

Laura di Fiore

11 The Respatialization of Italy between French Republics and Napoleonic Domination

Italy in the French Orbit: Rethinking an Encounter

The French Revolution is a historical process that had the power to shape a global moment, understood as a shared temporal framework during which events, effects, and transformations contemporaneously happened/spread/were performed. This shared character immediately invokes, beside the temporal dimension, the spatial one, recalling a global space. Undoubtedly, the French Revolution and Napoleonic domination produced a global space of action, ranging from the European territories involved in a multitude of ways in the revolutionary and Napoleonic system to its reverberations between the Atlantic and Indian oceans. Italy was part of this global space, firstly with the Jacobin republics and then with its almost complete incorporation, though in different forms, into the Napoleonic power structure.

The decision to consider the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods as distinct parts of a unique chronology is – besides an emphasis on the continuity between the two experiences, particularly evident in the Italian case¹ – due to the consideration of this temporal timespan as a pivotal caesura for the history of the Italian peninsula, namely the term *a quo* to rethink the opening of nineteenth-century modernization and the long *Risorgimento* (unification) beyond nationalistic logics.²

Respatialization turns out to be an effective lens to shed light on the crucial transformations of this passage in the Italian peninsula. One of the central points of the revolutionary and Napoleonic projects was undoubtedly a new management of the territory. The French Revolution, with its principles of juridical egalitarianism and centralization of public power in national sovereignty, led to the transition from a fragmented and heterogeneous space characteristic of the jurisdictional and institutional pluralism of Ancien Régime

¹ A. De Francesco, *L'Italia di Bonaparte. Politica, statualità e nazione nella penisola tra due rivoluzioni, 1796–1821*, Torino: Utet, 2011. On this point, see A.M. Rao, “Napoleonic Italy: Old and New Trends in Historiography”, in: U. Planert (ed.), *Napoleon's Empire. European Politics in Global Perspective*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

² See A.M. Banti et al. (eds.), *Atlante culturale del Risorgimento*, Rome: Laterza, 2011.

to a homogeneous, plain space reflecting the new kind of relationships between equal citizens and the unique state power focused on state territory. This new spatial framework was the central element of the Napoleonic administrative state. In fact, if the citizens lost the opportunity to participate politically – becoming more similar to subjects in continuity, nonetheless, with the revolutionary institutional design – they were destined to live not more among multiple spaces of power, but rather in a compact territory mirroring the even more centralized power and the administrative action of the new state.

Particularly, the interior administrative design, pivoting on the *département* (department), was decidedly “the premise of Napoleonic ‘administrative revolution’”,³ which created a basic territorial unit from which the prefect could guarantee the dissemination of central power to the peripheral areas of a hierarchically organized territory. Destined to have a lasting effect on the future of Italian spatiality, the departmentalization of Italy has not been the object of a systematic analysis. Nevertheless, this topic has received increasing attention in the last years. The department has been the central territorial unit in the imposing *Atlante storico dell’Italia rivoluzionaria e napoleonica*, in which, besides thematic maps and analyses, one of the preeminent aims of the cartographic work has been the very production of a georeferenced map showing all the departments in French Italy.⁴ Moreover, some works on specific areas (as will be shown) have quite recently analysed the dynamics involved in the creation processes of the departments in geohistorical and institutional perspectives.

The departmentalization process can now be read in an enriched perspective, in light of the special attention that has been devoted by historiography in recent years to the spatial dimension, in the framework of the “spatial turn movement”.⁵ Absolute, Cartesian space has been reconceptualized as unable to be independent of the social action from which it is constantly produced. This constructivist perspective has therefore made a sharp break with an essentialist view of spatiality, which had given shape, on the one hand, to a “spatial determinism”, in which physical space was perceived as a generator of historical phenomena, and, on the other hand, to “methodological territorialism”, based

3 C. Lucrezio Monticelli, *Roma seconda città dell’Impero. La conquista napoleonica dell’Europa mediterranea*, Rome: Viella, 2018, p. 61.

4 M.P. Donato et al. (eds.), *Atlante storico dell’Italia rivoluzionaria e napoleonica*, Rome: École française de Rome, 2013.

5 B. Warf and S. Arias (eds.), *The spatial turn: interdisciplinary perspectives*, New York: Routledge, 2009.

on an extreme rigidity of spaces, taken as independent data from the analysed phenomena.⁶ To consider space as a social and political product does not imply limiting the analysis to extra-institutional spaces, traced by social practices of the same space. The constructivist perspective of the spatial turn can fruitfully be applied in order to deconstruct and reinterpret the territorialization processes performed by state power as well as to investigate the relations between institutional and extra-institutional spaces.⁷ Adopting this perspective mainly means to focus on historical processes of the production of institutional designs, emphasizing the role played by institutional and social actors, with their desire and their capacity to negotiate spatial configurations.⁸ Moreover, the centrality of this processual character and of the social actors' role are at the centre of analyses in contemporary border studies, mainly carried out by geographers and anthropologists.⁹ The ethnographic approach to borders – focusing on the interaction between state and local communities as well as its interpretation as “highly dynamic” “spatial and social phenomena”¹⁰ – also proves to be useful in the investigation of internal borders.

⁶ E. Langthaler, “Orte in Beziehung. Mikrogeschichte nach dem Spatial Turn”, *Storia e regione* 21 (2012) 1–2, pp. 27–42.

⁷ M. Middell and K. Naumann, “Global History and the Spatial Turn: From the Impact of Area Studies to the Study of Critical Junctures of Globalization”, *Journal of Global History* 5 (2010) 1, pp. 149–170; S. Dorsch, “Space/Time Practices and the Production of Space and Time. An Introduction”, in: S. Dorsch and S. Rau (eds.), Special Issue Space/Time Practices, *Historical Social Research* 38 (2013) 3, pp. 7–21; M.G. Müller and C. Torp, “Conceptualising transnational spaces in history”, *European Review of History* 16 (2009) 5, pp. 609–617.

⁸ In Italian historiography see A. Torre, *Luoghi. La produzione di località in età moderna e contemporanea*, Rome: Donzelli, 2011; B. Salvemini, *Il territorio sghembo. Forme e dinamiche degli spazi umani in età moderna*, Bari: Edipuglia, 2006; L. Di Fiore and M. Meriggi (eds.), *Movimenti e confini. Spazi mobili nell'Italia preunitaria*, Rome: Viella, 2013; M. Meriggi, *Racconti di confine. Nel Mezzogiorno del Settecento*, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2016; L. Di Fiore, *Alla frontiera. Confini e documenti di identità nel Mezzogiorno continentale preunitario*, Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino, 2103.

⁹ See the syntheses: T.M. Wilson and H. Donnan (eds.), *A Companion to Border Studies*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell 2012; D. Wastl-Walter (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Border Studies*, Farnham: Ashgate: 2011. On the intersection of border studies and the spatial turn in history see L. Di Fiore, “The Production of Borders in Nineteenth-century Europe: Between Institutional Boundaries and Transnational Practices of Space”, *European Review of History/Revue européenne d'histoire* 24 (2017) 1, pp. 36–57; L. Di Fiore, “Border Studies und Global History. Grenzen als Gegenstand einer transnationalen Untersuchung”, *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 95 (2016) 1, pp. 397–411.

¹⁰ D. Wastl-Walter, “Introduction”, in: Wastl-Walter (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Border Studies*, pp. 1–9.

Finally, the analysis of French spatialization allows Italian history to be better understood in the framework of global history, moving beyond the view of an imperial history inclining to read administrative and territorial transformations in terms of a mere imposition, as a form of “cultural imperialism”.¹¹ The global scope of the French Revolution has to be instead identified as providing an impulse to events extending across different part of the world, where the French impact generated connections and exchanges and where, in the cases of French political domination, transformations and foreign political, institutional, and cultural models confronted local needs, paradigms, and agencies. The focus on agency can indeed be considered a common trait of new imperial and global history, interpreting domination and imperial encounters – even if unequal in power relationships – in terms of exchanges and hybridization rather than of unilateral impositions.

In this context, this chapter analyses how the process of departmentalization developed in revolutionary and Napoleonic Italy. In France, as major works have effectively shown,¹² the project of territorial reshaping dates back to the project advanced within the National Assembly on 29 September 1789 by Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès and Jacques-Guillaume Thouret. The project was based on principles of territorial rationalization, founded on natural unities aimed at homogeneity and complementarity, and on meeting administrative needs. The role of rivers, mountains, as well as cities turned out to be pivotal.

First with the spreading revolution followed by Napoleonic conquest, departmentalization was extended to sister republics and Napoleonic Europe, triggering various reactions among local communities. This process was actually not different from what happened outside of France. In France, for example, thousands of petitions were addressed to the National Assembly from local people and communities defending the previous order, suggesting alternative

¹¹ M. Broers, *The Napoleonic Empire in Italy, 1796–1814: Cultural Imperialism in a European Context?*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005. For a discussion of this thesis, see L. Antonielli, “L’Italia di Napoleone: tra imposizione e assimilazione di modelli istituzionali”, in: M. Bellabarba et al. (eds.), *Gli imperi dopo l’Impero nell’Europa del XIX secolo*, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2009, pp. 409–431; and for a reconstruction of the debate see M. Meriggi, “Costituzioni antiche e narrazioni orientalistiche. Dal Sette all’Ottocento”, *Storica* 15 (2009) 43–45, pp. 209–255.

¹² M.-V. Ozouf-Marignier, *La formation des départements. La représentation du territoire français à la fin du 18e siècle*, Paris: EHESS, 1989; M. Ozouf, “Dipartimento”, in: F. Furet and M. Ozouf (eds.), *Dizionario critico della Rivoluzione francese*, vol. 2, *Creazioni e istituzioni, idee*, Milano: Bompiani, 1994, pp. 498–507; S. Bonin et al. (eds.), *Atlas de la Révolution française*, Tome 4, *Le territoire*, vol. 1, *Réalités et représentations*, Paris: EHESS, 1989.

natural configurations, or trying to take advantage of the territorial redrawing.¹³ These dynamics were not so different from the ones set in motion in French Napoleonic Europe. Studies on departmentalization processes carried out in other contexts are not numerous, especially with a focus that brings together both institutional-administrative and geographical perspectives.¹⁴ Nevertheless, they uncover the multifaceted reactions emerging from this new spatial configuration, with an extra element, that is to say the presence of a foreign power in a context of conquest. This implied, firstly, a confrontation between different politico-institutional and cultural patterns and, secondly, an environment of unbalanced power relationships.

As regards French respatialization in Italy, it developed into a complex framework comprising the interaction, on the one hand, between foreign administrative actions and local population, and, on the other hand, between the French imported administrative models and pre-existing ongoing local processes. It seems plausible to advance the hypothesis that the Italian case could be considered emblematic of what happened in the rest of revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe, even with local and contextual variants, as further studies could highlight. My analysis will start from the south of Italy, followed by the insertion of this case into a broader Italian context, focusing on the Piedmont and the Roman areas.

In the South: The Neapolitan Republic and the Kingdom of Naples

In the Kingdom of Naples, the moment of respatialization brought about by the French Revolution consisted of two stages: the Neapolitan Republic – lasting just 6 months, proclaimed in January 1799 and suppressed in June in the same year – and the Napoleonic domination during the Napoleonic Decennio,

¹³ Ozouf-Marignier, *La formation des départements*; T.W. Margadant, *Urban Rivalries in the French Revolution*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

¹⁴ On departmentalization in Europe, see in particular S. Dubois, *La révolution géographique en Belgique: départementalisation, administration et représentation du territoire de la fin du XVIIIe au début du XIXe siècle*, Bruxelles: Académie Royale de Belgique, 2008; see also, in some regards, P. Horne, *Le défi de l'enracinement napoléonien entre Rhin et Meuse, 1810–1814. L'opinion publique dans les départements de la Roër, de l'Ourthe, des Forêts et de la Moselle*, Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2016.

namely 10 years between 1806 and 1815 when Giuseppe Bonaparte and Gioacchino Murat governed the kingdom.

The Neapolitan Republic immediately turned to the question of reorganizing the provinces in the kingdom, with the issuing of laws regarding provincial administration on 9 February 1799. Particularly, the “Departments Law” provided an organic and rationalized administrative system, in which 11 departments substituted the previous 12 provinces and were subdivided into cantons, which in turn were composed of municipalities.¹⁵ The new departments were assigned, as elsewhere in French Jacobin Europe, names of rivers, mountains, or other relevant natural elements.¹⁶

The “Bassal” Law (from the name Jean Bassal, who was among the French politicians who managed the first phases of the organization of the republic alongside the General Jean-Étienne Vachier Championnet) immediately raised criticism of and protests against this reorganization; as a result, on 25 April 1799 a new law restored the previous provincial design – except for retaining the new Province of Naples, raising the total of number of provinces to 13. Pietro Colletta, lieutenant general and historian, noted that the law changed,

the ancient names of remembered memory with new names. In this law, the rivers, the mountains, the forests, the natural elements were capriciously put into departments and cantons and sometimes communities. The names were mistaken; a mountain was supposed to be a city and made district capital, the territory of a community subdivided in two cantons, some rivers were considered as two, some lands were forgotten.¹⁷

This criticism of the “artificial” character of the new territorial order disapproved of such an establishment without any respect for the existent order of space¹⁸; for the lived experiences in the case of communities divided (as we

¹⁵ A.M. Rao, *La Repubblica napoletana del 1799*, Roma: New Compton, 1997.

¹⁶ Bradano, Crati, Garigliano, Idro, Ofanto, Pescara, Sagra, Sangro, Sele, Volturno, Vesuvio.

¹⁷ “i nomi per altri antichi di memorata memoria. In esso i fiumi, le montagne, le foreste, i termini di natura, si vedevano capricciosamente messi nel seno dei dipartimenti o dei cantoni e talvolta delle comunità: scambiati i nomi; creduto città un monte e fatto capo di cantone, il territorio di una comunità spartito in due cantoni, certi fiumi addoppiati, scordate certe terre.” P. Colletta, *Storia del Reame di Napoli dal 1734 al 1825*, 3 vol., Napoli: Libreria Scientifica, 1951: vol. 2, p. 13.

¹⁸ Similarly to what happened in the Cisalpina, Roman and Ligurian Republics. A. Spagnoletti, “La costruzione di un nuovo spazio amministrativo: il Mezzogiorno continentale tra 1799 e 1816”, in: G. Giarrizzo and E. Iachello (eds.), *Le mappe della storia. Proposte per una cartografia del Mezzogiorno e della Sicilia in età moderna*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2002, pp. 65–73.

have seen) in different cantons; or for people's memory of the space and its names. Therefore, the contrast seemed to be between a state/administrative/rational territorialization – performed from above without a real knowledge of the territory itself – and a social/rooted/perceived conception of space.

The spatial internal configuration of the Neapolitan territory was considered such a central issue that Vincenzo Cuoco, in his famous *Saggio storico sulla Rivoluzione napoletana*, considered the reform an example of the gap between the “two peoples” in the Neapolitan Revolution: the one (the elite) engaged in imposing foreign principles and models on the other one (the populace), the latter being unable to comprehend French paradigms and politics, without any consideration for the peculiarities of Neapolitan culture and social order. In this context, Cuoco strongly stated that “[t]his man [Bassal] who had no knowledge of our territory, made of it an impracticable, ridiculous division. A traveller who from the top of a mountain drew in the night the valleys under him not having ever seen it wouldn't have done more inept work.”¹⁹ Accordingly, if

the nature had divided the territory of our republic, then the nature indicated the departments; the population, physical and economic relationships between places must indicate the centrals [le centrali] and the cantons. Instead of that, intersecting departments cutting each other were seen; the people of province of Puglia saw themselves belonging to the provinces of Abruzzi; many cantons had no population, while others had too much population.²⁰

In this context, the nature as well as the social and economic networks of the spaces clashed with the geometric cuts performed by revolutionary administrators, accused of ignoring the natural and social make-up of the territory. And again, particular attention was devoted to the change of the existent names, with Cuoco judging that “most revolutions had unfortunate results for the excessive intemperance of changing the names of the things”.²¹

19 “Quest'uomo [Bassal] il quale non avea veruna cognizione del nostro territorio, ne fece una divisione inesequibile, ridicola. Un viaggiatore che dalla cima di un monte disegni di notte le valli sottoposte, che egli non abbia giammai vedute, non può far opera più inetta.” V. Cuoco, *Saggio storico sulla rivoluzione di Napoli*, Milano: Dalla Tipografia Milanese in Strada Nuova, 1801, pp. 118–119.

20 “la natura avea diviso il territorio della nostra repubblica”, then “la natura indicava i dipartimenti: la popolazione, i rapporti fisici ed economici de luoghi doveano indicare le centrali, ed i cantoni. In vece di ciò si videro dipartimenti che s'incrociavano, che si tagliavano a vicenda; (...) le popolazioni della Puglia si videro appartenere agli Apruzzi; (...) molti cantoni non aveano popolazione, mentre moltissimi ne aveano soverchia.” Cuoco, *Saggio storico*, p. 119.

21 “il maggior numero delle rivoluzioni ha avuto un esito infelice per la soverchia intemperanza di cangiare i nomi delle cose.” Cuoco, *Saggio storico*, p. 118.

The issue of the names, recurring both in Colletta's and Cuoco's opinions, is very significant, as the name is one of the distinctive elements of "territory" (connected with sovereignty) compared to "space" (connected with social life), according to Daniel Nordman, where the territory's "institutionalization, appropriation, and power are at stake".²² Therefore, naming is an expression and even a symbol of institutionalization. Nevertheless, at the same time, as the two authors stated, the names of territories were also central to people's relation to the space, symbolizing belonging and identity. The reason for this is that those names, even though rooted in an ancient memory, did not express a natural or purely social organization of space, but rather a different order of spatial organization produced by a different pattern of "institutionalization", "appropriation", exercise of "power" – or, better, of a plurality of powers²³ – characteristic of the Ancien Régime order. Accordingly, the oppositions – space vs. territory, or nature vs. administrative rationalization, or lived space vs. state space – have evidently to be nuanced.

To begin with, was the project of redrawing the provincial order imposed completely from the outside and alien to Neapolitan culture and needs? Not exactly. Giuseppe Maria Galanti cannot be viewed as the man on the top of the mountain drawing valleys in the night described by Cuoco. In the 1780s, Galanti, an economist among the major representatives of the Neapolitan Enlightenment, was given the governmental task of investigating the natural composition and economic situation of the kingdom. After his general visit of the provinces in 1792, he suggested the need to redraw the provincial design of the kingdom. His proposal consisted of a reduction of 12 provinces into 5 departments, each of which would become a seat of civil justice and fiscal, police, and economic administration. Even then, the state secretaries, except for Lord Acton, aggressively responded to this proposal, which they considered "sacrilege", being "disgusted" by Galanti's "dangerous ideas".²⁴ However, this proposal, similar to the others emerging in the last 20 years of the eighteenth century, did not materialize.

The main problem concerned the discontinuity of the power characteristic of the state territory, mainly due to the feudal order as well as the power structures of some universities,²⁵ so that the *Udienze* – territorial bodies in charge of

²² "enjeu d'une institutionnalisation, d'une appropriation, d'un pouvoir". D. Nordman, "Territoire", in: C. Gauvard and J.F. Sirinelli (eds.), *Dictionnaire de l'historien*, Paris: PUF, 2015, p. 698.

²³ M. Meriggi, *Gli stati italiani prima dell'Unità*, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2011, p. 34.

²⁴ G.M. Galanti, *Testamento Forense*, Venezia 1806, vol. 1, pp. 258–270.

²⁵ A.M. Rao, *L'amaro della feudalità. La devoluzione di Arnone e la questione feudale a Napoli alla fine del Settecento*, Napoli: Guida, 1984.

judicial and administrative functions on behalf of the central government – were just one power among others and moreover were not in charge of a capillary territorial coverage.²⁶ The abolition of feudalism, attempted by the brief experience of the republican revolution and then performed in the Napoleonic Decennio, created the conditions to put into action a territorial re-configuration in line with local projects from the late eighteenth century, when the synergy between an emerging middle class and a significant group of Enlightenment philosophers stimulated a rethinking of the relation between government and territory. Therefore, the “Departments Law” – more than a foreign initiative from above or alien to the local context, even though with some poor choices – was established in an evolving process propelled by the late eighteenth-century reformists, increasingly conscious of the problems connected with a fragmented territory characterized by the compresence of multiple powers.

Maybe this fragmentation was one of the causes of the weak sense of identity developed in the province since the sixteenth century, as the province played a very secondary role in the lives of people. And until 1806, internal administrative districts remained a very fragile pattern.²⁷ The quick suppression of the Bassal spatial design also prevented the inherent political project. The revolutionary design of the territory was indeed intended to build, along with an administrative space, a political identity space. As Ozouf-Marignier shows, based on the assumption of a geographic determinism, the departmentalization aimed at creating new forms of social organization related to space and territoriality. The final goal was the construction of a new sociopolitical order – representative democracy – through a new configuration of the territory, favouring the overlapping of spatial and social relations and identities. In particular, the departmentalization created new spaces for local identities, acting as a vehicle for a national feeling.²⁸ As a dowel of a wider national conscience, a sense of belonging was expected to develop within the department, creating an “*esprit*

26 A. Spagnoletti, “Nel Regno di Napoli. Dal potere diffuso alla centralizzazione,” in: G. Giarrizzo and E. Iachello (eds.), *Per un atlante storico del Mezzogiorno e della Sicilia in età moderna: omaggio a Bernard Lepetit*, Napoli: Liguori, 1998, pp. 66–67. See also Spagnoletti, “Nuovo spazio amministrativo”.

27 Ibid.

28 M.-V. Ozouf-Marignier, *La formation des départements. La représentation du territoire français à la fin du 18e siècle*, Paris: EHESS, 1989; M.-V. Ozouf-Marignier, “Centralisation et lien social: le débat de la première moitié du XIXème siècle en France”, in: G. Giarrizzo and E. Iachello (eds.), *Per un atlante storico*, pp. 75–91, at p. 76.

départemental”,²⁹ an expression of the power of the territorial design aimed to substitute previous forms of social organization and to produce social cohesion.³⁰

In the Kingdom of Naples, for this new spatial identity “feeling” it would have been necessary to wait for Napoleonic domination, which promoted the reorganization of the administrative provincial territory. Emperor Napoleon commended, among his first instructions to Giuseppe Bonaparte (his older brother), “do not waste a moment in dividing your territory into *intendances* or *prefectures*”.³¹ *Intendenza*, corresponding to North Italian “department”, was the name of the highest territorial form at a provincial level within the country’s hierarchical structure, with its lower subdivisions comprising districts and municipalities. Parallel to these government organs, there were central, provincial, and municipal councils, even though, as mentioned above, in the Napoleonic era the promises of freedom and representation were put aside in favour of the primacy of the executive power.³² Undoubtedly, the administrative reform issued by the Law of 8 August 1806 reproduced the French system established with the Law of 17 February 1800, expressing a more decisive centralization of the power after the fall of the Directory.

Nevertheless, Armando De Martino, in his important study on Napoleonic *intendenze*, investigates how the king’s councillors, like Edouard Lefebvre and Jean-Marie Alquier, highlighted, even in memoirs, the existence of the important legacy of reform projects proposed and discussed in the last decades of the eighteenth century. In particular, the knowledge of the unique social and territorial fabric of the kingdom had to be based on the analyses carried out by the some of the most distinguished European Enlightenment intellectuals, namely the Neapolitan Giuseppe Maria Galanti, with the “description” already presented, and Antonio Genovesi, Gaetano Filangieri, and Mario Pagano, with their projects for a radical reform of the kingdom and its power structure.³³ This is an important point, showing how, also in regard to administrative and territorial reform, the Napoleonic government in Naples moved in many respects in

29 Ozouf-Marignier, “Centralisation et lien social”, p. 77. The quotation is from a document produced in 1807 by the prefect of the Department Loir-et-Cher.

30 Ibid., p. 81. This essay pointed out the centrality of this issue in France for a significant part of nineteenth century, reconstructing its inheritance in post-revolutionary period.

31 “[N]e perdez pas un moment pour diviser votre territoire en [...] *intendances* or *prefectures*.” Correspondence de Napoléon, 8 March 1806, quoted in: A. De Martino, *La nascita delle Intendenze. Problemi dell’amministrazione periferica nel regno di Napoli*, Napoli: Jovene editore, 1984, p. 11.

32 Meriggi, *Gli stati italiani*.

33 De Martino, *Intendenze*, pp. 27–36.

line with eighteenth-century reformism. John Davis, in particular, suggestively emphasizes how in this “Mediterranean Kingdom”, becoming “the southern frontier of the Empire”,³⁴ the shattering reforms introduced were in many respects based on, and shaped by, forces coming “from below” in terms of both specific and contingent needs within the Neapolitan context as well as of pre-existing ideas and processes of transformation oriented in a direction similar to the one traced by the *Grande Nation*’s “modernizing mission”.³⁵

The provincial design, before its implementation in August 1806, was an object of discussion in the Consiglio di Stato (Council of State) during four sessions held the month prior.³⁶ In the debate, two different positions arose, the one suggesting a reduction of the existent provinces and the other one inclining to preserve the traditional order.³⁷ Finally – in contrast with what happened in the Kingdom of Italy – the latter position secured more consent, as it was judged more prudent not to introduce too many novelties in a moment of significant change, deferring possible modifications to future, calmer times.³⁸ The issue of the preserved traditional 12 provinces (with the addition of the Province of Naples) was scrutinized by Giuseppe Zurlo, one of the representatives of eighteenth-century reformism at the court of Murat, in his report on the results of financial and administrative order. As for the territorial subdivision, once again Zurlo highlighted that for a kingdom completely divided by the Apennine Mountains a division more based on natural considerations would be better. Nonetheless, he called attention to how the changes to existent *circonscriptions* (administrative districts), “always face the resistance by existing relations and already formed habits, which have overcome the obstacles of localities”.³⁹

34 J. Davis, *Napoli e Napoleone. L'Italia meridionale e le rivoluzioni europee (1780–1860)*, 2nd ed., Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino 2014, p. 7.

35 Ibid., esp. pp. 261–298. For a broad analysis of these processes, see A.M. Rao, *Lumi Riforme Rivoluzione. Percorsi storiografici*, Rome: Edizioni di Storia e letteratura, 2011.

36 As the State Council’s document was unfortunately burnt in Naples during the Second World War, the source to reconstruct these debates is the report by Capecehatro, president of the interior section, to the king.

37 De Martino, *Intendenze*. The second one had been suggested, with the first instructions, by Emperor Napoleon himself.

38 Nevertheless, some difficulties arose in the definition of borders, for examples in the case of Capitanata and Molise, see S. Russo, “Difficili confini: Capitanata e Molise nel Decennio francese”, in: S. Russo, *All’ombra di Murat. Studi e ricerche sul Decennio francese*, Bari: Edipuglia, 2007, pp. 115–134. More problematic, however, was the internal definition of the provinces in districts.

39 “incontrano sempre la resistenza delle relazioni già formate, e degli abiti contratti, i quali hanno vinto gli ostacoli delle località”. G. Zurlo, *Rapporto sullo stato del Regno di Napoli per*

For that reason, he judged that it was preferable “to sacrifice a part of the natural symmetry and of the future possible comfort, to the present convenience and to the preservation of the system to which the peoples are accustomed”.⁴⁰ The existent design, rather than natural, was the product of relations developed in previous institutional contexts, so that, in this case, the real opposition was between a geographical criterion and a sociohistorical one. The reform of 4 May 1811 followed this latter criterion, limiting change to just the network of districts, delaying once again the subdivision of the provinces. Accordingly, the choice was to make the administrative space coincident with the identity space drawn by the social practice and memory of the local population.

But in fact, the historical provinces maintained little more than just their names. Even on the basis of a compromise, the Napoleonic provinces were constructed, for the first time, as primarily administrative spaces, provided with state bureaucracies and representative organs. These administrative spaces gradually developed a new sense of identity connected with a new perception and practice of the territory. As Spagnoletti identifies, the correspondence between the “province-culture” and “the province administrative district”, helped by the compromise for a formal continuity with the past, was based on the formation of a new elite selected through parameters defined at the provincial level (census and professional profile) and recognizing itself as the new administrative standard.⁴¹

An example of the production of identity spaces emerging from one’s administrative identification is the centrality of the provincial unit for the “identification revolution”. Through the universal obligation for all people to receive identity and travel cards, a completely new relationship between people, space, and power was established during the Napoleonic period.⁴² Control over

gli anni 1810 e 1811 presentato al Re nel suo Consiglio di Stato dal Ministro dell’Interno il 20 aprile 1812, Napoli: Tipografia di Angelo Trani, 1812, pp. 8–9.

⁴⁰ “sacrificare una parte della simmetria naturale e del comodo futuro possibile, al comodo attuale e alla conservazione del sistema a cui i popoli sono accostumati”. Ibid.

⁴¹ Spagnoletti, *Nel Regno di Napoli*, pp. 71–73. It was, of course, just a part of the story. The subjects disadvantaged by the administrative reform, firstly the local elites previously ruling in the context of autonomous municipalities, would have still protested years later, in 1820/21. A. Spagnoletti, “Il controllo degli intendenti sulle amministrazioni locali nel Regno di Napoli”, in: Istituto per la scienza dell’amministrazione pubblica (ed.), *L’amministrazione nella storia moderna*, vol. 1, Milano: Giuffrè, 1985, pp. 953–960.

⁴² Within the rich literature on this topic see at least I. About and V. Denis, *Histoire de l’identification des personnes*, Paris: La Découverte, 2010; I. About, J.R. Brown, and G. Lonergan, *People, Papers and Practices. Identification and Registration Practices in Transnational Perspective*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013; L. Antonielli (ed.), *Procedure, metodi,*

internal mobility, that is to say moving within the kingdom, was introduced. A different document was needed depending on the distance covered and the borders crossed. A *carta di sicurezza* (security card) was issued by the mayor and stamped by the royal judge for those travelling outside the district, and a *carta di permanenza* (residence card) was, at the same time, required for those wishing to extend their absence for more than eight days. Those who wanted to cross the border of their own province had to obtain an internal passport issued by the highest authority at the provincial level, the intendant. In a first phase, the function of internal passport was performed by the *carta di ricognizione*, a sort of identity card prescribed in March 1808 by Giuseppe Bonaparte for all male inhabitants over 12 years old. Significantly, the pattern of the *carta di ricognizione* was different in its form for every province, maybe in order to immediately show the origin of the traveller.⁴³ Therefore, both the specific form for every province and, later, the prescription of a more binding document (as requested directly by the police) to cross the provincial borders concurred with producing a specific provincial space, recognizing its peculiarities from an administrative point of view and destined to be perceived in a new way also within the mental maps of individuals.

In this way, if the social fabric developed in previous institutional spaces remained the structure for the new administrative design, then provinces were in fact assigned new functions and meanings. And these substantially new spatial units produced new social practices and a new identity space. In this regard, Ozouf-Marignier's consideration of space and society as "in turn product and producers of each other" is very important.⁴⁴

It is thus evident how, rather than in terms of a contrast between a cultural/presumably natural/social spaces and an administrative/artificial/geometric territory, the introduction of Napoleonic designs was the result of a confrontation between, on the one hand, previous reform projects and, on the other hand, the population's needs and forms of identification. This may also be based on the memory of the failed attempts in republican times. Nonetheless, it was also input for new and further developments as regards spatial practices and identity also shaped by the Napoleonic system of relationships between people and territory through the complex architecture of bureaucracies and representative bodies.

strumenti per l'identificazione delle persone e per il controllo del territorio, Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino, 2014.

⁴³ Di Fiore, *Alla frontiera*.

⁴⁴ Ozouf-Marignieri, "Centralisation et lien social", p. 78.

The Annexed Departments: From Turin to Rome

The respatialization of southern Italy in Jacobin and Napoleonic years can be placed into the wider context of the Italian peninsula. These French territorial reforms represented a strong caesura for Italy's spatial order, reflecting the drastic change in the relationship between space and power performed on the basis of revolutionary principles. This common experience brought the different parts of the fragmented peninsula nearer together in a seminal process of "uniformation", which does not mean homogeneity or unification.⁴⁵ If an embryonic form of "unity" in Italy – even though not projected towards political unification – was realized on an institutional level,⁴⁶ the reshaping of territory was undoubtedly a crucial aspect of it. By 1811, almost the entire Italian peninsula exhibited an administrative design based on French-style departments.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, the multiple parts of Italy – different in natural aspects, diverse in political order, and experiencing various events – present peculiarities that require specific studies to be inserted into a framework for comparative analysis.⁴⁸ Even though a systematic analysis of French departmentalization in Italy has not yet been carried out, in recent years some historians and geographers have focused on this topic.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Donato et al. (eds.), *Atlante storico dell'Italia rivoluzionaria e napoleonica*, p. XI.

⁴⁶ L. Mannori, "Unità", in: Banti et al. (eds.), *Atlante culturale*, pp. 372–388.

⁴⁷ See the map in Donato et al. (eds.), *Atlante storico dell'Italia rivoluzionaria e napoleonica*, p. 43; A. Spagnoletti, "Amministrazione", in: L.M. Migliorini (ed.), *Italia napoleonica. Dizionario critico*, Torino: Utet, 2011, pp. 3–24.

⁴⁸ F. Galluccio, "Il découpage nel Lazio (1789–1814). Riflessi geografici e ideologici", *Quaderni meridionali*, 32 (2001), pp. 2–29; M.L. Sturani, "Introduction", in: M.L. Sturani (ed.), *Dinamiche storiche e problemi attuali della maglia istituzionale in Italia. Saggi di Geografia amministrativa*, Alessandria: Dell'Orso, 2001, pp. 1–11.

⁴⁹ Beside the mentioned *Atlante storico dell'Italia rivoluzionaria e napoleonica*, see P. Aimò, "Territorio e istituzioni nell'Italia rivoluzionaria e napoleonica: la creazione del dipartimento", *Storia amministrazione costituzione* 11 (2003), pp. 253–63; F. Bonini, "L'orizzonte politico-istituzionale vicino: la nascita delle circoscrizioni provinciali in Italia", *Storia amministrazione costituzione* 11 (2003), pp. 265–309; S. Mori, "Territorio e istituzioni: uno sguardo alla preistoria della provincia italiana", in: A. Corbellini and G. Angelini (eds.), *Le istituzioni storiche dell'Unità. Gli organismi territoriali di Valtellina e Valchiavenna e la provincia di Sondrio*, Sondrio: Società Storica Valtellinese, 2014, pp. 5–33. For Piemonte see M.L. Sturani, "La réorganisation des espaces administratifs à la périphérie de l'Empire napoléonien: le cas du Piémont (1798–1814)", *Revue de Géographie historique* 5 (2014), pp. 1–11; M.L. Sturani, "Innovazioni e resistenze nella trasformazione della maglia amministrativa piemontese durante il periodo francese (1798–1814): la creazione dei dipartimenti ed il livello comunale", in: Sturani (ed.), *Dinamiche storiche*, pp. 89–118; M.L. Sturani, "Riforme della maglia amministrativa e spazi sociali locali nel Piemonte napoleonico", in: L. Di Fiore and M. Meriggi (eds.),

In this section, I juxtapose the Neapolitan case with the annexed departments, particularly in Piedmont and Rome, relying on new studies intertwining history with administrative geography. To begin with, these departments had a different status after the republican phase – as part of the so-called “inner empire” – and were directly incorporated into the imperial Napoleonic fabric. Nevertheless, several processes show commonalities with aspects observed in the satellite Kingdom of Naples.

Considering the Piedmont space, the 22 Savoy provinces were reshaped into 4 large departments – Éridan (Torino as the capital city), Sésia (Vercelli), Stura (Mondovi), and Tanaro (Alessandria) – after the collapse of the provisory government in April 1799. Notwithstanding the brief timespan it was in force (amounting to only a few months), during this first experience with departmentalization the use of the names of rivers, recalling the concept of natural borders, was purely instrumental. It served “a symbolic function for legitimizing the new power. It marked a clear break with the Savoy tradition rather than a knowledge or a real willingness to adhere to the articulation of Piedmont river basins”.⁵⁰

Similarly, in the Jacobin Roman Republic the project realized by Gaspard Monge divided the territory into 8 departments: Tevere (Roma), Cimino (Viterbo), Circeo (Anagni), and Clitunno (Spoleto). Nevertheless, the names of natural elements often had no real correspondence with border lines, which in some cases tended to deviate from river courses for pre-existing routes more compatible with the exploitation of resources and the functionality of watersheds.⁵¹ Although not always “natural” in reality, the borderlines of the French department were neither necessarily established according to the declared geometric criterion of having a capital city in the centre to favour exchanges and

Movimenti e confini, pp. 93–107; S.J. Woolf, “Frontiere entro la frontiera: il Piemonte sotto il governo napoleonico”, in: C. Ossola, C. Raffestin and M. Ricciardi (eds.), *La frontiera da Stato a nazione. Il caso Piemonte*, Rome: Bulzoni, 1987, pp. 171–181. For Tuscany, see L. Rombai, “Amministrazione e territorio nella Toscana moderna e contemporanea. La riorganizzazione della maglia provinciale e comunale tra tempi francesi e fascisti”, in: Sturani (ed.), *Dinamiche storiche*, pp. 43–68. For Lombardy-Veneto, see S. Mori, “‘Il giro del dipartimento’. Aspetti della relazione fra pubblica amministrazione e territorio nel Regno Italico”, in: A. Di Francesco (ed.), *Da Brumaio ai Cento giorni. Cultura di governo e dissenso politico nell’Europa di Bonaparte*, Milano: Guerini e Associati, 2007, pp. 345–367; E. Pagano, *Enti locali e Stato in Italia sotto Napoleone. Repubblica e Regno d’Italia (1802–1814)*, Rome: Carocci, 2007. On the Papal area, see Lucrezio Monticelli, *Roma seconda città dell’Impero*, pp. 61–99; Galluccio, “Il découpage nel Lazio”.

⁵⁰ Sturani, “Espaces administratifs”.

⁵¹ Galluccio, “Il découpage nel Lazio”, pp. 11–12.

communication with the department's peripheries. For example, the choice of Anagni as the capital city of the Circeo department instead of the more central Frosinone was due to the closeness of the former to French political ideals compared to the loyalty of the latter to papal power.⁵²

After the quick collapse of the Jacobin republics, the Napoleonic territorial design altered the configuration of those that would become the annexed departments. The Piedmont territory, with the transformation into the 27th French Military Division and the following annexation to the French Empire in 1802, was reshaped into 6 departments, with the addition of Dora (Ivrea) and Marengo (Alessandria).⁵³ Between 1801 and 1805, some limited reforms intervened to make some changes to the administrative network, with the creation of *arrondissements* (districts) and municipalities. A more fundamental project of territorial reordering that placed more power in the hands of the prefects was blocked mainly by the protests addressed to the imperial government by local institutions and actors, such as mayors, communal councils, and representative of local elite. In many cases, these petitions and protests represented forms of resistance aimed at defending privileges and, more generally, the status quo.⁵⁴ But resistance to the rationalization of the territorial design and the defence of power positions were not the only forces at play. As Maria Luisa Sturani has revealed, the petitions also expressed "alternative projects from below, trying to ride the reform to build new centralities and new circumscriptions".⁵⁵ Even in this case, the administrative design, conceived and produced from above, had to face local requests, protests, and positions and to be subjected to a moment of negotiation with these forces from below. Social actors, even in the more oppressive Napoleonic administrative structure, did not stop exercising their agency, attempting to play their part in the process of territorial construction.

Far from a mere opposition between a new rational territorial order and a previous identity space is the case of Roman departments. Already in the context of the Roman Republic, some protests related to the new departmentalization were addressed to the French government, urging it to compromise in order to gain consent. Even in this case, despite the references to the "natural-ity" of communities, the real interests at stake were those of the landowners, who were worried about maintaining their privileges.⁵⁶ But, again, Napoleonic departmentalization opened up new scenarios. At the moment of Napoleonic

⁵² Ibid., p. 11.

⁵³ While Asti became the capital of the department Tanaro.

⁵⁴ S. Woolf, "Frontiere entro la frontiera".

⁵⁵ Sturani, "Maglia amministrativa e spazi sociali locali".

⁵⁶ Galluccio, "Il découpage nel Lazio", p. 24.

reconquest, in 1809, a Consulte Extraordinaire pour les Etats Romains, in charge of the administrative arrangement of the new possessions, recognized how “[t]he territorial division, which was immediately undertaken, provided the first impulse to the new order of things to be established”.⁵⁷ The Roman territory was subdivided in July 1809 into two departments: Tevere (Roma) and Trasimeno (Spoleto). The decision, taken on the basis of surveys and data collected in local archives, responded, in the opinion of its main protagonist, Joseph-Marie de Gérando, both to the “circonstances géographique” (geographical circumstances) and to the “habitudes anciennes” (old habits).⁵⁸ Nonetheless, in November 1810 the borders of the two departments were rectified in the light of “several complains advanced by the municipalities”.⁵⁹ In this regard, a recent study by Chiara Lucrezio Monticelli has convincingly highlighted how in the Roman departments local responses to imperial politics does not have to be read in terms of a simple opposition between two distant systems or an expression of a different culture and needs. Indeed, on the one hand, the Napoleonic territorial redefinition opened up new opportunities for the formation of new elites as well as forms of political participation⁶⁰; on the other hand, the local administrators proved to be in favour of mediating between central instructions and principles and local influences.

Conclusions

The combination of the Neapolitan case with the Piedmont and Roman examples leads to some final reflections. Revolutionary and Napoleonic experiences undoubtedly introduced in Italy an unprecedented relationship between space, power, and citizenship. Aware of the importance of the knowledge and control of space, French leadership deployed several means in this direction, from the setting up of cadastres to the formation of specialized corps, like the bridges and road service, establishing a tight link between administrative state and technical knowledge.⁶¹ In this context, the impact upon cartography, with the

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 19.

⁵⁸ Cit. in Lucrezio Monticelli, *Roma seconda città dell’Impero*, p. 85.

⁵⁹ “diversi reclami indirizzati dalli comuni”. Ibid., p. 89.

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 62; 90–99.

⁶¹ Meriggi, *Gli stati italiani*, pp. 74–75; L. Blanco, “Formazione e professionalizzazione dell’ingegnere ‘moderno’: alcune riflessioni a partire dal caso francese”, in: A. Ferraresi and M. Visioli, *Formare alle professioni. Ingegneri, architetti, artisti (secc. XV–XIX)*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2012, pp. 129–152; F.M. Lo Faro, “Ingegneri, architetti, tavolari: periti ‘di

establishment of military topographic offices, is very significant.⁶² Moreover, the introduction of identity and travel cards was a complementary aspect of this construction of a new typology of space. The Napoleonic state introduced in almost the entire Italian peninsula a system of classification and identification of people destined to accompany, even with some modifications, the Italian states until *Risorgimento*. The registry office connected, in most cases, every single person, free from Ancien Régime corps, to a precise point of state space, the domicile one, and, along with the introduction of identity cards, created a homogeneous, egalitarian space according to the state's perspective.⁶³ Controlling the movement of people, abolished in the first hour of the republican period, was extended during the Napoleonic era to internal movement so that the interstate space of movement mirrored the administrative one, making subjects aware, at every point, of a constant and exclusive relationship with state space in both their static and dynamic conditions.⁶⁴

Nevertheless, the production of this undoubtedly new institutional framework turns out to be more complex if investigated in the constructivist perspective suggested by the spatial turn. As shown by the three cases analysed here, these new institutional spaces were the product of a plurality of actors and an intertwining of different factors. To begin with, the French projects were not

misura' nel Regno di Napoli fra Settecento e Ottocento", in: R. De Lorenzo (ed.), *Storia e misura, Indicatori sociali ed economici nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia (secoli XVIII–XX)*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2007, pp. 305–361; G. Bigatti, "La matrice di una nuova cultura tecnica. Storie di ingegneri, 1750–1848", in: G. Batti (ed.), *La società operosa. Milano nell'Ottocento*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2000, pp. 31–89.

⁶² For the topographical office in the Kingdom of Naples see V. Valerio, *Società, uomini e istituzioni cartografiche nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia*, Firenze: Istituto geografico militare, 1993; G. Brancaccio, *Geografia, cartografia e storia del Mezzogiorno*, Napoli: Guida, 1991.

⁶³ O. Faron, *La ville des destins croisés. Recherches sur la société milanaise du XIXe siècle*, Rome: Ecole française de Rome 1997; M. Meriggi, "La cittadinanza di carta", *Storica* 16 (2000), pp. 107–120; A. Schiaffino, "L'organizzazione e il funzionamento dello stato civile nel Regno italico (1806–1814). Problemi di utilizzazione a fini di ricerca demografica", *Cahiers internationaux d'histoire économique et sociale* 3 (1974), pp. 341–420; A. Lazzarini, "Problemi d'impianto dei servizi demografici in un'area montana: il Dipartimento della Piave", in: L. Billanovich (ed.), *Il Veneto delle periferie. Secoli XVIII e XIX*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2012, pp. 107–120.

⁶⁴ A. Geselle, "Passaporti ed altri documenti di viaggio. Modalità e controllo del movimento in territorio veneto", in: D. Calabi, *Dopo la Serenissima. Società, amministrazione e cultura nell'Ottocento veneto*, Venezia: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2001, pp. 363–381; M. Meriggi, "Sui confini dell'Italia preunitaria", in: S. Salvatici (ed.), *Confini. Costruzioni, attraversamenti, rappresentazioni*, Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino, 2005, pp. 37–53; Di Fiore, *Alla frontiera*. Stefano Poggi, Ph.D. researcher at European University Institute, is carrying out research focused on the "security cards" in Napoleonic Kingdom of Italy, titled "State Identity. Personal Identification in the Kingdom of Italy (1805–1814)".

totally in conflict with reform projects and cultures that had been developed locally before the revolutionary turning point. In these cases, the revolutionary and Napoleonic moment, in virtue of the fundamental principles related to national sovereignty, central power, and juridical egalitarianism, advanced the already elaborated projects or launched processes, devoting particular attention to local specificities. Moreover, French respatialization very often took into serious consideration pre-existent orders. In reality, however, these criteria were not often followed. The natural one, even though constantly invoked, was generally not realized. The reference to nature was not less rhetorical when promoted by inhabitants, as it overlapped with the dimension of a social space – made up of economic and cultural relationships solidified in rooted practices and perceptions – which was far from “natural”. This social fabric of space, often claimed to be swept away by geometrical and rational administrative design, was instead dealt with by institutions in their construction of space.

It is true that it almost always occurred in a second moment, following protests and claims raised by the local population.⁶⁵ However, as we have seen, this opposition was not always present or only a way to defend rooted privileges and to reproduce an immobile status quo. Members of local elites often recognized the possibility of taking advantage of the new spatial network, advancing territorial requests as well as seizing opportunities of social ascent and participation in the changes concerning administrative space. Not by chance, these French departments, filled with new meanings even when maintaining previous borders, in turn produced new social practices and identity paradigms, leading to the overlap of administrative and social-identity spaces. This process was nevertheless more complex than the one postulated by geographic determinism.

This geographic-administrative framework, through the methodology of border studies and the spatial turn, is analysed as a product and then as a producer in an articulated mechanism in which several actors and elements took part: the central (even imperial) institutions, the local representatives more inclined to support local claims, the past culture and reform projects, and the local population, facing a new interaction with space made up of subjective perceptions, fears, and desire not only to keep privileges but also to exploit the new design.

Finally, such an interpretation of a specific aspect of revolutionary and Napoleonic Italy, namely its respatialization, based on an intertwining of institutional history with border studies through the lens of the spatial turn, contributes

⁶⁵ More generally, for resistance to Napoleonic administration in Italy see A.M. Rao, “Les formes de la résistance anti-napoléonienne en Italie”, in: C. Peyrard, F. Pomponi, and M. Vovelle (eds.), *L'administration napoléonienne en Europe. Adhésions et résistances*, Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 2008, pp. 159–175.

to the recent rethinking of Italy's place in the French and Napoleonic system. As frequently happened in contexts characterized by domination and in imperial spaces, institutional patterns and administrative systems were not only forced upon passive populations as a simple imposition by a conquering power in an almost "colonial" manner.⁶⁶ Rather, in a complex encounter, they confronted local paradigms – often generating hybrid solutions and local claims – the latter not just aimed at resisting but even at appropriating them.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Meriggi, "Costituzioni antiche".

⁶⁷ See C. Lucrezio Monticelli, "La police à Rome durant la première moitié du XIX siècle: entre influence française et modèles ecclésiastiques", and V. Fontana, "Briser l'empire de l'habitude. Le mémoire du préfet du Léman et la réorganisation policière, Genève (1812–1813)", both in: C. Denys (ed.), *Circulations policières. 1750–1914*, Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2012, pp. 191–208 and 159–189. See also L. Di Fiore, "Les modèles administratifs entre imposition et adaptation: la police 'moderne' et la transformation des pratiques d'identification", in: P.-M. Delpu, I. Moullier, and M. Traversier, *Le royaume de Naples à l'heure française. Revisiter l'histoire du decennio francese (1806–1815)*, Lille: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2018, pp. 133–146.