou il avait été mal traité de l’artillerie pendant Le Siege, il a toujours été occupé juisques a présent mais tous les planchers en general Sont pourris par mal proprete et hors d’Etat de Servir La Campagne prochaine: la couverture est apresent en bardeau. Le Pavillon servant cy devant de Logement a Messieurs les Gouverneurs est Etaye dans un de Ses angles Exterieurs et demande une reparation Considerable, la Couverture est en ardoise comme elle estoit.

In August, Boucher made a detailed estimate of repairs needed in all of Louisbourg and revealed that the most serious problem in the barracks concerned the wall of the governor’s wing facing the town, which had to be reconstructed from the foundations to the first floor. The two angles were to be redone in cut-stone as were the four ground-floor windows. Ten other windows and eight in the chapel were also to be replaced in cut-stone, and the ditch which the English had used as a refuse dump was to be excavated and cleaned. All the ground-level floors were to be rebuilt with timbers and planks. The shingle roof required repair, but the clock tower which had been hit and left in a useless state would be, he felt, costly to repair. The usual staircase and lock and bolt repairs were also specified.

By December, Boucher was able to report a number of works completed by Claude Coeuret, a contractor working under the authority of the ordonnateur. The seats of the chapel which the English had installed were dismantled and the wood was used to make a temporary altar and for many of the floor repairs. A partition was added to one of the rooms of the north wing, allowing it to be used for two prisons. Beds, tables and buffets were constructed. Locks and bolts and keys, including a spring bolt for the main door, were installed. Seventy-seven windows were replaced and 407 panes cleaned and puttied. The roofs of the outbuildings in the bastion, which had blown off during a storm, were replaced. Two coats of whitewash were applied to the sanctuary of the chapel, and holes in the walls were filled in.
1750–58

In August 1750, Coëuret was awarded a formal contract for work on the buildings and fortifications of Louisbourg. In December Boucher submitted a 13-page account of work done on the barracks and bastion during that year.

Many of the works, which Boucher had estimated months before, were included. Twenty-two days had been spent cleaning up the rubbish on the terreplein and along the barracks, and two basement rooms in the soldiers’ quarters were filled in. Many of the temporary beds in the casemates were dismantled and the wood used to repair floors or to shore up the basement and council chamber of the governor’s wing. There were the usual repairs of doors, partitions, fireplaces, staircases, locks and bolts, hinges and pints. Some old cut-stones were recut, or replaced where necessary. Two iron stoves were made for the governor’s wing. Amazingly, only 21 window panes were required to be replaced in the entire building. Eight 20-foot ladders were placed on the roof and three other ladders 21 feet long were also built. The door of the vestibule of the governor’s wing had a lock with five keys and a spring bell had been installed, probably at the main door of the residence. Some alterations were made to the chapel, and the door to the gallery was fitted with a lock with 40 keys for the officers. A new bell was set up on a frame on the ground across from the guardhouse and the soldiers rang the hours; some were over-zealous in their assignment and cracked the bell, which had to be sent to France to be recast.

In 1751 Boucher reported the old complaint of lack of workmen, saying he was not able to complete repairs to the barracks. There remained 10 attic floors to remake, but the present ones, he felt, could serve until they were replaced. The governor’s wing required considerable attention:

Le pavillon du gouvernement étoit en Si Mauvais état, que Jay commençé par prendre Sous oeuvre toute la partie Exterieure du Costé du fossé, depuis Sa fondation jusq. a la premiere plinte, qui fait le rez de chaussée et la hauteur des caves; la partie au dessus jusques a l’Entreblement, etoit aussi fort endommagée.

Five wooden floors of the wing, four on the ground floor and that of the big hall upstairs, were replaced. In the chapel the sanctuary floor was also laid and the eight large windows were totally repaired.

However, when the new governor Jean-Louis, le comte de Raymond arrived he was not impressed with his lodging, claiming that “il me seroit impossible d’y demeurer. C’est une vraye glacière et il n’y a aucune commodité qui puisse convenir à l’état de ma maison.” As his predecessor had done, he went to live in the engineer’s house in Block 1 and during all this period the engineer was forced to live elsewhere at a cost to the treasury of 400 livres. In 1753 Franquet, the new engineer, recommended that the governor move back into his wing in the barracks, ostensibly to save money, though doubtless Franquet was looking forward to occupying the engineer’s quarters himself. It was not until June of 1755 that Franquet was able to say that the barracks was ready, and that the new governor, Augustin de Drucour, had taken up residence in the governor’s wing when he arrived in 1754. Little else is reported about the barracks before the second siege.

In 1758 the fortress was again besieged by the British army. On July 22, at the height of the cannonade, Drucour reported: lintendie arrivée au Corps de Cazernes du Bastion du Roy, nous a tellement occupés depuis neuf heures le matin Jusqu’à la nuit, que nous n’avons pu Servir le reste des canons qu’inparfaitement. Ce feu a été occasionné par une Bombe des ennemis qui a tombé dans la Chambrée des soldats proche de la Voute du Clocher de la Chapelle, les soldats Se Sont occupés a l’evacuer et le feu n’y a paru que lors qu’il a été assez embrazé, pour que la droite et la gauche en ayent été attaquées Jusqu’à la Batterie du flanc droit que nous avons preservé a force de Soin et du monde, et Jusqu au pavillon du Gouvernement.

1758–68

A view of the town after the English took over (Fig. 14) shows what remained of the barracks. The governor’s wing and part of the officers’ quarters were intact, but of the rest only the triangular masonry partitions remained. A report on the building in August 1758, stated: “The roofs and floors of this building are burnt there remains only the Pavillon . . . and even this has been much battered during the siege.”

However, repairs were made to the building and it was exempted from the 1760 demolition which saw the razing of all the fortifications. In 1766 a drawing recorded what had become of the barracks (Fig. 15); over the ruins of the old north half, a one-storey wooden barracks, about half as wide as the original barracks, was constructed. The clock tower, chapel, and most of the officers’ quarters were still in ruins, but the governor’s wing was listed as reparable for use as an officers’ barracks.

There was no recorded end to the occupation of the barracks. Like most of the other buildings in Louisbourg it gradually disintegrated and was pillaged for building materials after the British abandoned the site in 1768. In 1897 a visitor was told by an occupant whose house reputedly sat on the site of the governor’s wing that in his father’s time there remained vaulted cellars, a well and a spiral staircase, all of which had been knocked down by the
14 The barracks (H) is in ruins after the 1758 siege except for the governor’s wing to the right. Note the breaches in the bastion walls. (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.)

15 The governor’s wing (1) is still intact in 1766; the chapel and officers’ quarters are still in ruins but new barracks (2) have been constructed. The walls of the fortifications were demolished in 1760. (British Museum, London.)
Life in the Barracks

Introduction

As with the construction, the history of the furnishing and occupation of the barracks is one of struggle, alteration and delay. Unfortunately the sources for this aspect of the building's existence are neither as extensive nor as organized as the construction accounts. Inventories of the barracks were made, but none have yet been found except for one inventory for the governor's wing. Details of daily life in the building are not readily available, and only an incomplete picture has so far emerged.

A serious impediment to a more complete analysis of daily routine is an almost total absence of informal journals or even private letters for this period. The information presented here is taken from official correspondence, plans of the barracks, and selected judicial records.

The 1731 barracks plan (Fig. 12) was the first to give the scheme of room distribution for the barracks. The governor's wing (no. 1 on the plan) was for the use of the government and included the governor's quarters, rooms for the superior council and basement rooms for the use of the governor. The adjoining rooms (no. 2) were officers' quarters, some of which were partitioned so that ideally, officers could be individually housed. The room (no. 3) which led into the chapel was reserved as a sacristy and chaplain's residence. The chapel (no. 4) completed this half of the barracks. The main entrance was next, with a drawbridge over the ditch; the long room above this central passageway was an armoury. The room on the ground floor to the right of the entrance was a guardroom (no. 5). The remainder of the rooms were for the soldiers (no. 6) including those in the north wing which had originally been designated as the ordonnateur's residence. The barracks were serviced by latrines in the right face casemates (no. 9).

Accommodations were a permanent problem in Louisbourg. While awaiting the decision on where the Ile Royale fortifications were to be constructed, and then for the decision on what form the fortifications were to take, temporary lodgings were constructed for the governor, officers and soldiers. This complex, which in the end consisted of a series of long buildings forming a quadrangle, did not long survive except for the government building which appears on the 1725 plan (Fig. 9, the building near M).

By 1719, the year before barracks construction began, the garrison at Louisbourg was composed of seven companies, each with 45 men and 3 officers, though, with absenteeism, the actual total was 19 officers and 297 men. Garrison officials seemed to be constantly changing quarters and, because of lack of hous-
ing, some of the officers and their families were sent to the outposts of Port Toulouse and Port Dauphin for the winter. In 1720, at the engineer’s request, they remained there since the barracks were not yet able to accommodate them.³

North Half of Barracks

North Wing (pavillion droit)

It was originally intended that the ordonnateur occupy the north wing of the barracks, but for years he managed to evade this design until it was officially agreed that the wing be used for other purposes. Before construction of the barracks the ordonnateur, de Mézy, had built a house on the north shore of the harbour (the better to survey fishing during the season, he claimed). From the beginning, even before the faults of the barracks were evident, he made it clear that he was not going to live in the barracks, calling it a stable.⁴ In a report of 1720 he stated that he hoped the governor would be able to move into the governor’s wing the following year, and the king’s lieutenant and the major into the north wing, pointedly excusing himself from occupying that area. He suggested that the governor’s present residence would suit him and his offices nicely.

The ministry did not approve these suggestions and said that any final decisions would await de Verville’s report.⁵ In the spring of 1722, the answer came that changes in the original plans were not to be tolerated, and de Mézy would therefore have to live in the barracks.⁶ The ordonnateur, however, had no intention of moving. In his official correspondence he reported that he was willing to move, but there were numerous objections – the wing was not ready; even when completed it should be used for soldiers since there was not enough room for all of them in the barracks; moreover, it was not natural for an ordonnateur to be shut up in a citadel.⁷ Saint-Ovide was not pleased that his colleague could evade his assigned housing and reported that de Mézy had told him he had no intention of ever moving into the barracks. Saint-Ovide felt it was quite natural for the ordonnateur to live there: “Je ne puis m’empêcher monseigneur de vous Représentés que Cest Eloignement [of the ordonnateur from the centre of things] Prolonge et Derrange entièrement Les affaires du Roy, Et Celle du Commerce.”⁸

The ministry was in a difficult position; whatever the decision, it would offend someone. There were so many other dissatisfactions and quarrels at Louisbourg at this time that the ministry may have felt this point was not worth pressing. In 1724 it was finally decided that de Mézy not live in the north wing but that it remain empty, and be considered the ordonnateur’s residence, presumably so the next occupant of that position would be able to move in and avoid the same situation.⁹ Up to this time four rooms of this wing were in use, two by the major, one for a temporary guardroom and the fourth as a temporary armoury.¹⁰

De Mézy, not surprisingly, was very pleased with the decision. It would not have been possible, he wrote, to conduct his affairs while shut up in the barracks away from his offices and the people with whom he had to have daily contact. He added that he and de Verville had made a study which showed that there would be room for only six companies and their officers in the barracks even if the governor and the adjutant shared the governor’s wing and the major and garçons majors the north wing.¹¹

In 1726 four rooms of the north wing were still occupied as they had been two years before. A year later Verrier finished three other fireplaces in the wing and reported that a company could be lodged there.¹² However, Saint-Ovide had not given up the idea of having de Mézy with him in the barracks. With the raising of his own wing in 1731 he reported that when the other wing was completed, de Mézy could very conveniently move in with all his offices.¹³

De Mézy, however, had a project of his own. He had since moved from his home in the north of the harbour to a rather elegant new one on the quay. At this time he went to France and endeavoured to sell this home to the government for use as the official residence for the ordonnateur. To do this he had to answer points which Saint-Ovide had raised. His main argument was that buying this house would be cheaper for the government (only 20,000 livres) than alterations to the north wing. He claimed that the changes in the governor’s wing had cost double what a house cost. He also returned to his old argument about needing to be near the affairs of the town: “il n’est guère Naturel denfermer dans un réduit LeComte ordonnateur.”¹⁴ It is not known if there was any reaction to his referring to the citadel as a mere “redoubt,” a word which, in French, can also mean “hovel.”

His arguments won out, and Verrier was ordered to suspend any repairs in progress and submit an estimate of the cost of altering the north wing.¹⁵ In his reply the engineer said that to make the wing suitable, all of it would have to be torn down since the present room divisions did not allow the best use to be made of the wing. His advice was to slate the roof at its present level so it could be used as a barracks, and to have the government purchase de Mézy’s house on the quay.¹⁶ In 1733 Maurepas gave his approval, and ordered the three top officials of the colony to report on how that wing could best be used.¹⁷ A contract for the sale of the de Mézy house was sent to Paris,¹⁸ and it was agreed
that since there was not enough room for officers in the barracks, the north wing would be used as additional officers’ quarters.

The idea of housing the king’s lieutenant in the north wing had been considered, but the changes required for this would also have been extensive and the soldiers who were then in the wing would have had no place to go. Apparently, the major had moved out of his two rooms and it was thought that by changing a few partitions, four subalterns could share those rooms with the soldiers remaining in the rest of the wing.\(^19\) The following year a fuller examination resulted in the report that by changing a stair and a fireplace and by adding a small cabinet with a bed for each officer, the lodgings would be quite suitable.\(^20\) Approval for this was finally given in the spring of 1735.\(^21\) Since there was no rush for lodgings for subalterns at that time (making one suspect that the reported shortage of lodgings for officers was exaggerated) and since slate was in short supply, no work was done that year.\(^22\) The wing was finally ready in 1736\(^23\) and the four subalterns moved into two unspecified rooms, with soldiers occupying the remainder of the wing. As far as is known, these men were the occupants of the north wing until the first siege.

**Soldiers’ Barracks**

The soldiers’ barracks rooms were a priority item in the early years of construction at Louisbourg, but they were not completed until the end of the 1720s. The basic design for this part of the building incorporated three blocks of rooms with entrances from the courtyard to corridors which ran perpendicular to the length of the building. Two corridors gave access to four downstairs rooms and, up the stairway, to four upstairs rooms while a third gave access to two downstairs and two upstairs rooms adjacent to the guardrooms. The guardrooms by the central passage were cut off from the barracks rooms, and entry was from the passage (Figs. 11 and 12).

There was evidently no communication between the blocks of rooms, so one had to go outside to reach another set of rooms. Access to the attics and basements was by ladder through trapdoors, except for the bakery which was serviced by a stairway.

The extensive repairs in 1736 give some indication of room layout in the soldiers’ barracks since the rooms were listed in sequence. This numbering began in the north wing and dealt with each block of eight rooms. However, each time this was done the order was slightly different, so in 1738 numbers were painted on the doors to give some consistency to the records;\(^24\) unfortunately no documents reveal just how this numbering was done. From the repair records it is known that three rooms had trap-doors leading to the basement, and three had similar doors to the attics, but since only those items are mentioned which required repair it is quite likely that there were other such doors.\(^25\)

By the end of 1722 ten soldiers’ rooms were ready, but two of these were used as an armoury and guardroom. Five French companies and one Swiss company were lodged in the other eight rooms.\(^26\) There were seven companies in Louisbourg at this time in addition to a detachment of miners,\(^27\) so the remainder of the troops must have been housed in the old barracks, which were reported to be in a poor state.\(^28\)

When 60 new men arrived the following year no new rooms were available. They had to live in the attics of the finished rooms, which were not made for such a load and were not equipped with fireplaces.\(^29\) The same situation arose in 1724 when 50 Swiss soldiers arrived. These men were placed in barracks rooms which did not as yet have fireplaces. (There is no indication of where they spent the winters, since the barracks would have been unbearable without warmth.)\(^30\) The situation was hardly better in 1725; many rooms still did not have fireplaces, the upstairs rooms were accessible only by ladders rather than stairways, and the minor room finishings were only just begun.\(^31\) In 1726 it was reported that 21 soldiers’ rooms, both large and small, were ready though there were still no permanent stairways.\(^32\) The finishings of these rooms were still not done in 1727 and a request was made for stairs, plastering, whitewash, chairs, beds and shutters.\(^33\) By the end of 1728 four rooms were still without beds.\(^34\) Presumably these were completed shortly thereafter and the basic furnishings of the soldiers’ barracks were at last in place, eight years after the beginning of construction.

The number of soldiers in a room varied according to circumstances. In 1722, while construction was still going on, six companies were living in eight rooms. At this time there were 45 soldiers plus two sergeants per company, giving approximately 35 men per room, certainly less than ideal for a room normally expected to hold 16 men.\(^35\) By 1726 it was reported that 21 rooms housed 300 men, or about 15 per room.\(^36\) In 1753 an accounting in the building listed 26 large and 10 small rooms for soldiers (by this time the officers’ rooms had been turned over to the soldiers). Thus 536 men could be lodged, with 16 men in the larger rooms and 12 in the rooms which were reduced in size by the stairways.\(^37\) This was the situation in the barracks during normal occupancy.

A hospital was originally planned for the barracks, and two rooms and a kitchen were to be utilized for this purpose. One of the rooms was for the sick and the other was for the Brother of Charity and his surgical chest.\(^38\) However, there was not enough...
room in the building and two rooms could not be spared. A temporary hospital was erected until the permanent one was ready, and the surgeon major was ordered to place an apprentice in the barracks to shave the troops and give first aid to accident victims; the following year Saint-Ovide proudly reported that he had received no complaints from the officers on the subject of the barber-surgeon.

In the original plan the ovens in two of the basement rooms of the soldiers' quarters were for the garrison bakery in which four bakers worked. The floors were cobbled, and tables, trestles and shelves were added. There were constant complaints about the dampness and the fact that a foot and a half of water stood in the bakery for half the year. As early as 1727 plans were begun for a new bakery in the town. The ditch in front of the barracks was deepened to relieve the water problem, but the location had for a new bakery in the town. The ditch in front of the barracks was deepened to relieve the water problem, but the location had other inconveniences and was a temptation for the soldiers: "les boulangers ny ont pas leur hauteur travaillent corbés avec bien de la peine, elle n’est point Éclairée et a toutes les incomodo[itês] imaginables pour le transport de la farine et du bois et la frequent[ation] continuelle des soldats qui y boire jouent, et fument." Maurepas tried to put off the establishment of the bakery but the officials at Louisbourg were determined to have it and produced new complaints. In 1729 Sabatier, the controlleur, said there was danger of fire in the bakery and that it should only be used in case of siege. The new bakery was finally finished in 1732; after this the basement rooms of the barracks appear not to have been used and there were requests for them to be filled to eliminate the dampness which was rotting the floors.

Equally unused were the attics of the barracks. Though it had been hoped that they could be used for storage and had been pressed into service as emergency barracks it was discovered that the walls and joists could not permanently support any real burden. De Mézy claimed that it never was intended to use them and that if stores were placed there the garrison would be in danger of being crushed.

Soldiers' Furnishings
Furnishings for soldiers' rooms were subject to few regulations. The Code des Armées Navales had nothing to say on the matter, and the Code Militaire, quoting an ordinance of 1716, specified only that the rooms contain as many beds as possible with a table, two benches and a fireplace. There are no plans showing room furnishings for the barracks, but there are some for other buildings in Île Royale. A small barracks for the outpost of Port Toulouse showed five soldiers' beds lining two walls of the rooms with a fireplace in the third wall and a door in the fourth. The centre of the rooms was left bare, presumably for a table and benches. Such furnishings are described in an account of the barracks of the Island Battery at Louisbourg; three tables were 6 pieds long and 2 pieds wide, and six benches were 6 pieds long. There was also a folding table 4 pieds long and 2-1/2 pieds wide. In a corner of two of the rooms in Port Toulouse there were small cubicles or cabinets, presumably for sergeants. A proposed new barracks for Louisbourg, drawn up in 1739, included a small sergeants' room with two beds, while the large rooms had seven beds lining two of the walls. A plan of the Royal Battery barracks shows bunk-beds, the only plans to do so. Finally, a plan of a redoubt in 1752 showed a room for sergeants separate from that of the soldiers.

It is evident that the furnishings in soldiers' rooms were evolving and that later barracks included items not thought of when the King's Bastion barracks was constructed in the 1720s. Those constructed by the English during their occupation had shelves, but the 1736 contract in Louisbourg only mentioned shelves in connection with officers' rooms. Eventually French barracks did adopt more elaborations for soldiers' rooms as represented by the plans for a barracks in Mont Dauphin in 1789. In that example, each room contained 15 beds which projected out into the room. In the centre was a stove, on one side of which were two tables and benches, and on the other side one table, a bench and a gun rack for 30 guns, one per man. Shelves suspended from the ceiling and fixed to the walls provided space for equipment and food. There were also small rooms built in for sergeants who had their own tables and benches. It is interesting to note that this barracks also provided rooms for married soldiers and a boutique or small store, as well as the usual armouries, guardrooms and storerooms. The barracks of the King's Bastion was far from incorporating all these developments, and did not even originally include sergeants' cabinets though their later addition to the rooms is found in repair documents which distinguish between soldiers' and sergeants' rooms. Since each company occupied roughly three large rooms and each had two sergeants, probably every third room in the barracks had a small cabinet for a sergeant.

The beds used by soldiers were double bunk-beds. A common practice was to assign three men to each bed, with two sleeping in it at one time and the third on guard. This was prescribed for the barracks in Louisbourg in 1718 but seems never to have been in effect, and later sources mention only two soldiers to a bed. Bunk-beds seem not to have been the usual barracks accommodation, but the evidence for their use in Louisbourg is conclusive. In 1726 Saint-Ovide and de Mézy had written that 300 men could be lodged in the barracks "in two beds one over the other." An-
other reference stated that each bed slept two and that they were placed one over the other,\textsuperscript{62} while testimony in a trial confirmed that two men did indeed share a bed; a soldier assured the court that he did not leave his bed during the night and that his comrade with whom he slept could testify to that. In another trial it was revealed that a board beside the bed served as a small storage space for goods and was held in place by a cord and a bracket.\textsuperscript{63} In the barracks, then, there were four double bunk-beds in each large room and three in each small one, allowing adequate room in the middle for eating and other activities.

For their beds the soldiers were provided with straw ticks, usually made by town widows, or by the Sisters of the Congregation.\textsuperscript{64} In the beginning it had been a question of whether to provide proper mattresses or make do with straw ticks, but the argument was put forth that the mattresses would rot in the damp climate whereas ticks could easily be changed; besides, mattresses were very expensive.\textsuperscript{65} Ticking was ordered from France and turned over to the women for sewing.\textsuperscript{66} The blankets provided were woollen and decorated with a centred, embroidered fleur-de-lis. Blankets and sheets were contracted out for cleaning and mending.\textsuperscript{67} On one occasion an enterprising sergeant had this concession for both the hospital and barracks; he was later found to be stealing utensils, locks and other objects.\textsuperscript{68}

The policy on room furnishings was not consistent. One reference from 1751 indicated that as long as the soldiers were earning extra money as labourers,\textsuperscript{69} they would have to provide their own blankets and pots. As with most other things the supplying of these items tended to be erratic. Evidence of other furnishings in the soldiers’ rooms emerges from the documents. Seven oak tables and a dozen benches were specified in one work account.\textsuperscript{70} Another mentioned iron scrapers for cleaning the floor and wooden shovels for carrying out refuse.\textsuperscript{71} In the late 1730s it was proposed that sinks be installed in the soldiers’ rooms for washing utensils and to promote better hygiene, but there is no indication that this was ever carried out.\textsuperscript{72}

\textbf{Soldiers’ Daily Life}

It is important to state again that barracks in the 18th century were a relatively new concept and that procedures and traditions which are taken for granted now were then in the process of evolution. Much of what went on in the barracks was a direct carry-over from the days when soldiers lived singly in billets, and common features of today’s military life such as messing and mess rooms were unknown. Another concept foreign to today’s highly programmed military life was the fact that the soldier, during most times, had the choice of whether he would join the local labour market or not. He also had the right to bargain with his employer for his wages even on government jobs, and to decide whether pay was to be per unit of time or by work done. Only during emergencies were soldiers compelled to work and the wages fixed at a given level. That is not to say that the soldiers had the right to strike or thought of bargaining as it is known now, but the soldiers did get a better pay scale than the contractor had originally proposed and they did leave work if they felt like it without fearing consequences. There was even a threat of work stoppage if pay was not forthcoming.\textsuperscript{73}

The basic pay for a day’s work was 20 \textit{sols} (one \textit{livre}) but in 1754, for example, salaries were reported in the 20–30 \textit{sols} range with the soldiers wanting 30–50 \textit{sols} and the engineer suggesting a compromise of 25–35 \textit{sols}.\textsuperscript{74} For military duty the ordinary soldier received 6 \textit{sols} per day, but deductions for rations and equipment reduced this to only one \textit{sol} leaving a monthly net salary of 1-1/2 \textit{livres}, or the amount that could be earned in a day and a half of work. (For a list of 18th-century salaries, see Appendix A.) Regulations for the colonies also tried to protect the soldiers as valets or in other capacities, and by also forbidding any deductions from the soldiers’ salary.\textsuperscript{75}

Most of the soldiers were unskilled and did labouring jobs such as hauling, loading, digging and gathering wood. Others, more skilled, were employed as masons, carpenters, bakers, tapestry workers, kiln workers, gardeners, tutors in reading and writing, and tailoring. Some of the jobs were permanent but other soldiers seemed to have picked up odd jobs where available and when they felt like it, such as the soldier who sold 100 faggots to the contractor for 16 \textit{livres}, and later helped unload a lime kiln.\textsuperscript{76} Of the 16 \textit{livres} this soldier earned, 6 were spent on drink with two companions, 2 on tobacco, then several quarts of liquor were purchased and shared with some soldiers, and 15 \textit{sols} spent on transportation. At the end of the day only 2 \textit{livres} remained.

In Louisbourg it is known that reveille was at 4:00 a.m.\textsuperscript{77} The \textit{Code Militaire} specified that in the winter this was changed to 6:00 a.m., and Louisbourg probably followed this practice. Evening retreat would have been at 8:00 p.m. in the summer and 9:00 p.m. in winter.\textsuperscript{78} For soldiers in construction the working day began at 5:00 a.m. and lasted until 7:00 p.m. with three breaks, one hour at 8:00 a.m., one and one-half hours at 11:30 a.m., and one half-hour at 4:00 p.m. This rigid schedule, 11 working hours in a 14-hour day, was created by the engineer Franquet, recognizing that it would not always be kept without constant supervision.\textsuperscript{79} The other extreme was demonstrated by the case of two soldiers hired by Governor Saint-Ovide to tend his garden.
At the time of this incident the governor was away, and a young cadet officer had been delegated to oversee the work but did not arrive until afternoon. The gardeners began their day working but left at 8:00 a.m. to join three friends in drinking a pint of liquor. They returned to work for a while, then left again for wine at another tavern until noon. After returning to work they decided to buy another bottle. There was some difficulty when the tavern-keeper’s wife refused the first soldier because he was too drunk, but the second did obtain the bottle. After finishing it both fell asleep beside the garden well. One of the soldiers, in a stupor, fell into the well and drowned. This was the situation by the time the young cadet reached the garden at 3:00 p.m. 80

Sunday and various religious and royal holidays were free from work and were also the only days on which regular military reviews were held. 81 In the Code des Armées Navales of 1689, exercises were also held on Thursdays, 82 but this does not appear to have been the case in Louisbourg. The rest of Sunday would have been devoted to religion and recreation, such as it was in Louisbourg. 83

The meagre salary soldiers received certainly encouraged them to work to supplement it, but military functions had to be performed and special arrangements were made. The most regular routine was the 24-hour guard duty. In some instances workers were exempt from it, 84 and in other cases could pay someone else to take their duty. 85 In the first case deductions were made from the worker’s salary and distributed to those on guard. In 1750 this was calculated at 1 sol per livre of salary or 5 livres per month. 86 For those who wanted to specialise in the military in Louisbourg, the only outlet for such ambition was training as a cannoneer, a full time occupation which was rewarded with a salary of over 10 livres per month after deductions. 87 There was also the possibility of pensions at half pay for some soldiers as reflected in documents which requested them from the ministry; in one instance for a soldier who had gone deaf, and in the second for an 18-year veteran who could no longer perform his duties. 88 Re-enlistment after the six-year engagement was encouraged with a 10-livre bonus for soldiers and 30 livres for sergeants. It was also possible to obtain a discharge to settle on a farm with three years’ supplies, but it was reported that this was not successful since most settlers wasted away the three years and then found some pretext to return to France. 89 It is interesting to note as well that in the concessions listed in the town for 1734, three sergeants and three retired sergeants had property, with two of them owning two lots. 90

If the soldier was not working or on duty, he would very likely spend part of his time supplementing his daily ration. In 1718 the daily ration for soldier and sergeant was given as a livre and a half of bread, 4 onces of raw pork or half a livre of beef, and 4 onces of vegetables. In addition the troops received a quarter livre of butter and 5 livres of molasses each month. 91 This ration, which was more than soldiers in Canada received, had first been allotted to troops in Placentia because of the harsh conditions, and was carried over to Ile Royale, with a warning that it would not last. By 1734 the ration was listed in different terms; 456-1/4 livres of flour per year (1-1/4 livres per day), four onces of vegetables and the same of salt pork, with a livre of butter per month. 92 Beans were the most common vegetable to be given to the soldiers and were sometimes two seasons old when consumed. Flour often went bad and was mixed with new supplies to try to preserve it. 93 Distribution of the rations was made every four days for bread and every 15 days for meat, vegetables, butter and molasses. 94 Shortages were not uncommon; in 1742 the bread ration had to be cut to 1 livre, and before the second siege in order to economize on wheat and vegetables, rice was added to the flour for bread and was distributed instead of vegetables. 95

Soldiers were expected to augment their food allotment by hunting and fishing, and they were given an allowance of powder for this purpose. 96 Soldiers went fishing for cod, shooting seals on the ice, and gathering strawberries, herbs for soup, and spruce boughs which, when combined with molasses, made spruce beer. 97 One soldier who went hunting at Spanish Bay with his dog killed 13 partridges. 98

A 1750 mémoire by the engineer Franquet gave an excellent account of what food it was possible to obtain on the island. As well as the strawberries mentioned above, there were raspberries, blueberries, and small red berries called meadow apples (probably Vaccinium) which were said to be edible only as a preserve. All vegetables were available, Franquet said, except artichokes and asparagus, though the late season meant that everything was eaten later than in France. Game was plentiful and included bears, of which only the fat was considered edible, moose and caribou, whose meat was said to make a soup as good as beef. These animals were hunted in winter and only by the Indians, though they would have occasionally found their way into the colony. Smaller game included passenger pigeons, hunted in July, and a species of wader, perhaps snipe, as well as the plentiful rabbit. Often eaten, he reported, were ducks, Canada geese, and aquatic birds which in the season of 1750 were said to smell of oil because they had been eating seaweed. In addition, there were salmon, trout, seals, walrus, whales and, of course, cod. 99
Soldiers prepared the food themselves in their rooms according to a cooking roster,\textsuperscript{100} and were provided merely with one large pot for every seven or eight men with that number of spoons attached.\textsuperscript{101} There are specific references to soldiers eating a game stew and a mackerel stew.\textsuperscript{102} The soldiers had few other utensils, and in 1736 it was proposed that a mess tin and a canteen be provided for each seven men as was the practice on ships, as well as two water buckets and frying pans for each room. The diet and cooking situation were described:

\textit{Le Soldat est obligé de manger Sa Soupe dans Sa Marmite, de tirer Sa biere dans quelques mauvaises Gamelles quils peuvent attraper dont Ils en perdent la plus grange partie, Ce qui fait qu'ils en manquent la plus part dumens, et qu'ils sont obligés de boire del'Eau qui n'est point bonne à Louisbourg, ce qui leur cause de fréquentes maladies; . . . Comme la Nouriture la plus ordinaire du Soldat a l'isle Royale est le Poisson, Il Serot très nécessaire que Monseigneur eût la bonté d'ordonner qu'il fut fourny deux Poeses par Chambrée pour faire bouillir et frire leurs Poissons; Ils sont aujourd'hui obligé de se servir de leurs marmites après qu'ils ont mangé leur Soupe pour faire cuire leur poisson, Se trouvant pressés ils Sont obligés de le manger souvent a moitié Cuit, ce qui leur donne des flux de sang, Ce que nous avoins vêu par Experience.}\textsuperscript{103}

There is no indication that the situation in the barracks improved before the first siege. Two hundred leather buckets for fire protection were ordered in 1741, but there was no provision made for frying pans or more mess tins and canteens.

The other dietary staple, bread, was obtained from the bakery, and spruce beer, also a regular part of the daily meal, seems to have been prepared by the soldiers themselves since no wages were paid to brewers. A brewery was an integral part of a barracks, and expeditions were made to collect spruce boughs.\textsuperscript{104} It was remarked after the return of Louisbourg to the French that there was no brewery in the town for soldiers’ use. One was soon constructed in the new barracks of the Queen’s Bastion.

The location of the brewery before the first siege is not certain. In 1736 there was mention of an old copper boiler for beer which came from a coach house, and it is very likely that the governor’s coach house, located in the terreplein of the bastion was used as a brewery during this period.\textsuperscript{105} It is not known when the house was built, but it first appears on the plans in 1733. Excavations of this building revealed a puzzling number of walls and a fireplace base, suggesting that the structure was indeed used for more than a coach-house.\textsuperscript{106} By 1744 the building was definitely used as a coach-house by the new commandant who had arrived in the fall of 1740; in 1741 two huge red copper boilers were ordered for the brewery of the barracks, and this may have marked the removal of the brewery to new quarters at the insistence of the governor.\textsuperscript{107}

A part of the soldier’s time would have been spent on personal care. Each soldier was provided with a needle and thread for mending his clothing and with soap for washing, though those who could afford it sent out their clothing to be washed. In the beginning soldiers had to provide their own firewood, and it is not surprising to learn that in winter some died and many froze their hands and feet. In 1726 it was agreed that wood be provided at the king’s expense.\textsuperscript{108}

The King’s Bastion barracks also contained a canteen whose location is not known. It was first requested in 1723 by the Swiss soldiers, but Governor Saint-Ovide refused because the Swiss soldiers were mixed with the French and he feared this would cause a continuous uproar. Also, since the barracks were not yet enclosed, there was no way to keep in the soldiers day or night.\textsuperscript{109} The governor was commended for his decision and was told that it was the king’s intention that there not be any canteen.\textsuperscript{110} However, three years later Saint-Ovide himself made the request for a canteen. Apparently it was the custom in all citadels to have a canteen which was run by the major, and this officer had asked the governor to request permission to set one up. It was approved in 1727,\textsuperscript{111} and probably stocked wine, spirits and tobacco. By 1739 each company had a canteen run by its officers, a situation thought to be less harmful than the dozens of cabarets in town.\textsuperscript{112} After the first siege the barracks canteen was the subject of much controversy for, according to a new ruling, the proceeds from the canteen were to be shared with the governor, king’s lieutenant and adjutant.

Soldiers were given a clothing allotment each year consisting of pants, two shirts, two ties, a hat, a pair of socks, and two pairs of shoes, and a jacket or vest on alternate years.\textsuperscript{113} It had been suggested that one pair of socks per year was not enough, but no change appears to have been made.\textsuperscript{114} According to the \textit{Code Militaire}, uniforms were not to be worn when soldiers were out working, a practice that seems to have applied to \textit{Marine} soldiers in Louisbourg.\textsuperscript{115}

There were, as well, large quantities of items ordered every year and supplied to the troops. In one year, 1721, when the shipment did not arrive, regimental captains had to supply the goods on the promise of repayment by France the following year. In another instance, just before the second siege, it was revealed that French merchants were not sending goods to Louisbourg for fear of losing them, that there was such a shortage of shoes that Indian footwear might have to be used.\textsuperscript{116}
Each soldier received 2 boxwood combs, 2 livres of soap, about 2 ounces of thread, and three needles per year. Candles were ordered from France until the late 1720s, after which they were supplanted by local supplies. After the first siege the allotments seem to have increased somewhat.

An idea of the kind of belongings owned by a soldier is given in an inventory of a soldier who was to be executed for theft. The value of the goods was placed at 30 livres, 5 sols and comprised a trunk with a key, four shirts, three of which were fine though half used, a large piece of fine cloth, two old pairs of socks, two muslin collars, an old pair of pants, a pair of used sheets and a filthy old shirt. Another soldier, found dead while out hunting, owned snowshoes, an axe and a compass.

In the first French occupation soldiers were not generally allowed to marry, and only 13 marriages are recorded in the 17 years from 1722 to 1739. However, there was a relaxation of this policy during the second occupation, and in 1748 permission for marriage was granted to any soldiers who by their industry and conduct showed that they would make a useful contribution to the life of the community, especially as farmers. However, by 1750 Governor Desherbiers felt that married soldiers were harmful to discipline. In the following year some soldiers were allowed to marry, but with a clause forbidding husband and wife to leave the colony, and in 1756 the governor reported he was allowing fewer and fewer marriages.

Discipline among the troops was administered according to an ordinance of 1727 (Appendix D) which provided severe penalties for all manner of crimes. In 1755 with the arrival of the army troops, a copy of this ordinance was ordered placed in every soldier’s room and guardhouse: “les Soldats ne scauroient etre trop instruits Sur ces objets et il est necessaire plus que jamais de les leurs faire connoitre.”

It is quite clear that the quality of the soldier’s life was affected by his enterprise and ambition, though there is no denying that his life could be unremittingly miserable.

**Soldiers’ Mutiny**

Little in the documents reflects the general condition of the soldiers’ life in the barracks, and military records such as courts martial have not come to light. Although specific items about military life did emerge in official correspondence, there was only one period in Louisbourg history when the overall plight of the soldier was given any discussion. This period began in 1739 and culminated in the mutiny of 27 December 1744.

Before his departure from France to take up his post as governor of the colony, de Forant was assured by Maurepas that the soldiers in Louisbourg were well housed. He cautioned the new governor against being taken in by complaints which, he claimed, would probably be the result of drunkenness and excesses. According to Maurepas, discipline was needed. This somewhat defensive letter suggests that Maurepas was expecting problems in the colony and had already received complaints about military conditions. It is likely, as well, that de Forant had a reputation for softness which necessitated the warning.

On arrival at Louisbourg de Forant, according to a report by the new ordonnateur, asked if there were any complaints against the officers. The answer, not surprisingly, was negative. De Forant, however, was not at all impressed by the quality of the troops or the conditions in which they lived. He asserted that he had never seen such poor soldiers and out of the whole garrison (then numbering over 600) he would not keep 100. A few months later he complained that proper furnishings were lacking, especially with regard to sheets and mattresses for the soldiers who needed more supplies:

*Le pays est assés rude pour l’exiger et il n’est pas possible que les habits avec les quels il faut quils couchent l’hyver puissent Se conserver propres; on ne Scauroit d’ailleurs changer qu’une fois l’année l’herbe Sur laquelle ils couchent ce qui cause tant d’insecte dans leurs chambres que la plus part couche l’été par preference Sur le rempart.*

Maurepas expressed surprise that the soldiers were as bad as de Forant reported and cautioned him against sending back any except those who were invalids. He did recognize the complaint about bedding and approved new mattresses and sheets for the soldiers to “les mettre alabry des inconvenients.” Conditions did not improve. De Forant’s replacement in 1740, Duquesnel, after his first tour of the fortifications wrote that he had seen much drunkenness and later proposed that the new barracks be constructed because the citadel barracks were slowly rotting away. The building was infected with vermin because there were too many men in one room without enough sheets and mattresses. At the very least, he later said, new floors should be put in the soldiers’ barracks.

The new barracks was never approved and the difficult conditions in which the soldiers lived continued, compounded by the Swiss and by the ration problem. The former seems to have been the result of a clash between the Swiss commander and Duquesnel, who claimed the Swiss were acting as an independent unit. The commander was eventually recalled but the bad feelings re-
mained, aggravated by poor rations. In 1739 Bigot, the new ordonnateur, reported that he had mixed bad flour with newer supplies to make biscuits for the soldiers, and in 1742 he insisted that Duquesnel force the soldiers to accept a reduction of half a livre of bread ration per day, adding to his report that the soldiers had not had any peas or beans for three weeks. In December, 1744, the garrison revolted to reinforce their demands for better rations. Duquesnel’s death two months earlier was probably a contributing factor since the office of military commander, which carried a great deal of moral authority, was vacant with only the king’s lieutenant as acting commander. (On another occasion Governor Saint-Ovide had been obliged to postpone a trip to France because it was feared there would be a revolt if he were not present in Louisbourg to exert his authority.)

On the evening of 26 December, 1744, three disgruntled and inebriated Swiss soldiers decided it was time to improve their lot. Seeking to gain support from their comrades they took up a candle and went to the rooms of some of the French companies. In one room they found everyone asleep, but in another there were two or three men still up around the fire. Just what they agreed to do in the ensuing discussion was never made clear, but the Swiss decided to remain up all night and lay on their beds with their clothes on. In the early morning, while it was still dark, they forced their drummer to sound reveille and all the Swiss assembled in the yard while a sergeant went to fetch the only officer in the barracks, a Swiss lieutenant. The officer arrived and was assured that no violence was contemplated. The grievances about the poor quality of rations and supplies were aired; the lieutenant promised that they would be dealt with and persuaded the soldiers to return to the barracks. However, some of the Swiss were not satisfied with this assurance and, according to the acting governor and the ordonnateur, reproached the French soldiers for not having joined them in their demonstration. Soon afterward, the whole garrison reassembled in the yard and a group of 36 soldiers with bayonets at the ready marched through town sounding the general alarm.

The officers, all of whom apparently resided in the town, rushed to the barracks but were not immediately allowed in. Some were forced at bayonet point to lie down on their stomachs. Eventually they were able to talk their way into the courtyard and listened to the soldiers’ demands which, in this account, were: that firewood which had been withheld as punishment for a case of theft be returned, and that the wood rations be increased by half a cord per company; that the rations promised to those on a recent military expedition be turned over; that proper uniforms be provided for the recruits of 1741, and that the practice of issuing rotten vege-

tables be stopped. The officials at Louisbourg promised to fulfill the demands, and an uneasy truce between the troops and officers settled in for the winter. Gradually, in the minds of the officers, there grew the suspicion that the troops had intended to turn the town over to the English with whom they felt there was a secret correspondence, though no real evidence was ever presented for this.

When the troops returned to France after their defeat by the New Englanders, those who were considered ringleaders were put on trial. The sergeant who was on guard at the barracks guardhouse was sentenced to the guillotine, and another sergeant and a corporal to hang. Others were given lesser penalties. During the trial a Swiss sergeant implied that the French officers were responsible for the conditions in which the soldiers found themselves. Asked if he were aware of the consequences of the mutiny he replied, qu’il Scavoit Bien qu’il alloit perdre La Vie Et qu’il n’ignoreoit pas S’être mis dans le Cas Selon nos ordonnances militaires, mais que Son Exemple devoit apprendre aux Offr’s command pour le Roy de tenir La main a ce que le Soldat ne fut point vexé Et que Luy fut distribué Bons conformemà L’intention de Sa Majesté Les Vivres payés Sur Leur Solde.

Guardrooms and Guard Duties
To the north of the central passage were two rooms designated as guardrooms for the barracks. The larger one was for the soldiers and the smaller for officers. Early plans (Fig. 9b; Fig. 11) show a masonry wall dividing the rooms in a ratio of about 2:1. The separation wall which ran along the centre of the barracks was replaced in the soldiers’ room by an arch; however, in the 1731 plan (Fig. 12) this wall had disappeared and the room thus extended the full width of the building.

The work accounts gave some details for the rooms. The original separation wall was only eight pouces thick and the officer’s room was provided with a fireplace while the soldiers’ had first an iron, then a brick stove. Cobbles were placed on the floor of the soldiers’ room. A bed of two-pouce pine planks was constructed in each room, the one in the soldiers’ was the full length of the room. A trapdoor led to the drawbridge mechanism.

Some time between 1729 and 1731, the two rooms were converted to one room for soldiers, evidently because of overcrowding. The officers moved to a new guardroom immediately above the old one, and the stairway to it was fully enclosed so people using the staircase would not have to enter the soldiers’ room. The former officers’ room was cobbled to give it the same flooring as the rest of the room. It is not known how many soldiers oc-
certainly too many for the small room in which they had occupied a guardroom at that time, but a document some five years later indicated that ordinarily there were 25 to 30 men on guard.\textsuperscript{144} Certainly too many for the small room in which they had been stationed before.

By 1740 it was felt that the guardroom arrangements were no longer suitable, and a separate guardhouse was constructed outside the barracks just beyond the drawbridge (Fig. 14). This left a large room in the barracks to be filled, and it was proposed that at least part be turned into a prison. The existing prisons in the casemates were reported to be inadequate and prisoners were suffering because of the constant dampness in these areas.\textsuperscript{145} The partition was restored, and the original soldiers' room became the new prison; six sets of leg and hand irons with padlocks were ordered for the new prison.\textsuperscript{146} The smaller room was to be a room for cannoneers, and the one above it, formerly the officers' guardroom, was to be a new school for cannoneers;\textsuperscript{147} but apparently only the prison was built. In 1741 new Swiss and French soldiers added to the numbers in the garrison; rooms had to be provided and former officers' guardrooms were made over for this purpose.\textsuperscript{148}

The school for cannoneers proposed for the old guardroom first appeared somewhere in the barracks in 1738,\textsuperscript{149} though the official company of cannoneers was not incorporated until 1743.\textsuperscript{150} A wooden cannon was provided for the school, to be used for the instruction of those officers and soldiers who were part of the unofficial company of cannoneers, and firing practice was held on Sundays.\textsuperscript{151} After the first siege the school was again set up in the barracks, accompanied by a school of mathematics for officers.\textsuperscript{152}

There is only one surviving guard list from the Louisbourg period. It is from 1741 just before the change to new quarters was made and indicates that there were 30 soldiers in the barracks guardhouse in addition to a sergeant, two corporals, and a drummer. Sentries from the guardhouse were placed at the governor's door, in the guérite of the King's Bastion, at the door of the prisons, and in front of the guardhouse itself. The prisons at that time were probably still in the casemates.\textsuperscript{153}

It is difficult to determine what rules governed the operation of the guardhouse. From the Code Militaire it appears that in a typical situation one-third of the garrison was on guard at any one time. The guard formed at 3:00 p.m. in winter and at 4:00 p.m. in summer. Sentries at the various posts were relieved every two hours, or every hour when it was cold. Officers were to remain in the guardhouse and sleep without undressing. They could leave at noon and at 6:00 p.m. for an hour to eat if they arranged to be relieved by those officers who were on duty the following day.

The town major was in charge of the daily guard list and conveyed this to the commander. At the change of sentries the corporal conducted them to the officer for inspection.\textsuperscript{154}

Louisbourg documents show some divergence from these regulations. During the mutiny there was no mention of an officer in the guardhouse, nor was any notice taken of this fact by officials who reviewed the case. The 1741 guard list confirms that the guard was for a 24-hour period, but adds that the same guard was posted every three days. It is also clear that it was possible to perform someone else's guard; one soldier paid for a pair of trousers by taking over four turns on guard in addition to giving over his beer ration.\textsuperscript{155} Workers could pay others to do their guard, or deductions could be made from those working to be given to those permanently on guard.

No one document specifies the furnishings for guardrooms, and information on this topic comes chiefly from the yearly requisitions. One of the principal functions of the guard was the security of the garrison at night, and a large variety of lamps, lanterns and candle holders was used. Because of the necessity of changing the sentries at fixed times, 30-minute hour-glasses were used. Special caps for sentinels were supplied, presumably to distinguish them from soldiers not on duty at that time. As with the barracks rooms leather fire buckets were provided.\textsuperscript{156} There were armoires on which pertinent documents were posted, and boxes were supplied for the various posts in which tokens were placed to keep track of the rounds. Straw chairs were ordered in one list but it is not known in which of the guardrooms they were placed. A green rug was ordered in 1752 for the officers' room.\textsuperscript{157} The soldiers' rooms had stoves which were dismantled in summer.\textsuperscript{158}

In 1755 regulations were issued governing the honours to be paid officials passing in front of the guardhouses. For the governor, commissaire général, or fleet commander, the soldiers would assemble in two lines with their arms and a drummer, while for the commissaire ordinaire, king's lieutenant, brigadier, director of fortifications or a ship's captain the soldiers simply lined up.\textsuperscript{159} It is not known whether this was a new practice or the modification of existing procedure.

Another practice hinted at in the documents comes from the number of tools such as axes and saws provided specifically for the guardhouses during the 1740s.\textsuperscript{160} It may have been that those soldiers not on sentinel duty were obliged to cut firewood and even building lumber, or else the tools were supplied for those who wanted to earn extra pay for such work. Firewood was distributed from the beginning of October to the end of May; the soldiers at each guard post were given 30 cords and the officers 6 cords.\textsuperscript{161}
Armoury
Over the central passage of the barracks was a long narrow room which, because it seemed to be ideal for the storage of weapons, became the armoury. One of its disadvantages was dampness, and eventually it was fully panelled to counter this problem. When the armoury was completed it held 1,000 guns, but this was soon found to be inadequate and in 1733 an armoury, capable of housing 3,000 guns, was constructed in the town over the new bakery.162 No mention is made of the old armoury after that date, and it may be that the room was turned into soldiers’ accommodation since it is not mentioned otherwise in the accounting of the building in 1763.163

South Half of Barracks

Chapel
A large double door from the central passage opened into the garrison chapel which, following the practice of the day, lacked pews. Though the carpentry required for the altar was not completed until after 1726, services were conducted at the time, and the furnishings for the chapel had been in the storehouse since 1724 (Appendix B).164

The barracks chapel was originally intended only for the garrison. The civilian population attended services in the chapel of the Recollet priests while waiting for the construction of a parish church. It soon became evident that money for a parish church would not be forthcoming and the priests decided to force the issue. They had given over their own chapel, they said, “que par pure bonté”165 but they refused to do so any longer, thus compelling the Louisbourg officials to make alternative arrangements. The only other available chapel was that in the barracks, which became the new parish church. The chapel retained its name, Saint-Louis, while the parish was named after Our Lady of the Angels.166

The date of this transfer was probably 1735; in that year the parish register stopped using the term “L’église paroissiale & Conventuelle” in favour of “L’église paroissiale.”167 There was considerable overcrowding in the chapel under this arrangement, especially when there were sailors in port,168 but it served as the parish church for the rest of the French occupation in Louisbourg. As it was one of the centres of town life, public notices were posted there.169 Maintenance of the chapel was the responsibility of the priests, who made so many requests for furnishings that in 1732 de Mézy felt it would be best to give them an annual allowance;170 in 1745 this amounted to 400 livres.

The only indication of the number of masses said in Louisbourg is from a document in the 1750s which reveals that there were four per day. One of the masses was said in the chapel at the hospital, another at the Royal Battery, and two others in the barracks chapel, one for the government and garrison and the other for the townspeople,171 though there appears to have been only one mass in the barracks during the first occupation. Mass was said fairly late in the morning, for one was reported in progress at 10:30 a.m. in 1737, and in 1754 the verger first visited the chapel at 8:30 a.m. so the first mass would have been at 9:00 a.m. at the earliest.172 A 1735 ordinance defined the seating arrangements in the chapel, stipulating that the governor would have a seat to the right of the altar and the ordonnateur to the left and on the same line. The king’s lieutenant was to have a seat on the same side as the governor but out of the sanctuary, while members of the council would be on the other side. The celebrant received the communion bread first, then the ecclesiastical assistants, then other clergy, altar-boys, the governor, the ordonnateur, the king’s lieutenant, council members, church wardens, and finally the rest of the congregation.173

An interesting feature in the chapel was the discovery during archaeological excavations of five bodies buried beneath the floor. They were the bodies of the governor de Forant, the commandant Duquesnel, and two military leaders, Captain Michel de Gannes, captain of a Louisbourg company, and the Duc d’Anville, leader of an expedition to recapture Louisbourg in 1746. D’Anville died on the expedition and had been buried outside Halifax; in 1749 the body was reburied beneath the altar of the chapel. There was also found the body of a small child whose identity thus far remains unknown. The archaeological report precludes the possibility of the child having been buried after the French left in 1758. There was no evidence of a coffin, however, and unlike the other bodies which were placed with the head pointing away from the altar, this body was placed roughly parallel to the altar.174 This was undoubtedly an irregular burial whose secret was lost with the fall of the city.

The chapel was the scene of two dramatic incidents which had their resolution in the courts. The first occurred in February 1737. At about 10:30 a.m. while the priest was saying mass, a young couple approached the front of the church and knelt holding hands on the first step of the sanctuary in front of the altar rail. Then they rose and said something to each other. The priest, surprised by this unorthodox behaviour, seized the chalice and hurried out of the chapel into the sacristy. The couple was arrested and accused of having caused a scandal in church.
As the story unfolded it appeared that the young man, Jean Le Large, had promised to marry the girl three or four years previously but his mother had refused her consent. His personal appeals to the parish priest were ignored so he decided to take matters into his own hands by following the letter of the law. In the marriage ceremony, technically, the couple marry each other; this has to be done in the presence of a priest and witnesses, so the couple went to the front of the church, exchanged their vows while the priest was still there, and had the congregation as witnesses. The court took a dim view of this irregular procedure; the young man was sentenced to the guardroom as a prisoner for a month and the girl was sent to the convent. The story had a happy ending, however, for on 8 July with the dispensation of the bishop, the couple returned to the chapel and were legitimately married.\textsuperscript{175}

The second incident, much more bizarre, took place in 1754. At 8:30 a.m. the verger entered the chapel to find the altar in disorder. The altar cloth was bloodstained and dirty with foot marks, and there were onion peels and bread scattered about. Blood was smeared on the tabernacle and on the frame of the picture on the wall above the altar. A crucifix was broken and a small niche containing statues was damaged. The small drawers of the altar had been rifled and various ornaments displaced. Two candles and a small purificator were missing.

The culprit was found to be an unemployed schoolteacher who had come to the colony looking for work but had had to take up fishing and woodcutting, for which he was not suited. As a last resort he decided to become a soldier. On the night in question he admitted going up to the barracks to get back an arithmetic book he had loaned to a soldier. He admitted he was quite drunk at the time, and, the door of the hall to the soldier’s room being closed, he walked about in the courtyard until he noticed the chapel door open. Inside there was a partition with a locked door which separated this entrance from the body of the church, so he climbed up to the balcony and jumped down. He said he only wanted to get nearer the altar to pray, and after a while it occurred to him that the two bouquets of flowers on the altar were not placed as they were in France, between the candle sticks, but rather to one side. The teacher took it upon himself to correct this divergence from orthodoxy and found himself climbing on the altar, in the process of which he cut himself on the face. While taking out his handkerchief to wipe the blood some bread and onions fell out. He then claimed to have dropped the handkerchief and, while retrieving it, inadvertently picked up the purificator while his bloodied hand left the stains on the tabernacle and picture frame. Having decided that this was enough he took two small candles to light his way out through the town, and, placing a board against the partition, climbed back to the gallery and then out into the courtyard. He stopped at the guardhouse to get a light and then left. It was observed that the tabernacle had not been forced and the accused, Le Bon, was vigorous in denying that he had tried to open it.

In all, this was a very strange case and despite more than 200 pages of testimony it appears that the full story was never revealed. The death penalty was sought, but in the end Le Bon was ordered to march barefoot with only a shirt to the chapel door and ask forgiveness of God and king, while carrying a sign which read, front and back, “Profaner of Sacred Places.” He was then fined the sum of 3 livres and banished perpetually from the colony.\textsuperscript{176}

\textbf{Chaplain’s Room}

The door to one side of the altar led to the sacristy and chaplain’s room. Both the 1729 and 1731 plans of the barracks showed the same arrangement for this room. Near the door was a large armoire which served as a sacristy housing sacred objects. Beyond this was the main part of the room with a fireplace, the chaplain’s sitting room. To the side was a small cabinet which would have served as a bedroom. There was an exit to the courtyard via the corridor in the officers’ quarters. After the first siege the sacristy was in a room by itself, the chaplain was given the room next to it, and the verger also had a room.\textsuperscript{177}

The principal occupant of the chaplain’s room during the French period was Father Isidore Caulet, who was first mentioned in Louisbourg in 1725 when he was thirty-four. He served with the troops for 30 years, including the four-year stay in Rochefort during the English occupation; he died in Louisbourg in 1754.\textsuperscript{178} He occasionally took over as Superior of the Recollets when the incumbent was away,\textsuperscript{179} but seems not to have had the ability to head the parish, though he had an excellent reputation as a priest.

Two assessments of Father Caulet have survived. In 1752 Governor de Raymond described the religious in Île Royale. There were only two Recollets in Louisbourg at the time – the superior, whom he termed incompetent, and Father Isidore whom he said was “rempli de zèle, bon prêtre, bien charitable et a de bonnes mœurs, C’est un homme a conserver.”\textsuperscript{180} While confirming Father Isidore’s goodness he added: “[he is] sans capacité, et d’ailleurs un peu sourd, mais aimé et estimé par sa conduite, ce qui qu’on lui on a confié les fonctions curiales . . . quoy que sans talent.”\textsuperscript{181} Sixty-three when he died, Father Caulet had given most of his adult life in the service of God in the colony and un-
doubtedly merited the honorific, the Venerable Father Isidore Cauet.

Officers’ Quarters
The officers’ quarters, located in the south half between the governor’s wing and the chapel, were originally designed to house 18 officers in the 11 rooms by dividing each of the larger rooms into two smaller ones (Fig. 11). With four officers for each company – a captain, a lieutenant, and two ensigns – as well as other officers such as the king’s lieutenant and major for a total of up to 30 during the first French occupation, it is not surprising to learn that housing for officers was a problem.

As early as 1723 de Mézy reported that a Swiss officer was being lodged with a citizen in the town because there was no room in the barracks. Before the barracks was constructed many officers had lived in residences worked on by the contractor Isaac-beau at government expense, and presumably still used these houses for their quarters. In 1724 de Mézy complained about the cost and waste of putting officers in soldiers’ rooms as had been done that year. He felt that six companies could be housed in the barracks provided the adjutant lived with the governor and the king’s lieutenant and the other majors resided in the north wing. For a time the adjutant did share the governor’s wing. The officers may have resided two to a room, but in 1725 Verrier envisioned each officer having his own room. The following year 18 officers’ rooms were reported ready, but this did not accommodate all the officers, for first the major and then four subalterns moved to the north wing. In 1729 an entire house in the town was made over for the use of six officers, and in 1736 the king’s lieutenant, the major, an artillery officer, two cannoniers, the port captain and three other officers were lodging in the town at government expense.

Officers who had families and owned homes also lived in town; the 1734 census recorded that all the captains plus the king’s lieutenant, the major, two other lieutenants and an ensign were town inhabitants. All had children and one or two servants. This preference for town living depended a great deal on his personal fortune, and one guide to the various standards of living is a census of 1749–50 which includes a list of servants. All the officers with families had servants, and the 12 captains had at least one, though only two had three or more. Of eight lieutenants, five had servants, and six of 27 ensigns had them. Those officers who relied only on their salaries had a difficult time outfitting themselves. The request for more supplies for officers was repeated in 1753 with the proposal that the King’s Bastion barracks be turned over to the officers. Furnishings for the rooms would have been two mattresses and blankets, a box-mattress, bolster, rug and a bed surround in double serge, curtains and fixtures, candlestick, table, coat hanger, and an armoire. This proposal was not implemented. In 1755 army troops made their first appearance at Louisbourg. Their officers were obviously accustomed to a higher standard of accommodation than the Marine officers and imported an impressive list of supplies including beds, tables, armoires (three and four shelves plus drawers), chairs, coat hangers and kitchen implements. Relief was finally provided by a supplement to the Marine officers’ salaries, and for a number of years 6,000 extra livres were sent to Louisbourg to be distributed among the various ranks.

Messing arrangements for officers were a private affair, though cadet officers received a ration which was reported not to have been adequate, and in some areas, as in the Royal Battery, stables were provided for the beasts and fowl of the officers. Presumably officers also made such arrangements as did the lieutenant, chevalier de Johnstone, who spoke of having his own garden. In the King’s Bastion barracks there was no room provided for cooking the officers’ meals (texts from the 1720s show small rooms being set aside with each officer’s room). In the proposed new barracks, which were never approved, such

Little furniture was provided for the officers’ rooms. The work accounts report only that frames were built for the rooms and Commandant Deshribiers confirmed this in 1750.

(quincy Le roy ne fournit que Le bois D’une couchette Et une table, qu’il faut que Les officiers Se fournissent de Lits, chaises, poeles, ou garnitures des Cheminee, draps Et de tout ce qu’il faut pour Lesurs petits meubles, ce qui Leur occasionne une depense au Des sus de Leurs moyens, La plus part couchent Sur une couverte Sans matelats n’y draps.)

There was a complaint that officers were transporting furniture from one room to another, and it was recommended that officers be forbidden to have the same kind of furniture as that which the king provided. The house which was made over for six officers was fitted with beds and shelves.

The style in which an officer lived depended on his personal fortune, and one guide to the various standards of living is a census of 1749–50 which includes a list of servants. All the officers with families had servants, and the 12 captains had at least one, though only two had three or more. Of eight lieutenants, five had servants, and six of 27 ensigns had them. Those officers who relied only on their salaries had a difficult time outfitting themselves. The request for more supplies for officers was repeated in 1753 with the proposal that the King’s Bastion barracks be turned over to the officers. Furnishings for the rooms would have been two mattresses and blankets, a box-mattress, bolster, rug and a bed surround in double serge, curtains and fixtures, candlestick, table, coat hanger, and an armoire. This proposal was not implemented. In 1755 army troops made their first appearance at Louisbourg. Their officers were obviously accustomed to a higher standard of accommodation than the Marine officers and imported an impressive list of supplies including beds, tables, armoires (three and four shelves plus drawers), chairs, coat hangers and kitchen implements. Relief was finally provided by a supplement to the Marine officers’ salaries, and for a number of years 6,000 extra livres were sent to Louisbourg to be distributed among the various ranks.

Messing arrangements for officers were a private affair, though cadet officers received a ration which was reported not to have been adequate, and in some areas, as in the Royal Battery, stables were provided for the beasts and fowl of the officers. Presumably officers also made such arrangements as did the lieutenant, chevalier de Johnstone, who spoke of having his own garden. In the King’s Bastion barracks there was no room provided for cooking the officers’ meals (texts from the 1720s show small rooms being set aside with each officer’s room).

103
rooms were to be provided. A military manual of 1725 indicated that in certain cases the commander was responsible for providing meals to subordinate officers, and this occurred in Louisbourg. In the 1750s, kitchen and dining furnishings were provided by the government for some of the officers, and Governor de Raymond reported that he helped some officers set themselves up so they could save a third of what it would cost to go to an inn. Whatever the arrangements were, they were not ideal. Franquet, the chief engineer, reported on conditions in 1750: “La vie Est icy fort dure, on n’y mange En viande de boucherie que celle, que L’on apporte de La Nouvelle Angleterre, et Lors que La navigation Est interrompue, L’on Est reduit a La viande Salée.”

References to the duties the officers performed are infrequent, but seem to have been flexible enough to allow them to engage in commerce. The main difficulty, aside from their meager salaries, appears to have been gambling which was prohibited on a number of occasions; in one case an officer was said to have lost 20,000 livres.

**Governor’ Wing**

The governor’s wing of the barracks was the official residence of the garrison commander in Louisbourg. It housed, at various times, three governors and one commandant, though two other commanders chose not to live there. The wing comprised four large attic rooms, four rooms on each of the two floors, and two usable cellar rooms. Though these quarters were for the commanders’ use technically, two of the rooms had to be given over to the superior council, while another room upstairs was referred to as a “government hall” and doubled as a dining room. The governor used part of the courtyard for his animals, and shared a garden in the town with the ordonnateur. Their upkeep was in the hands of the governor, but the initial work of building the stables and preparing the garden was done at government expense.

Block 35 was given over to this garden. Originally only a small corner of it had been conceded to the ordonnateur as his garden in 1723, while the governor had a similar plot in Block 16. However, by 1730 the whole of Block 35 was under cultivation and in 1732 Le Normant, the acting ordonnateur reported that Saint-Ovide was going to take it all over. Le Normant suggested that it was too large for the governor alone and that the two of them share it, a proposal which was adopted resulting in the block becoming the King’s Garden. Various buildings appear in the plans of the garden; three on the east side during Saint-Ovide’s occupancy were replaced by a single building in the northwest corner later. This building was referred to in 1741 as a “small house” costing just over 600 livres; the next year four benches costing 16 livres were made for the garden.

A well or pool in the centre of the garden first appeared on the plans in 1732 and was shown clearly on the 1752 plan (Fig. 16). It measured 15 pieds inside, accounting for the ease with which a drunken soldier was able to roll over the edge and fall in. The plans show a variety of patterns in the layout of the garden. In the 1730s the block was shown divided into many plots. But in the 1740s eight divisions predominate, with four most often shown during the English occupation and afterward.

Little is known of what was grown in the garden. The only indication comes from the Duquesnel inventory which recorded the food on hand at the time of his death. However, it is not possible to distinguish between what might have been imported and what was grown since most of the vegetables were salted to preserve them for the winter. Possible products from the King’s Garden were green beans, herbs, onions, peas and rhubarb.

Although the commander in Louisbourg earned considerably more than other officials, the salary was felt to be inadequate by most of those in the position. Commandant Duquesnel requested and was given a 5,000-livre advance in order to prepare himself for his appointment, and he reported that in all he spent 8,000 livres before leaving France. While in Louisbourg he was given a 3,300-livre gratuity. Another commandant, Desherbiers, requested 14,000 livres in advance to maintain his “dignity” in his new position. He then asked the government to write off this advance, which it did on condition that he agree to remain in Louisbourg an extra year. Governor de Raymond wanted a 20,000-livre gratuity to offset his expenses in Louisbourg, and was reported owing over 24,500 livres when he left. His salary was not enough, he said, and he sought recompense for lavish dinners he gave in honour of the royal family as well as for expenses incurred in expeditions to outlying ports. The last French governor, Drucour, was given a 10,000-livre advance and a 4,000-livre gratuity.

In order to supplement their salaries some of the officials engaged in commercial ventures. Saint-Ovide, as has already been mentioned, had an interest with the fortress contractor, and was also conceded a plot of land to the north of the harbour. After he left Louisbourg he rented the land to his successor, de Forant, and eventually sold it to Governor de Raymond. Although Saint-Ovide sold his fishing interest when the government prohibited such involvements for officers, he continued his commercial ventures by merely registering them in his secretary’s name.
View of the governor’s yard (basse-cour) and garden. (Archives du Comité Technique du Génie, Paris.)
Domestic arrangements for the governors varied according to their means. When Saint-Ovide first arrived in Louisbourg he was still a king’s lieutenant and had only a valet and cook.\textsuperscript{217} The eventual size of his household is not known, but by 1729 he owned a young negro slave of 10 or 11 years.\textsuperscript{218} For most of the time he lived alone in the barracks, his wife having returned to France. Duquesnel, whose wife also remained in France, had a staff of at least five servants: a chief steward, cook, lackey, kitchen boy and one other male servant. Desherbiers, the first commander after the return of Louisbourg to the French, came out with a steward, valet, cook, two other servants and a housekeeper with her son,\textsuperscript{219} all of whom belonged to one family, while his successor, de Raymond, had only two servants plus a secretary.\textsuperscript{220} Governor Drucour brought his wife and eight domestics in 1754.\textsuperscript{221} Only during the administration of Drucour was there a woman in charge of the residence. Of course the office involved a considerable amount of entertaining, for the commander was responsible for feeding certain officers as well as visiting dignitaries. There seems to have been no formal rules as to the governor’s duties in this regard, but there is evidence that virtually all the commanders kept some sort of open table.

The Governor’s Wing During Saint-Ovide’s Occupancy

Governor Monbeton de Brouillan dit Saint-Ovide was the first resident of the governor’s wing. The exact contents and layout of the wing during his occupancy are not known, but from the work accounts some of the rooms can be labelled and their furnishings identified. At first, Saint-Ovide shared his quarters with Major de Pensens who, on one occasion supplied four servants from France for use in the lodgings.\textsuperscript{222}

From the 1727 work account, it is clear that a number of built-in furnishings were supplied for some rooms. The kitchen was provided with a sink and drain, a potager (warming oven), a dresser for dishes made of 2-pouce-thick pine planks, and a ceiling of boards nailed to the joists of the floor above to prevent odours from penetrating to the upper floor. To these kitchen furnishings an armoire was added in 1732.\textsuperscript{223} In the 1730s a second kitchen was equipped and the first kitchen became the “old” kitchen.\textsuperscript{224} The original kitchen had been in the northeast room of the wing, and part of that room was also given over to small cubicles used as servants’ quarters (Fig. 11). With the raising of the roof of the governor’s wing and the establishment of new rooms for servants in the attics, the kitchen was enlarged by the removal of all but one of the small cubicles (Fig. 12). The small room which remained was probably that of the chief steward, who was responsible for the general supervision of the household. The attic rooms, as we have seen, were not a success and de Forant, by removing the stacks of the chimneys, made the rooms unusable. However, it is unlikely that they had been in use during much of Saint-Ovide’s time; because of the dampness of the attic rooms the servants had to move back to their original quarters in the kitchen. The expanded kitchen could not easily be reduced so the adjoining room was probably expropriated for kitchen use, becoming the “new” kitchen. The officers who had lived there were sent to other quarters, probably in the town. The original move to the attics was made in 1731 and the first reference to the second kitchen was in 1736, so the move back to the original kitchen and establishment of the second would have been sometime between these dates.

A second room, identified as a dining room, had a three-part buffet which was 7 pieds by 7 pieds, made of ordinary 2-pouce-thick pine planks with a more elaborate facing. Six dining tables, large and small, were listed for government use.\textsuperscript{225}

Two other rooms which can be identified during this period were the rooms for the superior council. The governor, according to the regulations, was to host the meetings of the council. Before 1739 the meetings were held in various houses in the town.

In 1727 there was a complaint that litigants before the council had to wait outside until their turn arose and there were no suitable furnishings or rooms for the council.\textsuperscript{226} Two years later the situation had not improved although two ground floor rooms had been set aside for the council.

\textit{mais comme cet endroit n’est ny meublé ny chauffé, l’humidité le rend Extrêmement froid et par consequent impraticable le printemps et lautomne qui Sont ordinairement les Saisons des procès... et Si l’Endroit en question continue a porter obstacle on pourrait Se Servir pour cet Effet d’une chambre en haut qu’occupoit cy devant M°. de Pensens a portée de la Salle a manger du gouvernement ou Se tiendroient Les Cliens pendant les Scéances avec un des huissiers pour empecher que personne ne S’Ecarte de Son devoir.}

Proposed furnishings for the chambers included a tapestry, a crucifix, a full-length portrait of the king, a painting of “Justice,” a rug with fleurs-de-lis for the table, which would have been large enough for 10 to 12 people, and a small cabinet for the council papers, to which the clerk would have the key.\textsuperscript{227} In 1732 a table was made for the council chamber; an iron stove was put in the following year and repaired with a brick base in 1735.\textsuperscript{228} Presumably a temporary table had been used up to that point, and the stove was designed to aid the fireplace in combating the dampness. Governor de Forant, who died in 1740, requested in his will that a number of his paintings be turned over to the government;
whether some of these found their way to the council chamber is uncertain, but included in the collection was a full-length painting of the king, one of the items wanted when the furnishings were discussed in 1729. In 1737 a 250-livre pendulum clock was purchased for the council and 14 velvet pile chairs were added in 1744.

Until 1739 the council met in the home of some of the councillors or in the home of the ordonnateur, especially when the governor was away. Certainly meeting in the town would have been more convenient for the majority of the council members. After 1739 the meetings appear to have been regularly held in the barracks, though during the second French occupation, while the governor lived in the town for a time, the council was held in the ordonnateur's house until ordered to be in the governor's house.

In 1736 an office was mentioned in the governor's wing. This was a serving room which contained dishes and equipment for keeping food warm. Food was brought here from the kitchen, then transferred to the dining room on the appropriate plate when the diners were ready for it. In 1733 there were stoves in both the hall or dining room and the office. Another room in the wing was a cabinet near the balcony containing an armoire 6 pieds by 6 pieds. A bookshelf 11 pieds by 7 pieds 9 pouces and a 7-pied by 4-pied armoire were in an unidentified room. Both had the finely finished fronts similar to that of the buffet in the dining room. There was at least one other armoire somewhere in the wing.

During this period the English began to carry on a considerable trade with Louisbourg. In 1732, for example, 36 bureaus, 36 chairs, 9 tables and 1 armchair were among the effects unloaded. Some of these items turned up in the barracks and will be mentioned in a later section. It seems likely that the dining room was also the room referred to as the government hall used for official functions. The deliberations of the military councils and courts martial by a body called the Conseil de Guerre were held in the governor's quarters, probably in this room. Certainly the room was well used in its function as a dining room, for the governors were required to provide meals for officers and other officials, and several complained about the expense involved. Costebelle, the first governor of the colony, said that during the evacuation from Placentia he had had to keep an open table for the honour of the nation. Saint-Ovide in 1717 complained of having had to keep an almost continuous table for from 20 to 24 people. De Raymond also pleaded for financial assistance, saying that among his expenses was "a tenir une table reguliere, à donner àmanger à tous les differentes états et à tous les Etrangers d’une Certaine façon et Soulager les officiers qui Sont dans le besoin." His successor, Governor Drucour, claimed to have fed a large number of officers. As his wife reported, "les officiers ne trouvaient a manger que chez le Chev. de Drucour qui avait Soin qu’on En peu trouver a toutes Sortes deheures."

There is little information on the dinners themselves. On one occasion, for the birth of the heir to the throne in 1730, the king's lieutenant and acting governor, François Le Coutre de Bourville, gave a dinner and ball for 80 which must have been held in the dining room or "government" hall of the governor's wing; it is difficult to think of any other place which could have accommodated these numbers. The majors and officers of the fortress then gave a dinner for a similar number, presumably in the same room. The ordonnateur had to give his party on successive nights because he could only accommodate 25 at one time in his home. It is interesting to note that the king's lieutenant asked to be compensated for the expense of the dinner he had to give. The governor, whose salary was five times that of his second-in-command, normally would have been expected to give these dinners.

The one account of an official celebration given by a governor dates from the period when the governor was living in the engineer's house. It was to celebrate the birth of the Duc de Bourgogne, and de Raymond, who seems to have been the most status-conscious of the Louisbourg governors, marked the event with considerable ceremony which was probably the high point of Louisbourg society during the French period:

M. le Comte de Raymond donna a diner à l'Etat Major, aux Ingenieurs, aux officiers d'artillerie et autres principaux officiers, au Conseil supérieur, au Baillage à l'amirauté et aux Dames de la Ville. Il y eut deux tables de 50. Couverts services a quatre services avec autant de somptuosité que de delicatessen. L'on y bût en abondance des vins de toutes especes et des plus delicats à la Santé du Roy, de la Reine, de M. le Dauphin, de Madame la Dauphine, de M. le Duc de Bourgogne et de Mesdames de france, alternativement abruit de la grosse artillerie. La Symphonie augmentait le plaisir de cette fête.

Sur les six heures du soir au sortir de Table l'on Se rendis à la Chapelle du Roy pour entendre le salut, La Benediction donnée le, Te Deum, fut chanté au bruit de toute l'artillerie de la Place et des vaisseaux. L'on Se rendit ensuite processionnellement sur les planades de la porte de Maurepas, M. le Gouverneur y alluma un [feu] de Joye qu'il y avoit fait preparer. Les troupes de la Garnison rangées sur les remparts et dans le Chemin Couvert firent trois décharges de Mousqueterie avec le plus grand ordre, Toute l'artillerie fit également trois décharges, apr[ès] Cette Ceremonnie, M. le Gouverneur fit distribue[r] plusieurs Bariques de Son vin...
aux troupes et au Public en différentes Places; Les Vives le Roy furent voir Tirer un feu d’artifice et grand nombre de fusées qu’il avait fait preparer et qui fut très bien exécuté, de retour chez lui le Bal commença et dura Jusqu’au Jour; Il y fut servy Toutes sortes de rafraîchissements et en abondance . . . Toutes les personnes distinguées dans la colonie n’ayant pût être invitées à cette fête par le peut détendue de la Maison du Gouvernement, M. le Comte de Raymond, donna le lendemain un grand diner au Clergé et le Dimanche suivant a plusieurs Dames, offi­ciers et autres personnes qui n’avoient point assisté à la premiere fête.242

From the one journal of the French period which gives any detail on daily life, that of the engineer Poilly beginning in January, 1758, two of the nine balls mentioned were given by Governor Drucour. This was during the Carnaval, the period between the Epiphany and Lent, and the balls were usually accompanied by an ambigu, a rather elaborate buffet often served after midnight.243

The Governor’s Wing During de Forant’s Occupancy
The new governor appointed in 1739, Isaac-Louis de Forant, entered the service in 1703, and as a ship’s captain had many times visited Louisbourg and Quebec.244 One of his first actions on arrival in September was to offer to give up his wing to any new soldiers who arrived, thus sparing the expense of a new barracks. He said he would move into the engineer’s house since the latter was going to spend the winter in France. He also used the argument that de Mézy had used in his successful bid to avoid living in the building — “je serois plus a portée pour Ce qui concerne la ville et le port et mieux par raport a moy que renfermé dans les casernes”245 — though in truth there could hardly be a better place for the military commander of a garrison than in the barracks.

While waiting for an answer to his request, de Forant set about changing the governor’s wing to suit his needs. Rain and dampness were still a problem in the wing, and de Forant’s solution was to remove the extra chimneys which served the attic fireplaces, thus rendering this area permanently uninhabitable and suitable only as storage rooms. He also requested changes in the lower rooms.246 Doors, panels and partitions in unspecified locations were affected, but his death from pneumonia after a 13-day illness put an end to the alterations.

According to Bigot, who wrote a long eulogy, de Forant was well liked in the colony and possessed those qualities which are necessary for a good governor. Il a été généralement regretté Sur tout de moy, monseigneur, qui conaissoit mieux que personne toutes Ses bonnes qualités la colonie a infiniment perdu, il conaissoit toutes les different caractères de la garnison quoiqu’il n’en fit rien paroir, il auroit ramené par douceur et par des sentiments d’honneur qu’il vouloit inspirer ceux qui Sécartaient de la droiture, il étoit desintéressé et uniquement occupé du bien du Service, . . . vous ne pourriez point trouver, monseigneur, un gouverneur plus propre que luy pour cette Colonie qui étoit Sans dessus dessous par les cabales et les partis qui faisoient repandre Sur eux toutes les graces.247

Bigot did not think it suitable to bury the governor in the parish cemetery, even though de Forant had mentioned this in his will. Instead de Forant was buried in the chapel in a lead coffin. The pathologist who examined his remains after recent excavations in the chapel found he had arthritis of the right hip and knee.248

De Forant’s will was made on his death bed, and, as was the custom, he made his profession of faith and set aside 300 livres for prayers for the repose of his soul after his death. He also made a bequest to the Sisters of the Congregation so eight places in their school could be made available to eight officers’ daughters who were in need.249 The governor of the colony was to make the selection, with the restriction that only those daughters of officers from long ennobled families (d’épée) were eligible. If there were not enough qualified candidates, the money could not be used for daughters of the lesser nobility (de plume), but was to be applied to repairs to the convent.250 Various paintings and tapestries were left to the government. The remainder of the effects was left to de Forant’s sister with the exception of an 11-volume quasi-religious dictionary by Moreri which was left to Bigot, the executor of the estate. Bigot was also instructed to settle the accounts of the servants, taking into consideration their needs and the quality of their service. De Forant’s sister protested the bequest to the school, but eventually agreed to a fund of 32,000 livres, the income from which was 1,600 livres.251

A fragment has survived of the inventory of de Forant’s effects which was taken after his death. Three rooms were mentioned, but it is not possible to say where these rooms were in the governor’s wing. According to the inventory, the entrance room contained three large tapestries, two of which represented Cleopatra, 16 black leather chairs with gold nails, a pendulum clock,
two paintings, one representing the tower of Cordouan and the other a carp, and a small table and jar. Since there seems to have been little personal furniture in the room this must have been the government hall which doubled as a dining room and thus contained government furnishings.

The next room was obviously a sitting room with six chairs and fire screens, a sofa, four armchairs and a commode. There were six paintings with gold frames: a full length portrait of Louis XV, plus paintings of Louis XIV, the late Dauphin, the battle of Leintz, and two marine scenes. Three white Indian-cotton curtains, six grey damask tapestries with a large red border, two chandeliers and six carafes completed the inventory of this room.

The third room mentioned in the document was de Forant’s bedroom with an elaborate bed, six chairs and six yellow damask armchairs, two mirrors, two family portraits, two quadrille tables, a seven-piece tapestry, a commode, and a painting of Mary Magdelaine. The impression of the furnishings in these rooms is one of luxury. The considerable number of tapestries would have been effective against dampness in the wing. From the wording of the will it seems that the paintings and tapestries in the second room were those given over to government and probably found their way to the council chamber and the government hall.

The Governor’s Wing During Duquesnel’s Occupancy
Jean-Baptiste-Louis Le Prévost Duquesnel was de Forant’s replacement, arriving on 2 November 1740. He was a veteran of 45 years in the Marine but his appointment to Louisbourg was only as a commandant, a position with all the rights of governor but without the title. In 1704 at the Battle of Malaga in southern Spain he lost his left leg and three toes of his right foot. Since 1708 he had commanded seven different small ships and had, like de Forant, been to Canada and the West Indies, but he had only one command as a ship’s captain. His wife was from Martinique but did not accompany her husband to Louisbourg, preferring to remain in France with her children (two girls and a boy).

If we are to believe the author of the anonymous Lettre d’un Habitant, Duquesnel was subject to many excesses, but this author was seeking to assign the blame for the fall of Louisbourg and likely overstated his case. Certainly the amount of wine and spirits which Duquesnel had in his cellar plus the number of games he possessed, show that he did lean toward drinking and gambling, but he also had to provide for the needs of his officers. The same report said he was at odds with all the officers and had a volatile temper, the latter partly accounted for by his poor physical condition. The pathological examination of his skeleton, uncovered in excavations in 1964, showed that he was suffering from widespread arthritis, that his teeth were greatly worn down with caries, that he had a dental abscess which had drained into the nasal cavity, and that his one remaining foot was distorted from infection.

Duquesnel himself had felt that he was suited for his new post. He assured the king, “vous auriez peu trouver quelqu’autre qui eut Remply Cette place avec plus de Zele plus d’application et plus de dignité que moy.” He spent $8,000 preparing to live in Louisbourg in a “proper fashion.” As with all the officials who were sent to Louisbourg, the commander was awarded a certain amount of free cargo space on the king’s ships. The practice seems to have been to take 30 tonneaux in the early years, but was reduced to 10 in the 1740s, though such limits were difficult to enforce. From the amount of goods which Duquesnel left behind it seems he had used as much space as he could for his supplies. Servants of the governor were allowed free passage, and in 1741 his wife sent him two servants and in 1743 a cook.

Alterations and additions to his residence were requested by Duquesnel and reported by Verrier: a stable for wintering animals, a pigeon roost, paneling in a cabinet and another room, and an oven in the kitchen. Maurepas was not pleased with the cost of the repairs from that year (Bigot also made substantial changes to his house) and was annoyed that the changes were made without his permission. In a letter the following spring he forbade any more changes, except for simple maintenance, without prior approval. In these repairs the second kitchen was again mentioned (presumably it was still in use), and the old kitchen was mentioned in association with the council chamber.

On 9 October 1744, Duquesnel died “without having regained consciousness.” He was given only a token eulogy in letters to Maurepas, a sharp contrast to that given to de Forant. Ducham-bon, who became acting commander, had Duquesnel’s effects inventoried and sold to pay off his debts; the remainder would be sent to his widow “Supposé quil y en ayt âpres Ces detes payées” for Duquesnel had many debts.

The inventory following death was a vital part of the legal procedures of the day. Immediately upon notification of the death of an official, usually the attorney general went to the deceased’s lodging, frequently with the deceased in the bed in which he died, to seal off all the rooms which would not be absolutely necessary and to make a quick inventory of those rooms which had to remain open. When it was convenient the officials returned to make a complete list of the possessions of the estate, often including a description of the items. Personal papers were also inventoried. The items were then sold at public auction and the money used to pay debts, with the remainder sent to the heirs. In making the lists
of furnishings and applying the wax and paper which constituted the seals, the function of the rooms was often given. Thus it is possible to reconstruct to a substantial degree the interior of the governor’s wing of the barracks as it was when Duquesnel lived there, and from the list of household accounts it is possible to examine some of the mechanics of 18th-century housekeeping.

Figures 17 and 18 give the conjectural distribution of the wing as revealed in the application of seals and the inventory. The entrance from the courtyard of the bastion was into the vestibule, which contained a large staircase and a passage to the kitchen area. On the other side of the staircase was a small cubicle for a servant, possibly the lackey, part of whose duties would be to answer the door.

By the time Duquesnel occupied these quarters the “new” kitchen had been incorporated into the wing and most of the cooking was done there. It contained one servant’s room, probably that of the kitchen boy. The “old” kitchen housed two other servants including the chief steward. The remaining portion of the room was given over to the garde-manger devoted to food storage and washing. A staircase down from this room would have given access to the cellar.

The large staircase led up to a passage which went by the office (serving room) into the dining-reception room. The office also housed a linen closet which doubled as a cook’s room, and a staircase up to the attic. Next to the dining room was the bedroom which contained the private cabinet, a door out to the balcony, and exits to the stairway, the adjoining dressing room and wardrobe room. The latter also served as a toilet. The council chamber and antechamber on the ground floor would have formed a separate unit with their own entrance from the courtyard.

Inasmuch as the inventory was taken in October, it reflects the effects of the occupants at their fullest stock in readiness for the isolation of winter. The complete inventory in its original form is given in Appendix C. What follows is a room-by-room summary of the contents with comments on room function.

**Attics:** The attic rooms were essentially storage areas which served briefly as servants’ quarters. During Duquesnel’s time three of the four rooms were used mostly for the storage of food and clothing. One of the objects was a sedan chair in which Duquesnel would have been carried to ease the difficulties caused by his wooden leg. However, its location in the attic and its designation as “old” indicates it may not have been in use at the time of the inventory. The other items in the rooms were:

**Food**

5-1/2 large barrels of wheat

7 large barrels plus 4 quarts of oats

3 large barrels of corn

14 quarts of flour

1 quart of bran

2 quarts of peas

26 ropes of onions

**Metal Goods**

andirons, shovels, tongs, large copper boiler

4 irons for ironing

36 livres of “old” pewter

2 earthen copper pots (terre brune)

**Clothing and Linen**

75 shirts

52 collars

37 handkerchiefs

46 night caps

142 serviettes, 21 of which were fancy

14 tablecloths, 5 of which were fancy and 4 for the kitchen

18 sheets, 13 fancy and 5 big

67 dusters

36 aprons

6 morning coats, 3 flannelette and 3 thin cotton

**Miscellaneous**

a harness

Small hamper full of white table glasses

2 faience chamber pots

old bed with its attachments

**Bedroom:** The main bedroom contained an impressive duchess bed. This style of bed had a canopy projecting from supports at the head, as opposed to vaulted beds which had supports at the four corners for the canopy. A curtain at the edge of the canopy could be pulled around to completely enclose the bed. This particular bed had two woolen mattresses and a straw mattress along with a feather bolster. Two white woolen blankets and a figured bedspread covered it. The canopy was made of white taffeta quilting and the fringe was in fire-red serge with a white ribbon ornamentation. The bed-curtains, tailor’s wrapper, the bed-valance and fringe were in the same serge. Finally there was a quilt in white taffeta. The whole ensemble sold at auction for 380 livres.

The rest of the room contained:

- sofa covered in velvet pile
- 8 English wood chairs with red leather seats
- mirror with a gold-painted wooden frame which sold for 137 livres
- four-drawer bureau
17 Conjectural layout of the ground floor of the governor's wing.

18 Conjectural layout of the first floor of the governor's wing.
7 window curtains of printed cloth
2 andirons for a fireplace
three-drawer commode

Dressing Room: This room was rather puzzling in its contents, and because it adjoins the bedroom and contained the governor’s personal clothing, it has been called the dressing room. It also housed a small vaulted single bed valued at 273 livres. There were three mattresses and woolen blankets as well as feather bedding and a pillow. This may well have served as a guest room. The rest of the room contained an odd assortment and seems to have been a storage room for items which the governor could have had brought into the bedroom or the hall for use. Some of the clothing and other items were probably found in the bedroom but were moved to this room during the sealing of doors on the day of the death, since the bedroom remained open and was not sealed.

Of particular interest are the sweets and games, as well as items of clothing, one a suit and jacket of fire-red cloth laced in gold and lined in white plush, valued at 333 livres; the second a grey frock coat with a black velvet collar or cape valued at 101 livres. Other items:

9 chairs:
4 straw arm chairs, green serge arm chair, 4 English leather chairs

4 game sets:
a chess board and men, backgammon board (tric-trac) and pieces, green quadrille table and 2 boxes used in the game, green piquet table and bag of ivory tokens with a small wicker basket

Food
2 livres of ginseng
Almost 30 livres of chocolate, 10 of it from Manilla
4-1/4 livres of prepared chocolate, and 15 from the “isles” not yet prepared
7 different boxes of tea
3 “quarter-pounds” of rhubarb

Clothing
18 “common” silk handkerchiefs
11 pairs of knitted yarn light shoes
3 pairs of cotton stockings
8-1/2 ells of cloth, 2-1/2 from Rouen and 6 of striped muslin
2 jackets, one in lemon lined in silk and laced in silver; one (old) in poppy-coloured smooth velveteen lined in white plush and laced in gold
3 pairs of pants; one in cinnamon cloth, 2 velvet
jerkin and trousers of drugget and of brown silk with gold buttons lined in lemon taffeta
old jerkin of brown cloth with gold buttons lined in red silk dressing gown in striped cotton lined in cotton cloth box with three wigs

Also in the room were a pair of bellows, an English bureau with Duquesnel’s personal papers, a watch in a silver case valued at 96 livres, and an old spyglass with a missing lens as well as the usual curtains, two green serge rugs (probably for the gaming tables), a firescreen and a mirror with a gold painted wooden frame, which sold for 132 livres.

Cabinet: The governor’s tiny private cabinet contained only two pieces of furniture and was obviously the room where his valuables were kept. The contents of this room alone were valued at more than 4,400 livres. There was a desk, though no mention of a chair, and a red calf-skin trunk. There were 2,777 livres, 4 sols and 6 deniers in cash, most of it in ecus which were coins in denominations of 6 and 3 livres. There were also 3 Mexican dollars as well as some English and Spanish money. Other valuables in the room were:
cane with a golden handle in the shape of an apple valued at 83 livres
silver seal with the Duquesnel arms and its case
24 silver spoons and forks with arms worth 940 livres
6 silver stew spoons
2 average sized silver plates
2 silver salt-boxes
2 cases each with 6 silver coffee spoons
2 snuff-boxes, one varnished cardboard, the other plain shell small purse containing a pair of gold shoe buckles with an iron frame, a pair of gold cufflinks, a silver collar button

Wardrobe: Among the personal rooms in the governor’s wing was the wardrobe which contained two large armoires, one with toiletries, medicines and spirits, the other with clothing. There was also a toilet with three pots, and over 100 livres of “table candles.”

Toiletries
porcelain shaving basin
10 bottles of Hendaye brandy
small pot with 3 onces of rhubarb extract (commonly used as a laxative) box with 4 flasks of Gerrus elixir (a concoction made of aloe, myrrh, saffron, cinnamon, cloves, nutmeg mixed with spirits of wine and water which when distilled and mixed with maidenhair [fern] syrup and orange blossom
water and allowed to stand, produced the elixir which could be poured off.

12 bottles of liqueur from the "Isles"
2 bottles and a smaller one of syrup
2 small bottles of caster oil, one of which had been opened

Clothing
- pair of woollen gaiters
- 3 pairs of silk stockings, 2 new and 1 old valued at 42 livres
- 5 pairs of sheets, 4 "fine" and 1 "common"
- 7 new nightshirts
- 50 trimmed shirts
- 105 handkerchiefs
- 3 jackets for use at the basin
- 1 morning jacket for the same purpose
- 3 flannelette morning jackets
- 15 ells of cloth painted (or printed), in two pieces
- 27 cap linings
- 6 caps, two of which were embroidered
- 10 pairs of light shoes of knitted yarn
- 11 pairs of stockings
- 15 muslin collars
- 3 hats, one beaver embroidered in gold, one plain beaver, one embroidered in gold valued at 48, 25 and 24 1/2 livres respectively
- 1 box with 4 pairs of shoes

On top of one of the armoires was a cross-cut saw and a table candle.

Office (Serving Room): The office was the room from which the dining room was served. The food prepared in the kitchen was brought here and other food, such as salads and coffee, were prepared here with smaller articles being fried in one of the four frying pans. All of the food was then arranged on plates and taken into the adjoining room when called for. The number of dishes indicates a potential for serving a considerable gathering. There were 144 plates of faience, 132 of blue porcelain, and 64 platters of various sorts. Downstairs there were 132 blue porcelain dishes and 72 gold porcelain dishes. The latter obviously was the "good" set, valued at almost twice the blue set, whereas the faience plates were the "common set," worth only half the blue porcelain.

This room contained 28 chairs, and stored here was some food, mostly imperishables, half of which was stored in an armoire. There is no mention of tables in the room or fireplace equipment. These items were probably provided as part of the initial furnishings of the wing and would not have been counted as personal property. Among the items of interest are two gelatine moulds in which fruit syrups were poured and then placed in a bucket of ice; the syrup was stirred from time to time until it was set and then, according to one manual, served in goblets. The variety and quantity of articles in the room is impressive:

- 24 chairs, 6 English red leather, 6 English black leather, 8 rush armchairs and 4 common straw chairs
- 22 tea tables
- 31 cups and saucers
- 4 sugar bowls
- 4 tea pots, one with a saucer
- 21 bowls, 6 small, 4 large and 9 salad
- 276 plates
- 65 platters of various sorts, one with a saucer
- 2 mustard dishes
- 12 earthen dishes
- 12 compote-dishes
- 5 buckets of faience and glass
- 4 sauce-boats
- 23 salt pots
- 2 basins
- 16 tin moulds, 2 for gelatine, 2 for cheese, 12 for biscuits
- 1 sprinkler
- 5 pairs of candle holders
- 2 extinguishers for candles
- 1 cistern and spoon
- 6 cooking pots, all sizes
- 11 casserole, 9 with handles
- 1 braising pan and cover
- 1 strainer
- 1 cake tin (for special cakes called poupelins)
- 5 pie plates, one not usable
- 2 dripping pans
- 1 fish kettle
- 3 skimming ladles, 2 for preserves
- 1 spoon for pots
- 4 copper sheets
- 1 boiler
- 4 frying pans one of which was iron, the other, copper (both listed as "old")
- 4 iron tripods
- 1 iron grill
- 3 trimmed crystals (glasses with a plate)
- a balance with 33 livres of lead and 3 weights
- 1 waffle iron
- 1 pot
36 glasses, 22 large and 14 small
6 table carafes
1 chafing-dish
12 dirty table knives with wooden handles
1 butter dish and cover

Food
14 hams
27 sugar loaves
4-1/2 livres of pepper
1 packet of truffles – 1 livre
1/2 livre of mousserons, (small edible mushrooms)
dried oranges
cinnamon
dry preserves

In the armoire in the office were:
53 livres of coffee in a bag
20 livres of almonds shelled in a bag and 8 in a paper bag
6 livres of rice in a box
19 pots of current jelly preserve
A “big heap” of sugar from the “Isles”
14 livres of dry preserves from the “Isles” in a small case

Cook’s Room and Linen Armoire: In the vicinity of the office was a room with an armoire for linen and a bed for the cook. Again there was an impressive quantity of items, especially serviettes, of which there were 84 fancy ones, 468 plain and 72 used; and tablecloths, 6 fancy, 49 plain, 13 for kitchen use and 60 used. In addition it will be recalled that in the attics there were 121 plain and 21 fancy serviettes and 14 tablecloths. Other items in the room were
10 pairs of sheets, 3 for servants’ beds, 7 almost new
1 small sack full of down weighing 3 livres
8 dozen kitchen aprons
1 bed covering for tombeau in cinnamon-coloured serge
3 small curtains of printed calico
1 sawyers’ trestle (baudet) covered in cloth with 3 small mattresses, 2 ticks, 2 bolsters, 3 white woollen covers, a dog’s hair blanket
3 common straw chairs

Kitchen: The kitchen, where cooking was done, contained some items also found in the office. It housed the coal used in many of the fireplaces at this time and also bedding used by a servant, probably the kitchen boy. In none of the servants’ rooms are beds themselves mentioned; it is probable that these were built in and were part of the government furnishings of the wing. No food was inventoried in the room. Inventoried items included:
28 large barrels of coal
1 water jug
2 casseroles
2 candlesticks
1 old silk sifter
1 old coffee pot
1 old big kettle
1 boiler
2 mortars of lignum vitae and pestles, one of which was small
5 spits
1 grill of iron
1 iron frying pan
1 cooking pot
1 iron shovel
   tongs and pincers
1 spoon for pots and another for skimming
1 skimming ladle
2 butcher knives
   pepper mill
2 plates
2 pastry cutters
34 pastry moulds
1 wooden chair with straw seat

Chief Steward’s Room: The inventory of the chief ward’s room recorded the following possessions:
   woolen mattress
   tick
2 sheets
   white woolen blanket
   In the preliminary inventory two other servants’ rooms were mentioned with similar bedding, but for some reason they were not present in this inventory.

Garde-Manger (Pantry): The garde-manger contained perishables such as lard, butter and vegetables as well as dishes. Here were stored the glasses, 66 crystal, and 192 plain, various sizes of candles and corks. Other items included:
2 quarts of lard
3 small barrels and 3 firkins (tinette) of butter
1 small barrel and 2 small firkins of lard
1 small barrel of salted beans
1 small barrel of salted herbs
1 small barrel of salted mushrooms
228 glass bottles
12 glass pints
1 jar for water
1 butcher’s chopper
2 candlesticks – one small
18 dozen plates (216)
2 butter dishes with tops and plates
2 tea services with 12 cups each and each a sugar bowl, tea pot and bowl
2 mustard pots
1200 corks
25 quarts of oats
1 quart of almonds in shells
1 quart of bran
1 small sack of lintels
25 livres of candles in a case
433 larger candles
30 livres of soap in 8 cakes

66 chicks and chickens
9 turkeys
5 geese
2 Canada geese
1 sow
16 sheep
1 dapple-grey horse
3 cows

In the attic of the stables were 60 quintals of hay and 25 cords of wood as well as a cask of rice, 100 bottles of English beer and a wicker basket holding 100 empty bottles. The pigeon roost had 12 pairs of pigeons. Finally, Duquesnel owned a boat which was kept at a dock near the stores building.

The total figures for items in the inventory are quite impressive. There were 45 chairs of various kinds, 48 sheets, 125 shirts, 132 aprons, 144 tablecloths, 160 handkerchiefs, 294 glasses, and 560 plates. The wine, in all, amounted to more than 5,000 bottles. In December a number of items arrived from Quebec for Duquesnel and were sold at a small auction in the square on the quay. Among the articles were butter, sheets, apples and a trap with harness, the last item valued at 80 livres.

The next step in the liquidation of the estate was the sale at public auction, which, including the December sale, realized the sum of 22,610 livres, 4 sols. However, Duquesnel’s debts were equally impressive and, conveniently, give some insight into the running of the household. Among the papers were two account books, one for servants’ wages and a second for daily receipts and expenditures. With these the officials were able to verify the claims presented against the estate. Duquesnel owed money to five servants. A sixth servant is mentioned but was not owed anything at the time of the commander’s death; whether he had just been paid or was no longer working for the governor cannot be determined. He was recently a member of the household because he had had a servant’s costume made and his son was being taught to read at the commander’s expense. Lamothe, the chief servant for the household, was the valet or chief steward. He handled most of the household transactions, signing for goods received and doing a large part of the ordering. He even paid those accounts which demanded cash, and paid the wages of the kitchen boy. His own pay was 300 livres per year plus an allowance of three pints of wine per day. It appears to have been Duquesnel’s habit to withhold the wine and give money instead.

In all Lamothe was owed for arrears in salary of 3 years, 7 months and his own out-of-pocket expenses and wine allowance, a total of 1,243 livres, 9 sols and 6 deniers, an enormous sum for a serv-

---

**Basement:** The two basement rooms were additional storage areas, mainly for a considerable amount of wine and spirits. The wine, from France, Spain, Italy, Cyprus and South Africa, totalled 783 bottles, 25 large barrels, 3 small barrels and 2 fourths valued in the auction at over 4,600 livres or more than half the commandant’s basic salary. Cognac, brandy, gin and other liquors from France totalled 5 bottles, 6 pots and 4 ances. In liquors there were the flavours of strawberry, orange and an unidentified one from Barbados totalling 42 bottles. Syrups were also present, one labelled capillaire, made from a maidenhair fern and renowned for its relief of chest illnesses and often mixed in tea, and another labelled orgeat (barley syrup). Finally there were 81 bottles of English beer. In foods there were:
- oils of different sorts, all labelled "fine" contained in 78 bottles, 23 flagons and one small barrel
- 2 quarters of salted beef
- 3 small barrels of lemons
- 1 large water jar
- 2 small flagons of pickled lemons (preserved)
- 16 flagons (bottles) of anchovies
- 11 flagons of capers
- 1 Gruyère cheese and a piece of Parmesan

**The Yard During Duquesnel’s Occupancy**
In the courtyard was the coach house sheltering a four-wheeled coach with harness. In the yard itself there was a considerable menagerie.
ant to be owed in those times. He also received 40 livres for guarding the seals in the period between the two inventories.

The cook, Duval, who had been sent out from France the previous year, was the highest paid servant at 400 livres per year. He had also received his wine allowance for the last year in money. Having been only paid 96 livres since his arrival, he was owed 454 livres. Two other servants, Dambrun (also called Saint-Jean) and Saillant, each received 120 livres per year. The latter also had received his wine allowance for the last year in money and this, plus salary arrears for 3 years, 2 months, meant he was owed 538 livres. The former servant had no wine allowance listed in money so presumably he received the wine itself. He was owed the relatively modest sum of 170 livres. The kitchen boy, Pierre Dorin, from the claim put in by Lamothe, had received 30 livres in the first year, 40 in the second and 50 in the third.

Money was not the only recompense the servants received. Duquesnel provided them with a bed, mattress and sheets. Their washing was done by a laundress at his expense, and their clothes were made by his tailor. Presumably their food came from his table. Moreover these servants did not have to care for everything in the house. Laundry, gardening, breadmaking and considerable maintenance were all done outside the household. Duquesnel even hired a soldier to teach the son of one of the servants, Sugère, to read at a cost of 3 livres per month for 6 months. In all, these servants seem to have been better off than the average soldiers and the lower public officials.

About 35 bills for various services and purchases were presented for payment to the estate, and they reveal much about Duquesnel’s daily household. The washerwoman’s bill, for example, discloses that she lived outside the town. Another bill indicates that a man was paid to haul clothes out to her and back. The washerwoman was owed 278 livres, 68 of which she had received in flour at 18 livres per hundredweight. In the settlement of the estate she took another 11 livres worth of soap and the rest in cash. In a year her washing for the commandant had included 90 livres worth of servants’ clothing, over 2,000 serviettes, 232 tablecloths and sheets, and nearly 300 shirts. Duquesnel’s bread was baked by a widow who lived in the town.

A number of his possessions are accounted for by the purchases recorded from captured English ships whose goods were sold by the admiralty. He still owed for wine from the Canary Islands and Florence; olive oil, silk handkerchiefs, anchovies, raisins, beer, lard, butter, and 11 pairs of women’s gloves. Other bills were for the services of a gardener, ironmonger-blacksmith, carpenter, tailor and tinker. Among the carpenter’s work was the making of a new wooden leg for Duquesnel, and the repair of the foot of an old one. Other purchases, which had been used up by the time the inventory was made and consequently were not mentioned, included a large quantity of tongue, veal, horseshoes, shallots, tobacco, cod and liver.

The funeral service was a considerable expense. One hundred candles were lit and a mausoleum was provided as well as the usual hangings totalling 300 livres. Fifty masses at 1 livre each were also prescribed, while the grave-diggers cost another 14 livres. Then there were extensive legal fees for the sealing, inventories and auction sale. These in addition to the taxes and other expenses came to 1,278 livres. Finally the treasurer of the Marine claimed 2,256 livres as the overpayment of Duquesnel’s yearly salary which had, apparently, already been paid to him.

Final settlement of the estate took years and when, in 1745, Duquesnel’s widow sought an advance from the estate, which was still in Louisbourg, she was refused because the town had fallen and it was not certain that any of the estate would survive. The sale of goods had brought 22,610 livres, and there were other benefits from Duquesnel’s commercial ventures such as a 10 per cent share in the brigantine Tempête which brought a profit of 808 livres. Other unspecified assets inflated the total, so despite debts of almost 14,000 livres, by January of 1746 there remained a balance of 13,957 livres, a sum quite out of keeping with Duchambon’s comment that there might not be enough left from the estate to send to his wife. This sum was not the final figure in the estate, and as late as 1757, Madame Duquesnel was represented in a lawsuit in Louisbourg by her son concerning some of her husband’s business interests on which she was making a claim. In 1745 she had received a pension of 1,500 livres for herself and her two daughters.

Finally, among the papers found in the wing were two family documents, one of which gave nobility to the house of Duquesnel and a second which, in 1667, made Robert le Provost a noble écuyer (noble squire).

After Duquesnel’s death, Duchambon, the king’s lieutenant, acted as commander. A new governor, Antoine Le Moyne de Châteauguay, brother of Iberville, was appointed, but Louisbourg fell before he could take office. He died in 1747 without having had a chance to assume his command.
English Occupation: 1745–49

Descriptions of the barracks by the English were factual. The Cittadel . . . was a Very Large House. Being 23 Rods Long and about 45 Feet Wide all Built of Stone and Brick. it was Defended By it Self Against the City Having a trench between it and the City and the Bridge on which we went over (part of it) was Easily Highsted up . . . In the Middle was A Steeple where Hung an Excellent Bell, the Biggest (By far) that Ever I see. (altho’ we Broke it.) at the East End it is three Stories and Several Larg Rooms Well finished. there is also a Chappel in it Larg Enough to hold Large Congregation. I Trust 1-000 Men may Live Comfortably in Said House.

There is only limited information on the use made of the barracks by the English. These new inhabitants of Louisbourg soon found that the building was inadequate for the number of troops, and set about constructing a wooden barracks inside the adjoining Queen’s Bastion.

A few changes were made in the existing barracks. The addition of pews to the chapel and a new altar turned it into a place of Protestant worship. Before the roof was repaired a participant recorded the following incident in the chapel:

I went into the Barracks or Cittydal and when we were in the Chappel there was a man aloft and the upper part Being very much Broke by our Cannon Balls it gave way & [sic] a Cannon Ball with Boards Came Down and had Like To have Struck Clerk Patterson & my Self and the man hung by his arms By a Joyce.

The barracks was the site of courts martial which were probably held in the council chamber, and the prison was used again. The conditions there were vividly described. “All prisoners sent there be subsisted with Bread and Water only and that each prisoner pay three pence at their going in, and three pence at their coming out, and one penny p’day for each day they may be confin’d.” Prisoners were let out to witness lashings which were given in the yard (one man was given 800 over four days) and then returned to their confinement.

The barracks of the King’s Bastion housed one regiment of troops, that regiment being chosen by the drawing of lots and changing roughly each year. This allowed each regiment to occupy the good lodgings and allowed for periodic cleaning of the barracks. From the summer of 1745 to June, 1746, the building was occupied by Warburton’s regiment. Fuller’s men (minus Hopson’s company) seem to have remained in the barracks for the next two years until May 1748; the colony was returned to France in 1749.
**French Occupation: 1749–58**

The French official sent to re-establish control over the colony was Commandant Desherbiers, who arrived in June of 1749. Arrangements were soon completed with the English, who remained in the barracks while the French came ashore; the English then boarded seven of the same ships and were returned to New England. The original plan for reoccupation called for the soldiers to occupy the New England barracks and for the townspeople to temporarily use the barracks of the King’s Bastion while waiting to move into their town houses or to go to the outposts; however, it was not until 1754 that the French barracks resumed its role as soldiers’ quarters.

Commandant Desherbiers did not take up residence in the governor’s wing of the barracks but lived in the engineer’s house since there was no chief engineer at this time. The governor’s wing was much out of repair, especially the ground floors which required new beams. Repair documents refer to the ground floor containing a council chamber, antechamber, vestibule and kitchen. The dining room was mentioned when a two-piece buffet with cornice and shelves was added to the room, as well as two large trestles for a buffet table. In 1750 two iron stoves were added to the wing in the perennial fight against dampness.

There were assorted occupants of the governor’s wing in the first years of reoccupation, with the king’s lieutenant residing there in 1749 and the noted French geographer, Joseph Chabert, in 1750. The latter had been sent out to make readings of the stars and tides in the North American colonies, and he had built a wooden observation shack on the left flank of the King’s Bastion to which he had access from the governor’s balcony. Chabert left Louisbourg in 1751, but the new governor, M. le compte de Raymond, declined to move in. “C’est une vraye glacier,” he reported, “estil n’y a aucune commodité qui puisse convenir à l’état de ma maison.” He, too, lived in the engineer’s house, and that winter the wing was occupied by some naval officers whose ship wintered at Louisbourg for fear of an attack on the colony in the spring.

Two lists of occupants in the barracks in 1752 and 1753 reveal that the building was given over to both civilian and military occupation. Inevitably, personal relations were strained at such close quarters, and in May the ordonnateur wrote that a new engineer, Brécon, and his two sons, who were sub-engineers, were guilty of bad conduct. The father was living with a woman de mauvaise vie and was waiting for a second “qu’on dit veuve d’un officier Irlandois.” This ménage was living in the governor’s wing and even wanted to make alterations which the ordonnateur prevented.

Other barracks residents had been forced to leave the colony, including three women “of bad life” and “plusieurs familles et Irlandois qu’on aëté obligé de chaser du pays.” Aside from the notorious Brécon and his sons, two captains and their families lived in the governor’s wing. In the officers’ quarters there were more captains with three rooms set aside for the church and occupied by the chaplain, the verger and the sacristy. Another room housed a pensioner. Some of the rooms in the soldiers’ barracks were given over to officers, but most were allocated to married soldiers. One soldier was in the same room as a woman of “bad life,” but she had disappeared by the time the second list was compiled in 1753. Other rooms were allotted to sailors, the school for cannoneers, and the contractor; two were set aside for the government and one was vacant. In the north wing four rooms were occupied by a Captain Benoit and his family, and the other four by a captain, an ensign and his wife who had two rooms, and a widow sans profession.

It is not possible to discern on what basis the rooms were allotted. In some instances captains had only one room while the ensign, much lower in rank, had two. A number of civilians also had rooms to themselves. As well as listing the occupants of the rooms these documents did give some interior details. The governor’s wing was described as “Vaste, bon et Commode” with two rooms for the council and kitchen on the ground floor, and an office, large antechamber, bedroom, cabinet, wardroom and private staircase on the first floor and three attic rooms for servants. It was felt by the author that the wing had other advantages:

> Le rampart du bastion du Roy peut lui servir de promenade que le jardin commun entre luy et L’Ordonnateur, est Situé vis a vis Quil y a une grande Cour pour la Volaille avec Ecurie, remise, et Pigeonniere Et qu’enfin Si la Cour adopte le projet formé pour Effacer le Chemin Couvert de la Gorge du fort, on pour[ra] y procurer une Entrée de face a la place d’Armes.

The plan for a townward entrance to the governor’s wing did not materialize. The north wing was still referred to as the “Ancienne Intendance” and it was described as having eight rooms which could be turned over to the king’s lieutenant for his residence, with the adjoining casemates to be used as storage areas. The rest of the building was referred to simply as the barracks. It was recommended that three rooms be set aside for the sacristy, chaplain and prison; that two be set aside for the government; and that the remaining 31 serve as officers’ rooms with one room for subalterns and two for captains or married officers. This recommendation was never carried out because of the officers’ reluctance to leave their town dwellings.
In the spring of 1754, a third commander was appointed to Louisbourg, Governor Augustin de Drucour, who, with his wife, took up residence in the governor’s wing which had finally been readied for his occupancy. The arrival the following year of 1,050 soldiers and 62 officers of the second battalions of the Artois and Bourgogne regiments meant that all available space would be used for barracks. The north half was finally returned to its original function and was to house 324 soldiers and 2 captains. The south half, however, was left to be occupied by the government, chapel, chaplain and “Le Capitaine des portes.”

By means of the chaplain and “Le Capitaine des portes,” the officers were finally lodged. The newly arrived officers did not expect or want barracks accommodation, and the engineer Frquent complained that they were expecting to get what they had in France, forgetting that this was a place of war where they had to accept what was provided. The ordonnateur, Prévost, went so far as to suggest that the officers be forced to go into the quarters provided for them; however, as mentioned above, the army officers were much more effective than the Marine in getting their lodging suitably furnished.

Little is known about the occupation of the barracks of the King’s Bastion until the second Louisbourg siege. In 1758 two additional battalions from the Combis and Volontaire étrangers regiments added 1,360 troops to the rolls and the accommodation problem must have been acute. There is some evidence that the courtyard of the bastion, along with the chapel, was turned into soldiers’ quarters.

On 8 June the second siege of Louisbourg began and the building suffered severe damage from enemy artillery and mortar fire.

A sept heures ce matin [of July 23] il a tombé sur les Cazernes du fort au Nord du Clocher de la Chapelle une Bombe de 12 Pouces dans une Chambre de Soldats; ces Soldats ont tous Sortes emportant leurs effets, on S’est présenté pour visiter si elle y avait mise le feu mais on n’a pas cru qu’il y étoit, une demie heure après le feu a paru tres allume, il s’en communique rapidement le long du faîtage, et de la couverture en Bardeau; on a fait des efforts pour le couper au dessus de l’Eglise; ... mais les vents ayant changés dans ce moment, L’Incendie a enflé la longueur de ce Batiment, Il n’a pû être arrêté qu’au Pavillon du Sud logement de M. de Drucour Gouverneur de cette Place, tous le reste y compris le Pavillon de l’autre Bout a été consumé.

Les Anglais Pendant ces incendie qui a duré cinq à Six heures ont faits pleuvoir dans cette partie des Bombes et des Boulets avec une extreme activite. Neanmoins toute la garnison, des ouvriers de la ville et les Charpentiers des Vaisseaux s’y sont porter avec une Bravoure, et une ardeur peu commune. A second account of the fire described the scene in the building and in the yard on that disastrous morning.

Une bombe y tombe [on the barracks], éclate, tue et blesse huit personnes, une seconde remplit d’artifices, vomissant des flammes par cinq bouches, y met le feu, déjà une grande partie de cet édifice est embrasé, les flammes sortent de toutes parts et montant jusqu’aux nues présentent un simulacre du volcan; à ce spectacle d’horreur se joignent les gémissements, les cris des femmes, des enfants, le feu avait entamé les bois et blindages qui couvraient l’entrée de leurs casements, une fumée noire et épaisse avait pénétré. Cette odeur empestée les réveillant, la crainte d’être brûlées les précipitant hors de leur lit, à la hâte elles quittent ces asiles enterrés, et se sauvent en foules les unes vêtues en simple jupon, la plus grande partie d’un seul linge, l’une enserre sa fille, l’autre porte son fils, celle-ci en a deux crochetés dans ses bras, un troisième la suit, et cette autre aidée [illegible] porte et traine son corps.

Once out of the casemates the only exit from the courtyard was through the central passage – also in flames and partly collapsed. Leurs tendres pieds fument déjà, leur linge est embrasé, leur peau en est rougee, n’importe leur determination sont au dessus de tout risque; de leurs corps elles percet les flammes, se font jour au milieu et malgré les boulets, les bombes et leurs éclats, traversent au milieu la grande place, les rues, passent sur les cadavres, voient des expirants.

Only the governor’s wing was saved from this conflagration, but the barracks as it was ceased to exist. After the surrender on 26 July, the English built a small barracks over part of the remains and seem to have occupied it until their withdrawal from Louisbourg in 1768.

In many ways the barracks building paralleled the history of the fortress. As with the plans for the fortifications which were changed and modified before construction, the barracks’ plan underwent various alterations before work was begun. As with the fortress, construction suffered many delays and the final touches were made years after construction should have finished. Even then both required constant repairs, and there were serious problems with each, partly because they were designed without consideration for the special problems of Louisbourg’s climate and situation. The building saw its lowest point in the 1750s after the French reoccupation, during the period of mixed civilian and military occupation, but returned to full service in its final years.
19 Remains of the barracks, 1907, looking toward the north wing. (Archives of Ontario.)

20 Stabilized ruins of the barracks looking toward the north wing, during the 1930s. (Original source unknown.)
end of resistance to the English; three days later the French surrendered. The imposing barracks which had dominated the peninsula was gone.

### Appendix A. Yearly salaries and allowances in *livres, sols* and *deniers* of selected officials in Louisbourg for 1744.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor or Commandant</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>included 1,200-<em>livre</em> allowance for the up-keep of a boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissaire</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordonnateur</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>if appointed as <em>Général</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief engineer</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>in addition he had a 1,200-<em>livre</em> allowance for a draftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s lieutenant</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>included a 300-<em>livre</em> gratuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-engineer</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Captain</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>included a 200-<em>livre</em> gratuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief scribe</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>included a 200-<em>livre</em> gratuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudant or Aide-major</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translator</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>included a 300-<em>livre</em> gratuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storeskeeper</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Cannoneer</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ensigne en pied</em></td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ensigne en second</em></td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storeskeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>less deduction for ration and uniform, leaving 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. “Etat de l’habillement, munitions de guerre et autres effets qui se sont trouvés dans les magasins du Roy le premier août 1724.”

Chapelle du fort
2 aubes à dentelle
5 aubes simples
5 amict
1 antiphonaire
1 bassin d’argent
2 burettes d’argent
2 boites d’étain pour les Saintes Huiles
5 bourses de différentes couleurs
2 calices d’argent
4 chandeliers de cuivre
1 crucifix de cuivre monté sur bois
1 canon complet
1 cloche de fonte pesant 120 livres
1 clochette
4 caporaux [corporaux]
5 chasubles
2 chapes
3 devant d’autel
1 drap mortuaire
5 étoles
1 missel romain
5 manipules
2 nappes à dentelle pour l’autel
3 nappes simples
2 nappes de communion
1 pierre d’autel
1 pseautier
12 purificatoires
1 graduel
4 lavabos
1 surplis à dentelle
1 surplis simple
5 voiles pour calice

Balance des recettes et consommations des vivres, munitions et marchandises faites dans les magasins du Roy depuis le 23 juillet jusques et compris le dernier décembre 1749.

12 amits pour ornements de l’église
11 aubes pour id
1 aspersoir pour chapelle
4 boites d’argent pour les saintes huiles
1 bénitier de fer blanc
4 bénitiers de cuivre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cannoneers</th>
<th>426</th>
<th>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>less deduction for ration and uniform leaving 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>less deduction for ration and uniform leaving 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>less deduction for ration and uniform leaving 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st sergeant</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sergeant</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannoneer (2 grades)</td>
<td>191.14</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 167.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>less deduction for uniform leaving 139.4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 bourses des 4 couleurs de l'Église pour chapelle
6 burettes d'étain pour id
4 bonnets guarrés pour id
8 boîtes de fer blanc pour mettre les pains à chant
44 chandeliers de cuivre ordinaires
6 idem grands pour l'autel (de l'hôpital?)
4 calices d'argent avec leur patene, coiffe et étui
4 ciboires d'argent avec leur étui
4 crucifix de cuivre
3 canons pour la messe
1 croix de cuivre
16 corporaliers
12 ceintures de fil
4 chasubles des 4 couleurs de l'Englise
1 idem noire
4 clochettes pour chapelle
2 cartes d'autel
4 coussins des 4 couleurs de l'Englise
1 idem noir
2 cloches de fonte
1 chape de camelot noir
1 idem de satin des 4 couleurs de l'Église
4 devant d'autel des 4 couleurs de l'Église
1 idem noir
2 dalmatiques de camelot noir
3 évangiles
4 étoles des 4 couleurs de l'Église
2 idem noires
1 encensoir de cuivre jaune avec sa navette
2 éteignoirs de cuivre rouge
40-1/2 aunes d'étamine noire
1 graduel en plain chant
3 lavabos pour chapelle
1 lampe de cuivre jaune à cul et bocal pour la chapelle
4 missels ordinaires pour la messe
1 idem en plain chant
4 manipules des 4 couleurs de l'Église
2 idem noires
1 moule de fer gravé pour faire le pain à chant
4 pierres bénites pour chapelle
12 palles pour id
20 purificatoires pour id
1 psautier en plain chant
rituels pour aumônier
5 surplis
1 tabernacle à deux faces, de bois de chêne
1 tabernacle simple de bois de pin
4 voiles des 4 couleurs de l'Église pour chapelle
1 vespéral en plain chant
4 pigoux²
Appendix C. Duquesnel Inventory and Sale.\textsuperscript{1}

The inventory of Duquesnel's effects is transcribed here with the addition of the sale price and, where possible, the average unit price. The descriptions and the quantities mentioned in the sale sometimes differ from those in the inventory; any such discrepancies are recorded in parenthesis after the item in question. No comment was made in the documents about these discrepancies and there is no way to account for the missing items since the rooms were sealed until the sale began.

Because some of the goods were sold in lots it has not been possible to give a price for each article. All prices are in \textit{livres} and \textit{sols} (there were 20 \textit{sols} in a \textit{livre}). The division of the \textit{sol} into 12 \textit{deniers} has been disregarded, and \textit{sols} have been rounded off. Attempts have been made to equate the \textit{livre} to the modern dollar, but estimates vary so much as to render the exercise useless. More meaningful is the relative value of goods with each other and with other value scales such as the index of salaries in Appendix A.

1. Premièrement Sest trouvé dans la chambre a la droite de la salle en entrant

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Sales & Units & Prices \\
\hline
380 & un lit garni de Sa couchette & 36 \\
& paillasse deux matelas de laine couverts & \\
& de toile rayée & \\
& Item un traversain de cotil garni de plume & 132 \\
& deux couvertures de laine blanche & \\
& Item la housse du lit garni de son imperiale & 23 \\
& a la duchesse fonsé de taffetas blanc pi-

qué et des pentes de Serge couleur de feu & \\
& orné en dessins de ruban blanc, les ri-

deaux et bonne graces de la meme Serge & \\
& ainsy, que les Soubassements et pentes & \\
& Item une courtepoinique piqué de taffetas & 60.10 \\
& blanc & 6.1 \\
& 41 & Item un canapé couvert de moquette & 13.10 \\
& 137 & Item un miroir de Glace garni de Sa bor-

\[2-1/2]\] dure de bois doré & \\
& Item deux boitss a Cadrille & \\
& Item un petit sac de jettons d'ivoire avec & \\
& un petit panier dosier & \\
& Item une vieille longue vue a laquelle il & \\
& manque un verre & \\
& Item deux rideaux de fenetres de toile peinte [10] & \\
& Item un Bureau anglais dans lequel sest & \\
& trouvé des papiers que nous avons remis a & \\
& examiner après l'inventaire des meubles & \\
& Item dix huit mouchoirs de soye Commune & \\
& [25] & \\
& Item environ Cinq livres de chocolat de & \\
& Manille & \\
& Item Cinq autres livres de meme chocolat & \\
& Item environ quatre livres et demi de cho-

colat apretté & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Item quinze livres de chocolat des isles non apreté
Item Sept différentes boettes de thé
Item onse paires de chaussons de fil tricoté
Item trois paires de chaussettes de cotton
Item environ six aunes de mousseline rayée [5-2/3]
Item environ deux aunes et demi de toille de rouen
Item environ trois quaterons de rubarbe
Item dans la même chambre S'est trouvé
Item un habit de drap Cannelle galonné en or doublé de Soie Cramoisî
Item une veste de gros de naples couleur de feu galonné en or doublé de peluche blanche
Item une Culotte de drap canelle
Item deux Culottes de velours dont l'une neuve
Item un Justaucorps et culotte de droguet de soye brun et boutons dargent doublé de taffetas citron
Item un veste de gros de naples couleur Citron garnie en argent doublée de soye
Item un vieux Justaucorps de drap brun a boutons dor doublée de soye rouge
Item une vieille veste de velours ras ponceau galonné en or doublée de peluche blanc
Item une redingotte de drap gris garnie d'un collet de velours noir
Item une robe de chambre de cotton rayé doublée d'une cottonade
Item une boette dans laquelle S'y est trouvé trois perruques
Item un Soufflet

3. Ensuite avons passé dans le cabinet ou il S'est trouvé
Sale  Unit  Price  Price
Une malle couverte de peau de veau rouge dans laquelle S'est trouvé un sac contenant Cent soixante Sept ecus de six livres qui font la Somme de mille deux livres
Item un autre Sac contenant Cent Cinquante ecus de Six livres qui font la Somme de neuf Cens livres
Item un autre sac contenant quatre vingts quinze ecus de Six livres trente ecus de trois livres faisant en Semble la somme de Six Cens soixante livres
Item dans le même Sac un rouleau de papier Contenant un louys dor de vingt quatre livres vingt deux ecus de Six livres, deux ecus de trois livres et trois piastres mexiquaines faisant ensemble la somme de Cent Soixante dix Dept livres
Item dans un pupitre S'est trouvé quatre ecus de six livres, deux pieces de vingt quatre sols six pièces de dous sols, deux pieces de vingt sols monnoye despagne et trois Sous marqués de six liards [écritoire vendu pour 6.10]
Item un Cachet dargent armoiré des armes du defunt avec son etuy le couvert
Item vingt quatre Cueillieres et vingt quatre fourchettes d'argent armoirés aux armes du defunt [une cuillère et une fourchette font un couvert et 6 couverts ont été vendus à la fois; le prix a été déterminé par le poids de l'argent donné en marc, once, et gros et vendus selon le prix d'un marc qui pèse à peu près 9.7 onces modernes. Les couverts pesaient à peu près 5 onces et se vendaient de 52 livres le marc à 56 le marc.]
Item Six Cueilleres a ragout armoirié Comme dessus [pesant à peu près 4 onces et se vendaient de 57 livres le marc à 60 le marc]
Item deux moyens plats dargent [pesant 2 marcs, 8 onces (probablement une erreur, devrait être 4 onces), 3 gros, vendus à 51 livres le marc]
Item deux Sallieres dargent [5 onces 6 gros à 56 livres le marc]
45.19 4 Item deux etuis garnis de Six Cuillères a Caffé dargent chacun [chaque cuillère pèse environ 4 gros et se vend à 56 livre le marc] 47 1.3 Item vingt mouchoirs de poche demi usés [40]
83 Item un gé a pomme dor [une canne à pommeau d’or] 26 8.13 Item trois vestes de Basin
24 Item une tabatière de Carton incrustée en vernis 4.15 Item une Camisole de basin
3.15 Item une autre tabatière d’ecaille unie 58 .16 Item trois Camisoles de flanelle
Item dans une petite bourse une paire de boucles a souliers dor a chape de fer Item quatre aunes de toile peinte en un morceau
3.10 Item une boucle de col dargent 12 6 Item une paire de boutons démanche aussi dor
26.10 Item une boucle de col argent 7 1.4 Item une morceau de toile peinte Contenant environ onse aunes
4. Premièrement Sest trouvé dans une armoire de la garderobe 58 Item vingt Sept coiffes de bonnet [72]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>326.07 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.10</td>
<td>136.10</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Ensuite avons passé dans loffice ou it Sest trouvé

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

six chaises a langloise garnies d’un Cuir noir
Item six autres chaises a langloise garnies de cuir rouge
Item huit fauteuils de Canne [6]
Item quatre chaises communes de paille [6]
Item un Cabaret garni de douse tasses de porcelaine doré avec trois sucriers de di­ferentes grandeurs Sa tayiere une Jatte et Sa soucoupe
Item un autre Cabaret avec six tasses six soucoupes de porcelaine une tayiere et Soucoupe de meme
Item six petites Bolles de porcelaine bleu
28 Item une Braisiere avec son couvercle aussi de Cuivre rouge
11 Item une passoir de cuivre rouge
20.10 Item une poupe tonnire avec son Couvercle de cuivre rouge
12.15 Item quatre tourtières Sans couvercle et un plat de cuivre rouge
6.18 Item deux lechefrites de cuivre rouge
20 Item une poissonnière avec Sa feuille de cuivre rouge
Item un ecumoir et une Cueilliere a pot de cuivre rouge
Item une Cafetière de cuivre rouge
Item quatre Feuilles de cuivre rouge
Item une chaudière de cuivre rouge
Item deux poiles a confiture avec lecumoir de cuivre rouge
Item deux vieux couvercles et une tourtière de cuivre rouge hors de service
Item un vieux poêlon de cuivre jaune et une caffetiere sans couvercle du levant
Item un gril quatre trespieds et une vieille poile le tout de fer
31 10.3 Item trois Cristaux garnis avec chacun un plat de porcelaine
9 2.2 Item quatre compotiers avec leurs Couvercles de cristal
76.17 Item quatorze Jambons [8 pesant environ 12 livres et vendus à 13–14 sols la livre]
24 Item une paire de balances de Cuivre rouge avec son fleau de fer et vingt deux livres de plomb en trois poids
42.08 Item Cinq paires de chandeliers de Cuivre Jaune [6 chandeliers]
5.5 .5 Item onse tasses et onse Soucoupes de porcelaine bleu
8 2 Item deux moutardiers et une tayiere de porcelaine
8.2 2 Item huit Saladiers de porcelaine bleu [4]
131.10 Item Cinquante neuf plats de fayance de differentes façons [51]
20 5 Item quatre terrines ovales de fayance avec leurs couvercles
5 12 Item huit Salieres de fayance Id dis de cristal
2.5 Item une tayiere et deux écuettes de terre brune [de fayence brune]
44.10 7.5 Item Cinq paires de chandeliers de Cuivre Jaune [6 chandeliers]
4 Item trois Seaux de verre blanc
5.2 .17 Item six huillieres de verre blanc
2 Item deux moules a glace, deux moules a fromage, douse petits moules a biscuits et un petit arrosoir le tout de fer blanc
97 Item Six marmittes tant grandes que petites aussi de Cuivre rouge
97 Item Six marmittes tant grandes que petites aussi de Cuivre rouge
43.15 4.17 Item neuf Casseroles a queue aussi de cuivre rouge
36 18 Item deux Casseroles rondes aussi de Cuivre rouge
Item un paquet d'environ une livre de truffes et un autre paquet d'environ demi livre de mousseron

53

Item deux boîtes de Confitures Seiches dont l'une entamée

14 8.7

Item environ une livre et demi de Cannelle

2

Item un boîtier avec son couvercle de porcelaine

24.15 1.7

Item un paquet d'environ deux livres de truffes

12 2

Item environ quatre livres de poivre

19.5 2.15

Item un Caisson doranges tapée

57 7.3

Item dous mauvais couteaux de table à manche de bois.

18.10

Item dans un Sac vingt livres damenées

20

Item dans un Sac de papier Environ huit livres d'amendes

9.14 1.4

Item Cinquième trois livres de Café dans un Sac [51]

34.10 1.16

Item vingt Cinq pains de Sucre fin

7.10

Item dans une quaisse Environ Six Livres de Ris

82.10

Item dans un quart Environ un quintal de Sucre En Castonnade

2.7

Item une grosse forme de Sucre des Isles

102.4 4.2

Item une petite quaisse quatorze Livres de Confiture Seiches des Isles

6. Ensuitte avons passé dans une chambre appelée la Lingerie de plain pied a la Salle dans la quelle S'Est trouvé dans une armoire

Sale Unit
Price Price

95.05 23.16 Cinq Bariques Et demie de Blé [4]

6.46 23 Item un quart de Son Et deux quarts de pois

33 Item vingt Six glennes d'ognon

20.10 Item une paire de chenets, tenailles pelle

22 Item une paire de vieils chenets, une pelle

12.5; 19 4.15 Item pinsettes ornées de figures de Cuivre

Item une paire de vieils chenets, une pelle

22 Item un petit matelats

19.5 2.15 Item une Barique Et quatre quarts D'avoine

381.06 38.3 Ensuite avons passé dans autre chambre ou nous avons trouvé

66.05 13.5 quatorse quarts de farine [10]

Item six Bariques d'avoine [5]
Item deux flambeaux de Cuivre Jausne
Item un tamis de Soie viel
Item une vieille Caftiere du Levant
Item un viel Cocquemar de Cuivre Rouge
Item une chaudière de Cuivre Rouge avec Son anse de fer
Item un mortié de bois de gayac avec Son pilon
Item un Egrugeoir de bois de gayac avec Son pilon
Item deux Broches
Item trois atelets de fer
Item un gril de fer
Item une poille de fer
Item une marmite de Cuivre Rouge avec Son Couvercle
Item une pelle, pinces Et pincettes de fer
Item une Cuiller a pot, un Ecumoir Et une Cuiller a degresser le tout de Cuivre Rouge
Item une chese de bois foncé de paille
Item deux Couteaux à hacher
Item un moulin a poivre de fer
Item deux plats Et un Coupepâte le tout de Cuivre Rouge
Item vingt deux moules à petits pâtés le tout de Cuivre Rouge
Item vingt deux idem Et un Coupe pâte de fer blanc
Item un matelats de laine, deux traversins, deux Couvertes blanches Et une paire de draps

9. Ensuite avons passé dans une chambre a Costé, de plain pied, ou loge le M°. d'hostel, ou nous avons trouvé un matelats de Lainne, une paillasse deux draps de Lit Et une Couvert de Lainne Blanche.

10. Ensuite avons Entré dans une chambre de plain pied vis avis ou nous avons trouvé

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 146    | 73   | deux quarts de Lard
| 131.01 | 65.5 | le quintal
Item deux grandes tinettes Et une petite pleines de beurre [pesant 81, 80 et 40 livres]

76.08 66.10 le quintal

Item deux petites tinettes pleines de Sein doux [pesant 60 et 58 livres]

55.6 65.5 le quintal

Item deux petits Barils de Boeurre [pesant 46 et 36-1/2 livres]

34.13 65.10 le quintal

Item un autre Baril de Beurre [pesant 55 livres]

15

Item un Baril d’haricots verds Salés

11.10

Item un Baril d’herbes Salées

14

Item un Baril de Chamignons Salés

15.8 70 le quintal

Item un Baril de Sein doux [tinette pesant 22 livres]

51 22 le cent

Item deux Cent vingt huit Bouteilles de verre

6.10
dans un autre petit Sac un millier de Bou- chons de bouteilles

Item vingt Cinq quarts D’avoinne

134.6 5.3

Item un quart presque plain d’amendes En Cocques

43.10

Item un quart de Son

6.10

Item un petit Sac presque plain de Leintille

Item viron deux Cent Bouchons de Bouteilles, dans un sac

6.10

Item une petite quaisse pleine de Bougie

211.5 1.1

Item quatre quaissses pleinnnes de Chandelles pesants chacunne Cinquante Livres

Item huit Briques de Savon pesants En-

semble trente une Livre [29-1/2 livres]

Item Soixante Six verres de Cristail de Roche

35.2 3.1/2

Item Cent quatre vingt douz verres Blancs

11. Ensuiette avons dessendu dans le Cave du Costé du fossé

ou nous avons trouvé

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1167  | 129.13| neuf Bariques de vin Rouge de St. Onge| pleinnnes

147;150; 131

Item trois Bariques de vin Rouge de Bordeaux [un de St. Onge]

40;41

Item deux quarts de Beuf Sallé

120 4 Item un Baril En videnge d’huille fine (30 pots)

46;21

Item deux petits Carteaux de vin de Navare dont un En videnge

157.10 39.7 Item quatre ances d’Eau de vie

150.10 25.2 Item Cinq Cavevettes Remplies de vin de florence, de trente Bouteilles chaque [6]

27 47 Item vingt Six Bouteilles de même vin

1.10 Item deux quaissses d’huille de trente Bou-

29-1/2 Item dix huit Bouteilles de la même huille

telles chaque [d’olive]

Item une autre guesse de vin de florence Contenant trente Bouteilles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.04</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Item quatre vingt une Bouteille de bierre d'Angleterre [80]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Item quarante neuf Bouteilles de vin d'Espagne Blanc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>Item dix sept Bouteilles de vin blanc de Bordeaux [10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>Item Cent quatrevingt douze Bouteilles de vin Blanc . . . d'anglet [191]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Item vingt sept Bouteilles de vin Blanc de Bordeaux [26]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Item dix huit Bouteilles de vin du Cap de bonne Esperance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item quarante Bouteilles de vin Rouge, Bordeaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Item dix Bouteilles de vin Cleret, de provence [18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Item vingt trois Bouteilles de Liqueur de flamboises [22] [eau-de-vie]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Item deux petits flacons de Citrons Confits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Item douze flacons d'Enchois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Item Cinq flacons de Capres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Item vingt Bouteilles de vin de Chipre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Item une quaisse Contenant Six flacons de Capres Et quatre d'Enchois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Item neuf dindes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item Cinq oies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Item deux outardes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Item une truie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Item Seise moutons Et Brebis [15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Item Seise moutons Et Brebis [15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item deux outardes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Item une truie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Item Seise moutons Et Brebis [15]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item deux outardes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Item une truie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. “Ordonnance du roy, Concernant les Crimes & Délits Militaires, du premier juillet 1727.”

Sa Majeste s’étant fait représenter le XXXe Article du Règlement donné à Poitiers par le feu Roy son Bisayeul, le 4. Novembre 1651. par lequel il auroit été ordonné que les anciens Règlements & Ordonnances militaires seroient ponctuellement suivies pour toutes les choses concernant la discipline & police des Gens de guerre, ausquelles il étoit pourvu par icelles; Et étant informée des embarras qui naissent journellement dans les Conseils de Guerre, lorsqu’il s’agit d’y juger des crimes, délits ou autres cas intéressans le service, la discipline & la subordination, tant parce que la plupart des Officiers qui y sont appellez n’ont pas connoissance des Ordonnances de François I. du 24 Juillet 1534. de Henry II. des 20 Mars 1550. 23. Decembre 1553. & 22 Mars 1557. qui ont établi la régle qui doit être suivie en ces matières, que parce que quelques-uns desdits cas n’y sont pas exprimez d’une manière assez précise pour lever toute difficulté: à quoy étant nécessaire de pourvoir en réunissant & expliquant les dispositions, tant desdites anciennes Ordonnances, que de celles du feu Roy Bisayeul de Sa Majesté, relatives à cette matière, par une Loy générale qui puisse faire connoître aux Soldats, Cavaliers & Dragons l’étendue de leurs devoirs; & à leurs Officiers, les peines qu’ils doivent prononcer contre ceux qui y manqueront. Sa Majesté, après avoir examiné lesdites Ordonnances de François I. & de Henry II. des 24. Juillet 1534. 20, Mars 1550. 23. Decembre 1553. & 22. Mars 1557. & autres données en conséquence, a ordonné & ordonne ce qui suit.

Article Premier
Tous Soldats, Cavaliers & Dragons seront tenus, sous peine de la vie, d’obéir aux Officiers des Régimens & Compagnies dont ils seront, en tout ce qui leur sera par eux ordonné pour le service de Sa Majesté, soit dans les Armées, en Route, dans les Quartiers & dans les Garnisons.

Il
Veut Sa Majesté qu’il soient tenus sous la même peine de la vie, d’obéir à tous Officiers des autres Compagnies ou Régimens qui seront dans leur Quartier ou dans leur Garnison; l’intention de Sa Majesté étant que vingt-quatre heures après l’arrivée d’un Officier dans lesdits Quartiers ou Garnisons, il soit réputé connu des Cavaliers, Dragons & Soldats qui s’y trouveront.
Ill
Ordonne Sa Majesté ausdits Officiers, de tenir la main à ce que les Soldats, Cavaliers & Dragons obéissent aux Maréchaux des Logis, & Sergens de leurs Compagnies & Régimens avec lesquels ils seront en garnison; Voulant Sa Majesté que ceux qui leur désobéiront en choses concernant son service, soient punis corporellement, ou de mort, suivant la nature & la circonstance de leur désobéissance.

IV
Tous Cavaliers, Dragons & Soldats qui mettront l'épée à la main contre des Officiers, soit de leur Régiment ou des autres Troupes de leur Quartier ou Garnison; qui les frapperont de quelque manière que ce puisse être, ou qui les menaceront, soit en portant la main à la garde de l'épée, ou en faisant quelque mouvement pour mettre leur fusil en joue, quand même ils auraient été frappés & maltraités par lesdits Officiers, auront le poing coupé, & seront ensuite pendus & étranglez.

V
Le Cavalier, Dragon ou Soldat qui frappera un Maréchal des Logis ou un Sergent, tant de son Régiment que des autres Troupes du Quartier ou de la Garnison, étant de Garde ou de service actuel avec luy, sera puni de mort: Et hors le cas du service actuel, celui qui frappera un Sergent ou un Maréchal des Logis, soit de son Régiment ou de la même Garnison, ou qui mettra contre luy l'épée à la main, sera condamné aux galères perpétuelles.

VI
Celui qui frappera un Caporal ou Brigadier avec lequel il sera de Garde, de Détachement, ou autre service actuel, soit que ledit Brigadier ou Caporal soit du même Régiment ou d'une autre Troupe du Quartier ou de la Garnison, sera pareillement condamné aux galères perpétuelles.

VII
Tout Soldat qui de jour ou de nuit, après avoir été posé en sentinelle, quittera son Poste sans avoir été relevé par un Sergent, Caporal ou Anspessade, sera puni de mort.

VIII
Les Cavaliers & Dragons qui quitteront le lieu où ils auront été mis en vedette, ordonnance ou autre faction, sans avoir été relevé par leurs Officiers, seront condamnés à la même peine.

IX
Tout Soldat ou Cavalier étant en sentinelle ou faction, qui se trouvera endormi pendant la nuit, sera pareillement puni de mort.

X
Lorsque la Garde de nuit aura été posée dans une Place de guerre, celui qui tirera des armes à feu, ou qui fera du bruit ou autre chose capable de causer quelque allarme dans une Place de guerre, sera mis sur le cheval de bois, chaque jour pendant un mois, à l’heure de la Garde montante.

XI
Sera condamné à la même peine celui qui s’envvrerà le jour qu’il sera de garde.

XII
Quiconque donnera ou fera connaître l’ordre à l’ennemi, ou à aucun autre qu’à ceux à qui il doit être donné, sera pendu & étranglé.

XIII
Tout Soldat, Cavalier ou Dragon qui mettra l’épée à la main dans un Camp ou dans une Place de guerre, étant agresseur, sera condamné aux galères perpétuelles: Voulant Sa Majesté, que dans le cas où deux Soldats, Cavaliers ou Dragons mettraient l’épée à la main l’un contre l’autre volontairement, & sans qu’un des deux y ait été forcé pour la défense de sa vie, ils subissent tous deux la même peine des Galères perpétuelles.

XIV
Tout Cavalier, Dragon ou Soldat qui aura été offensé par un autre, soit de parole ou de fait, s’adressera à l’Officier commandant dans la Place ou dans le Quartier; lequel après avoir ouy les raisons des Parties, fera faire à l’offensé telle réparation qu’il jugera convenable, & imposera à l’offenseur le chastiment que le cas luy paroitra mériter.

XV
Lorsque des Soldats, Cavaliers ou Dragons auront l’épée à la main pour se battre, & qu’un de leurs Officiers, ou autre de la Garson, survenant, leur criera de se séparer, ils seront tenus de luy obéir sur le champ, sans pouvoir pousser un seul coup, à peine d’être passez par les Armes.
XVI
Celui qui insultera & attaquera un Soldat, Cavalier ou Dragon étant en sentinelle, ordonnance ou faction, soit l'épée à la main, le fusil en joue ou à coup de bâton ou de pierre, sera passé par les Armes.

XVII
Tous Cavaliers, Dragons ou Soldats qui exciteront quelque sédition, révolte ou mutinerie, ou qui feront aucune assemblée illicite, pour quelque cause et sous quelque prétexte que ce puisse être, seront pendus & étranglez.

XVIII
Subiront la même peine ceux que se trouveront en pareilles assemblées, ou qui auront appelé, excité, ou exhorté quelqu’un à s’y trouver.

XIX
Seront pareillement punis de peine corporelle, ou de mort, suivant l’exigence des cas, ceux qui auront dit quelques paroles tendantes à sédition, mutinerie, ou rébellion, ou qui les auront entendu sans en avertir sur le champ leurs Capitaines ou Officiers supérieurs.

XX
Celui qui étant engagé dans quelque querelle, combat, ou autre occasion, appellerait ceux de sa Nation, de son Régiment, ou de sa Compagnie à son secours, ou formera quelqu’attroupement, sera passé par les Armes.

XXI
Ceux qui auront fait quelque entreprise ou conspiration contre le service du Roy, & la sûreté des Villes, Places & Pays de sa domination, contre les Gouverneurs & Commandans desdites Places, ou contre leurs Officiers; comme aussi ceux qui y auront consenti, ou qui en ayant eu connaissance, n’en auront pas averti leurs Capitaines ou Mestres de Camp, seront rompus vifs.

XXII
Celui qui dérobera les armes de son camarade ou autre Soldat, en quelque lieu que ce soit, sera pendu & étranglé: Et celui qui dérobera dans les chambres des cazernes leur linge, habit ou équipage, ainsi que le prest ou pain de ceux de sa chambrée, sera condamné à mort, ou aux galères perpétuelles, suivant les circonstances du cas.

XXIII
Leur défend pareillement Sa Majesté, à peine d’être passés par les verges, d’aller hors du Camp ou de la Garnison, audevant de ceux qui y apportent des vivres, pour en acheter, quand même ce seroit de gré à gré & sans aucune violence.

XXIV
Leur défend Sa Majesté sous peine de la vie, de voler les meubles ou ustensiles des maisons où ils seront logez, soit en Route, ou en garnison.

XXV
Tout Soldat, Cavalier ou Dragon, qui de guet-appens, méchamment, & avec avantage, en blessera ou tuerà un autre, sera pendu & étranglé.

XXVI
Quiconque aura pillé, volé ou dérobé en temps de paix, ou pendant la guerre, soit dans le Royaume, ou en Paus ennemi, Calices, Ciboires, ou autre vien d’Eglise, sera pendu & étranglé: Et si par les circonstances du vol, il se trouvoit y avoir eu profanation des choses sacrées, il sera condamné au feu.

XXVII
Celui qui dérobera les armes de son camarade ou autre Soldat, en quelque lieu que ce soit, sera pendu & étranglé: Et celui qui dérobera dans les chambres des cazernes leur linge, habit ou équipage, ainsi que le prest ou pain de ceux de sa chambrée, sera condamné à mort, ou aux galères perpétuelles, suivant les circonstances du cas.

XXVIII
Celui qui vendra sa poudre ou son plomb, sera mis pendant quinze jours sur le cheval de bois, à l’heure de la Garde, s’il est en Garnison; si c’est dans un Camp, il sera mis au piquet pendant le même temps.

XXIX
Personnes de quelque condition, grade, ou caractère que ce soit, ne pourra, sous peine de la vie, avoir correspondance en temps de guerre avec l’ennemi, par aucune voye que ce puisse être, sans la permission du Général, si c’est à l’Armée; ou du Commandant de la Province ou de la Place, si c’est dans les Quartiers, ou dans les Garnisons.
Defend Sa Majesté à toutes personnes que ce puisse être, à peine de punition corporelle, ou de la vie, suivent l'exigence du cas, d'attenter ou d'entreprendre rien contre les Personnes, Villles, Bourgs, Villages, Chasteaux, Hameaux, ou autre biens & lieux auxquels Sa Majesté aura accordé Sauvegarde.

Quiconque sans permission de son Commandant, sortira d'une Place ou Fort assiégez, ou s'écartera au-delà des limites d'un Camp, pour quelque prétexte que ce puisse être, sera pendu & étranglé.

Tout Soldat, Cavalier ou Dragon qui sortira d'un Camp retranché, Ville de guerre, ou Fort, ou qui y rentrera par quelque détour, par escalade, ou autrement que par les portes & chemins ordinaires, sera pendu & étranglé.

Le Cavalier, Soldat ou Dragon, qui étant dans le Camp ou dans la Garnison, ne suivra pas son Drapeau ou son Etendant, dans une allarme, champ de bateille, ou autre affaire, sera, comme déserteur, passé par les Armes.

Chacun secourra & défendra des Drapeaux ou Etendarts de son Régiment, soit de jour, ou de nuit; & s'y rendra au premier avis sans les quitter, jusqu'à ce qu'ils soient portez & mis en sûreté, sous peine de punition corporelle, ou de mort, suivant l'exigence du cas.

Tous Cavaliers, Dragons, ou Soldats en faction, comme aussi les Brigadiers commandant la garde les Etendarts, qui laisseront sauver les Prisonniers qui leur seront consignez, & à la garde desquels ils auront été établis, seront condamnez à servir comme Forçats sur les Galères pendant trois années; Enjoignant Sa Majesté aux Officiers de garde, de veiller & tenir la main à l'exécution du présent Article, à peine d'en être responsables en leurs propres & privés noms.

Defend Sa Majesté, en conformité de l'Ordonnance du 20. May 1686, à tous Cavaliers, Dragons & Soldats, de jurer & blasphémer le saint nom de Dieu, de la sainte Vierge ni des Saints, sur peine, à ceux qui tomberont dans ce crime, d'avoir la langue percée d'un fer chaud; Voulant Sa Majesté que les Officiers de la Troupe dont ils seront, soient tenus, aussi-tost qu'ils en auront connaissance, de les remettre au Prevôt étant à la suite d'icelle, ou au Major du Régiment, pour leur faire subir la peine susdite.

Tout Officier qui osera insulter un Commissaire des Guerres dans ses fonctions, sera sur le champ envoyé ou prison par le Commandant du Corps dont sera le dit Officier, ou par ordre du Commandant de la Place où l'insulte aura été commise; lesquels en formeront sur le champ le Secretaire d'Etat de la Guerre, pour, sur le compte qui en sera rendu à Sa Majesté, être ledit Officier puni ainsi qu'il sera par Elle ordonné, suivant les circonstances du cas.

A l'égard des Cavaliers, Dragons & Soldats qui seront assez témoignes pour attenter à la personne desdits Commissaires, soit en les frappant ou se mettant en posture de les frapper, veut Sa Majesté qu'ils soient jugez par le Conseil de Guerre, & condamnez à être pendus & étranglez.

Defend très-expressément Sa Majesté ausdits Cavaliers, Dragons & Soldats, de frapper ou insulter les Maires, Eschevins, Consuls, Juges & autres Magistrats des lieux où ils seront en garnison, ou par lesquels ils passeront lorsqu'ils seront en Route; Voulant Sa Majesté, que sur la réquisition desdits Magistrats, les accusiez soient mis en prison, pour être jugez par les Prevôts des Maréchaux, ou par les Juges des lieux, suivant la nature & les circonstances du délit.

Dans le cas où lesdits Magistrats ou Officiers Municipaux auraient été frappes ou insultez par les Officiers des Troupes de Sa Majesté, ils en adresseront leurs plaintes & Procès-verbaux au Secretaire d'Etat de la Guerre, pour, sur le compte qui en sera par luy rendu à Sa Majesté, y être par Elle pourvu & selon ainsi qu'il appartiendra.

Lorsque les Prevôts, Archers, ou autres préposéz par les Juges ordinaires, arrêteront prisonniers des Soldats ou autres accusiez, aucun Cavalier, Dragon ni Soldats ne pourra s'y opposer, les leur
oter de force, ni se mettre en devoir de les leur oter, à peine de la vie.

XLII
Defend Sa Majesté à tous Soldats, Cavaliers & Dragons, d'aller ni envoyer couper, abatre & dégrader aucun bois dans ses Forêts, Bois, Buissons & Domaines, ni dans ceux des Particuliers: de chasser ni pêcher dans les terres des seigneurs: comme aussi de tirer sur les pigeons, poules, poulets, lapins, & autres animaux domestiques: & d'endommager les Moulins, Viviers & Etangs; le tout à peine de punition corporelle.

XLIII
Tout Soldat, Cavalier ou Dragon qui trichera ou pipera au jeu, sera puni corporellement. Veut Sa Majesté que si dans les Camps ou dans les Places il s'établisse des Jeux de hazard, & capables d'engendrer querelle, les Commandans ou Gouverneurs fassent rompre les tables, machines & ustensiles servant ausdits Jeux; & qu'ils fassent mettre en prison ceux qui tiendront lesdits Jeux.

XLIV
Defend Sa Majesté à tous Officiers, Cavaliers, Dragons & Soldats, d'avoir & entretenir à leur suite aucune fille débauche, à peine ausdits Officiers d'être cassez, ausdits Soldats, Cavaliers & Dragons de trois mois de prison, & ausdites filles d'avoir le fouet, & d'être chassées des Armées ou des Places.

XLV
Veut au surplus Sa Majesté, que les Ordonnances rendues par le feu Roy son Bisayeul contre les déserteurs, suborneurs & seduceurs, Passe-volans, Faux-sauniers, Contrebandiers, contre ceux qui auront vendu ou acheté des outils, habillemens, armes & chevaux des Troupes de Sa Majesté, ou des métaux, poudres, pièces & munitions d'Artillerie, & généralement toutes autres Ordonnances ausquelles il n'est point dérogé par la présente, soient exécutées selon leur forme & teneur.

Mande & ordonne Sa Majesté aux Gouverneurs & ses Lieutenants généraux en ses Provinces & Armées, Gouverneurs & Commandans particuliers de ses Villes & Places, Chefs & Officiers de ses Troupes, Intendans & Commissaires départs dans ses Provinces, Commissaires de guerre ordonnez à la Police desdites Troupes, Prevôts des Maréchaux, & autres ses Officiers qu'il appartiendra, de tenir la main, chacun ce qui le concernera, à l'exécution de la présente Ordonnance; laquelle Sa Majesté veut être lue & publiée à la tête desdites Troupes, & affichée dans les principaux Corps-de-garde de ses Places, & autres lieux que be-
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