

**Overcoming Institutional Voids: *Maisons Spéciales* and the
Internationalisation of Proto-Modern Brands**

Nicholas Alexander*

Lancaster University Management School, Lancaster University, United Kingdom

nicholas.alexander@lancaster.ac.uk

Anne Marie Doherty

Strathclyde Business School, University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom

annemarie.doherty@strath.ac.uk

* Corresponding author.

Abstract

This article explores the role of institutional voids in the internationalisation of proto-modern brands in London from the mid-1820s through to the early 1850s. Internationalising firms addressed institutional deficiencies in the market through the establishment of retail operations identified here as international *maisons spéciales* and by adopting marketing strategies designed to legitimate their proto-modern brands. Together, these organisational and strategic marketing responses enabled firms to overcome institutional voids and shape market norms. These mutually supporting organisational and marketing innovations occurred at a much earlier date than the literature currently suggests.

Keywords: Institutional voids, Proto-modern Brands, Marketing, International Retail, Maison Spéciale, Market Shaping, Brand Development, Brand Identity, Brand Values, Trademark Regulation, Arenas of Consumption, Regent Street

Introduction

Institutional voids have been used to explain how firm structures and strategies are adapted to institutional contexts in late twentieth century and early twenty-first century emerging markets.¹ Building on the work of Khanna and Palepu, management and international business research has considered how firms address problems created by institutional deficiencies.² The business history literature has primarily considered institutional voids in the organisational context of business groups and an historical context post-1920.³ In this literature, business group activity in emerging markets has been considered as one response to institutional voids.⁴ Markets such as China, India and Turkey have attracted particular attention.⁵

In this article, we consider how firms overcome institutional voids by taking advantage of institutional deficiencies. We do this in an historical context in order to encourage further research on how early commercial responses to institutional voids shape market practices within long-term historical processes. Here we consider responses to institutional voids in the organisational context of firms with a specialist merchandise focus and in the historical context of early nineteenth century Britain. This research considers early strategizing of institutional voids and the market shaping activity associated with organisational and marketing responses to institutional deficiencies. Specifically, we explore the effect of institutional voids on the internationalisation of proto-modern brands through consideration of the international activities of predominantly Parisian firms operating in London between the mid-1820s and the early 1850s. In so doing, we explain how marketing and retail operational innovations adopted by internationalising firms as a response to institutional voids helped shape the modernization of marketing practices and thereby influenced the adoption of such practices by other internationalising firms later in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century.⁶ Further, we show how these interrelated and co-dependent organisational and marketing innovations associated with the internationalisation of proto-modern brands were located within contextualised consumption practices.

We use the term *proto-modern brand* to distinguish the brands discussed here from modern brands and proto-brands. Accepting that modern brands provide the consumer with both transactional and *sophisticated* transformational information, we build on Moore and Reid's assertion that brands before the twentieth century were little more than identifiers of information associated with logistical functionality and should "be referred to as proto-brands"

by proposing an intermediary stage of brand development.⁷ Many early and mid-nineteenth century brands provided much more than logistical information associated with warehousing and distribution. Therefore, we use the term *proto-modern brand* in recognition of the transactional and *nascent* transformational information provided to the consumer by some early and mid-nineteenth century brands. As Keller notes: “the multidimensional nature of consumer brand knowledge (in terms of different types of information in consumer memory) and leveraging (in terms of multiple sources of secondary meaning from a linked entity) must be understood and accounted for” when researching branding.⁸ For Keller sources of secondary meaning may be people, things or places (entities) associated with the brand. These entities transfer awareness, attributes, benefits, images, thoughts, feelings, attitudes and experiences to the brand, and become associated with the brand in the mind of the consumer. The proto-modern brands considered here were marketed with reference to other entities. Therefore, far from offering transactional information alone, they were marketed - albeit in a rudimentary manner - with reference to transformational information which was intended to create intangible and meaningful dimensions of knowledge in the mind of the consumer.

In the findings below, we identify firms’ retail operational response to institutional voids in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. This response was characterised by the internalisation of distribution activity and the internationalisation of the retail function. The term international *maison spéciale* is introduced here in order to identify a particular business form. The term is drawn from firms’ description of their own retail businesses in contemporary trade directories and advertising material. Representing an early form of international retailer, the international *maison spéciale* emerged in the second quarter of the nineteenth century as a mechanism through which firms could support the internationalisation of proto-modern brands. Through the development of a retail operation, internationalising firms bridged institutional divides.⁹ The *maison spéciale* represents a reflexive process of legitimation; the physical retailing environment contextualises the proto-modern brand and the proto-modern brand defines the physical retailing environment. These were the specialist retail branches of businesses engaged in the production process, and in this the international replication of the home market store. International *maisons spéciales* are very early examples of multiple site retail organisations and international retailing activity. They are the precursors of developments that were to define the modernisation of retail activity in the late nineteenth century and the twentieth century. But they were not merely organisational replications of successful retail outlets; they were the physical representation of the proto-modern brand in an international

market. They were part of the marketing process as much as they were a sales outlet. Their inherent association with the internationalisation of proto-modern brands highlights the emergence of marketing practices that were later adopted by larger commercial operations. Here their organisational and marketing characteristics together with their role in addressing institutional deficiencies are considered for the first time.

Khanna and Palepu suggest that in product markets characterised by institutional voids, both firms and consumers experience a lack of information.¹⁰ They identify three reasons for this: an underdeveloped communications infrastructure, an absence of mechanisms to corroborate claims made by firms about their products, and an absence of mechanisms providing redress if customers are dissatisfied. For Khanna and Palepu, this has two implications for the brand building process: higher costs are incurred and firms have greater difficulty competing with well-established brands. Here we propose that these conditions describe the market environment encountered by firms internationalising proto-modern brands in the early nineteenth century. We assert that such conditions enhance the role of retailers. As an established source of information, corroboration and redress, retailers occupy a place in the distribution channel that enables them to overcome institutional deficiencies. A relatively underdeveloped communications infrastructure places particular emphasis on the role of the retailer in providing product information.¹¹ Through direct contact with customers, retailers in this context are uniquely placed to corroborate or refute claims made about products and offer redress if products do not meet customer requirements.

Adopting an institutional voids perspective facilitates the development of a more dynamic understanding of how firms strategize – severally or conjointly - their response to international market conditions.¹² Representing an actionable construct, voids encourage firms to overcome deficiencies through substituting formal institutions with informal ones. This may involve different organisational forms and partnering arrangements.¹³ For example, institutional voids encourage the establishment of private ordering systems to manage contractual hazard and, in some cases, they may encourage the use of specific assets.¹⁴ Consequently, there is an interrelationship between market failures and institutional voids and internationalising firms having to compensate for both of these.¹⁵ By disrupting the functioning of markets, institutional voids discourage entrepreneurship and hence competition, but they also encourage firms to innovate and shape markets. Consequently, there is an opportunity for institutional capabilities to be transferred across markets.¹⁶

In the historical context explored here, we are predominantly concerned with Parisian firms. Entering the British market, these firms would have encountered institutional voids consistent with Khanna and Palepu's analytical framework: an underdeveloped communications infrastructure, an absence of mechanisms to corroborate claims made by firms about their products, and an absence of mechanisms providing redress if customers were dissatisfied.¹⁷ This does not mean that there was an absence of voids in the French market. Rather, given the emergence of embryonic institutional frameworks in France, there were greater institutional deficiencies in the British market: so that, for French firms entering the British market, institutional voids may have appeared more acute in the host market than they did in the home market.¹⁸ For example, Hahn considers retail marketing innovation was a characteristic of the French and particularly the Parisian market in the 1830s and 1840s,¹⁹ while Duguid suggests that British trademark regulations lagged behind French frameworks in the middle years of the nineteenth century.²⁰ This suggests that there was a more developed communications infrastructure and there were more developed mechanisms to corroborate claims made by firms about their products in the French market.

Marketing innovations in Paris such as the use of promotional material, would have at least in part begun to address the problem of an underdeveloped communications infrastructure: practices increasingly commonplace in France but less evident in the British market would imply a relative institutional weakness in the British market. As Hahn notes, in their promotional material, retailers were reimagining the way in which they communicated their identity: "By the early 1840s images of stores increasingly featured refined architecture, spacious interiors, splendid arrays of goods, elegant consumers, and central locations", thereby invoking "lifestyles firmly set in the urban environment".²¹ But it was retailing's interrelationship with the street - and by inference retailers in a specific arena of consumption - that redefined the consumer experience: "The public space of the street and the semi-private space of shops were linked in the delineation of the areas of urban excursion. Shops such as Susse, Duvelleroy, Duroisseau, the furniture shop Monbro, and the stationery shop Marion exemplified speciality shops, most of which advertised extensively".²² Martin suggests that a fundamental change in the growth in advertising material to be found in two Parisian daily newspapers, *Le Journal des Débats* and *Le Constitutionnel*, dates to the decade 1825-1835.²³ This innovative commercial environment, where improved marketing communications were transforming consumer awareness of proto-modern brands, coincided with the expansion of international *maisons spéciales*.

In a similar vein, Duguid's assertion that British trademark regulations lagged behind French regulations emphasises the relative weakness or absence of mechanisms that could be used in the British market to corroborate claims made by firms about their products. Duguid's argument rests on both a longer term embedded, or, from a theoretical perspective, a taken for granted understanding of trademark protection, and a more immediate regulatory reiteration of trademark protection that would have provided a normative mechanism for the control of trademark usage.²⁴ This argument rests on the existence of a pre-revolutionary guild system and the early introduction of a post-revolutionary regulatory framework. In Britain the guild system had declined by the eighteenth century, whereas in France, "strong and far-reaching guild structures survived up to the revolution of 1789".²⁵ In France, after a very brief interlude, regulations were introduced in the mid-1790s to cover "marks for plate and jewelry and for cutlers" and a more general set of regulations were introduced in 1802–1803 to protect manufacturers against counterfeiting.²⁶ As Duguid notes, these regulations, while addressing the problem of "what the Anglo-Saxon tradition would call "passing off,"" they also addressed "goods marked "façon de ...," which comes closer to trademark infringement."²⁷ Incrementally developed over the next two decades, "the law was reinforced in 1824 specifically to protect the names of manufacturers, businesses, and places of manufacture against imitation and appropriation".²⁸ In contrast, "until 1876, there was no national registry of trade marks in the UK" and "consequently there was no such offence as trade mark infringement."²⁹ Traders could only seek the protection of common law and the offence of passing off. However, the costs of such actions and a long drawn out legal process with an uncertain outcome left traders vulnerable to counterfeiting in what was a weak institutional environment where marks of trade could not be relied on to provide a robust mechanism to corroborate claims made by firms about their products.

Additionally, Khanna and Palepu's analysis of institutional voids emphasises an absence of mechanisms providing redress if customers are dissatisfied.³⁰ Retail outlets associated with a brand are one means of overcoming this absence and thereby redressing institutional deficiencies. In the Parisian market, the role of the retail outlet in the marketing of luxury items was well established by the end of the eighteenth century. Indeed, as Coquery asserts, in the "absence of trademarks – communication of information about production and consumption occurred principally via shopkeepers and merchants".³¹ Therefore, when the firms considered here began opening international retail operations in London in the early nineteenth century, they were expanding from a domestic market that had a tradition of

legitimizing merchandise quality through the use of retail provision. Institutional voids encourage the establishment of private ordering systems in order to manage contractual hazard; retail outlets are an example of how specific assets are used to achieve this end.

As discussed above, a combination of factors coalesced to provide the institutional conditions required to stimulate the development of international *maisons spéciales*. The firms considered in this article responded to institutional voids by adopting organisational arrangements that internalised commercial activity and, in so doing, they were better able to support the international marketing of their proto-modern brands.

Internationalisation of Retailing and Proto-Modern Brands

Maisons spéciales are evidence of early international retailing activity. They show this activity occurred at an early date and to a greater extent than previously thought, and help to explain why later activity occurred in the way that it did. They advance our understanding of how firms responded to international market opportunities.

A growing literature on late nineteenth and early twentieth century international retailing activity shows that international retailing was more extensive, and has a far longer history, than had previously been understood.³² This recent research has shown that international retailing is not a phenomenon to be associated primarily or exclusively with late twentieth century globalisation. Earlier international retailing activity took a variety of organisational forms: manufacturers with retail outlets, department stores, free-standing retailers and specialist retailers.³³ Large manufacturing firms with strong brands had an important role to play in the retail internationalisation process, as did smaller specialist retailers with their own distinctive brands.³⁴ Therefore, far from being essentially a post-1980s phenomenon as originally thought, this growing body of work demonstrates that international retailing was an integral part of an emerging global economy from the 1880s.

Indeed, the business history literature also indicates international retail activity can be discerned before the last decades of the nineteenth century.³⁵ For example, market based research identifies three occurrences of inward investment in Britain in the 1850s, three in the 1860s, and two in the 1870s.³⁶ However, these early examples of international retailing have been described as having limited economic importance. It has been suggested that they do not represent the scale of FDI associated with large-scale manufacturer owned retail networks that

appeared later in the nineteenth century.³⁷ Nevertheless, more recent research suggests there is justification for further examination of the extent of early international retailers' organisational formats and marketing practices in order to better understand how they influenced later international retailers.³⁸ For example, firm based research has shown how American retail buying activity in the Paris market of the 1840s developed into early forms of retailing activity in subsequent decades.³⁹ Indeed, this new evidence suggests there is a need for a better understanding of the relationship between proto-modern brand development and international retailing activity.

As noted above, a considerable literature now exists on the development of trademarks in the late nineteenth century.⁴⁰ During the nineteenth century, brands developed with the internationalisation of trade and often well in advance of the legislation that regulated trademarks. Before this extended trademark codification process, firms had to rely on proto-modern methods of brand identification. As noted in the introduction above, proto-modern brands are an intermediary stage between proto-brands that predominantly conveyed transactional information and modern brands that are characterised by their transformational information. Proto-modern brands emerged in an entrepreneurial firm environment. Therefore, they were not supported by a formalised marketing function found in twentieth century corporate contexts. The proto-modern brand is a manifestation of an early phase in marketing development where there is an absence of the organisational and institutional frameworks that support modern marketing activity.⁴¹ Trademark legislation and trademark protection had not caught up with practices in the market place. Proto-modern brands were marketed with reference to sources of secondary meaning such as people or places (entities) and thereby sought to establish brand meaning through such associations. Such associations with meaningful entities transfer awareness, attributes, benefits, images, thoughts, feelings, attitudes and experiences to the brand, and in so doing the brand becomes more meaningful to the consumer. Moore and Reid's proto-brands were being eclipsed by proto-modern brands by the early nineteenth century as firms adopted practices that imbued their brands with transformational information rather than transactional information used simply to identify products to distributors and consumers in the distribution channel.⁴² Some of these practices were associated with promotional messages and others were brought together within a retail environment that could be controlled by the firm marketing the brand. Indeed, in-house retailing activity was important not only because a controlled service environment could be created to enhance brand associations but because in-house methods of distribution helped to

overcome institutional deficiencies in a weak institutional environment. Therefore, when viewed from a marketing perspective, early forms of international retailing may be seen as an important manifestation of marketing innovation in an economy in which proto-modern brands had an increasingly important role to play.

The development of retail networks is closely associated with the internationalisation of brands in the late nineteenth century.⁴³ However, the relationship between the internationalisation of proto-modern brands and the development of international retail branch systems in the early nineteenth century has not been explored. Retail stores are a means to protect brand identity. In an environment where brand protection is weak, this role is further enhanced. For example, in-house retailing facilities allow firms to address counterfeiting activities of other traders.⁴⁴ In a proto-modern regulatory environment, retailers have a particularly important role to play in the authentication or verification of merchandise.⁴⁵ They are the guarantors of quality. As Belfanti has suggested, early brands emerged in a consumer culture which was capable of responding to “the stimulus offered by the first advertising campaigns adopted by businesses”; that is, where “marketing strategies were created” and were “able to stimulate new sensibilities”.⁴⁶ However, proto-modern brands also developed in a context of weak institutional frameworks. Consequently, firms marketing proto-modern brands required support mechanisms to help them overcome institutional voids.

The location in which retailers operate creates an environment from which customers derive cues about the merchandise being sold. In this way, international brands can protect and project brand identity in sites of consumption which are contextual facilitators of retail change.⁴⁷ Physical space and social practices bring into being arenas of consumption. In this way, consumption itself is seen not simply as an end point in the distribution process but as a set of social practices; an entertainment provided through the excitement created by exotic ranges of merchandise from other places.⁴⁸ Rappaport has observed: “As mass production, distribution, and transportation developed during the nineteenth century, new groups began to shop in a host of new arenas”.⁴⁹ In the second quarter of the nineteenth century, centres of cosmopolitan consumption were redefining consumers’ retail experience. By the early 1840s, retailers in Paris were using central locations, exterior architecture, interior layouts and ranges of goods to invoke a heightened sense of space.⁵⁰ Arenas of consumption both define and are themselves defined by social practices. Rappaport notes that by the 1850s London’s Regent Street was a meeting place for members of “Society” “as it became the epicenter of the West End shopping district” and an arena that “housed a public form of aristocratic consumption and

display”.⁵¹ Centres of cosmopolitan consumption provide consumers with “a *belongingness pathway*” by providing access to products, specifically brands, with symbolic values which signal membership of an international consumer community.⁵²

These early nineteenth century arenas of consumption were populated by specialist retailers. In the literature on retail structural development, specialist retailers in this period are presented as a retail format indicative of pre-modern retailing rather than a retail format capable of supporting commercial innovation.⁵³ It is only in the last decades of the nineteenth century, with the emergence of branch store or chain store operations, that the specialist retailer is seen as representative of organisational development and modernity.⁵⁴ In contrast, the *Grand Magasin* or department store has attracted considerable attention for its role in the modernization of retail practice.⁵⁵ Therefore, discussion of retail innovation and change has focussed on the achievement of format size and scope;⁵⁶ it does not focus on identity as projected through brands or proto-modern brands. By focussing on format and organisational form, the literature has framed retailers as the *locus* of exchange.⁵⁷ In this interpretation, retailing is the final stage in a traditional distribution channel. The retailer receives goods from a variety of sources and sells those goods under the name of the manufacturer. The physical retail environment of the sale, as represented by the interior of the large store, is the signifier of modernity. Hence, the department store and later the chain store have become the touchstones of retail modernity in the period 1850-1950. Yet innovations associated with retail modernity took some time to develop in these commercial settings. For example, department stores were slow to develop their own brands or establish international offshoots. Both innovations were aspects of their twentieth century rather than their nineteenth century activities.⁵⁸ In contrast, the firms considered here integrated international retailing within their business operations and did so in order to project their proto-modern brand within a host market. The international *maison spéciale* was the physical representation of the proto-modern brand and in this was the forerunner of international retailing activity associated with brand development at the end of the nineteenth century and during the twentieth century.⁵⁹ In the Parisian market long established practices associated with “the aesthetic of the shop” helped define the consumer experience and in so doing defined consumer understanding of the goods sold.⁶⁰ In this marketplace, the importance of making the experience of shopping, “a social activity, an attractive leisure pursuit”, encouraged some retailers to downplay the commerciality of the store and engender the atmosphere of the private collection or as Coquery notes “a *cabinet de curiosités* rather than a store”.⁶¹ In this, the eighteenth century Parisian

luxury retailer may be seen as the progenitor of the international *maison spéciale*. But what was different by the 1820s, 1830s and 1840s was the combination of emergent proto-modern brands and the willingness of manufacturing firms to engage in the internationalisation of in-house retail operations. Originating in a market that understood the legitimizing role of a retail outlet that resembled “a *cabinet de curiosités*”,⁶² the *maison spéciale* was a specific asset that could be used to control the proto-modern brand experience for the international consumer. An experience that was otherwise left to chance at the premises of local traders. To use terminology associated with a later manifestation of the specialist store format dedicated to the sale of a single brand and designed to downplay overt commercialism in order to engender the luxury shopping experience, the *maison spéciale* played an “ambassadorial role” for a brand enhanced by the “extravagance” of its physical aesthetic.⁶³

Because this research is concerned with market context and how incoming international firms respond to institutional voids, we consider the internationalisation of retailing activity and proto-modern branding practice within a specific arena of consumption. Arenas of consumption are intrinsically sites of otherness; that is, otherness as represented by merchandise transferred-in over some distance. However, there are some arenas that are emphatically defined through their redolence of otherness. In an arena of consumption, such as London’s Regent Street, New York’s Fifth Avenue or Paris’ Rue de la Paix, otherness is offered not only by remotely connected intermediaries but by representative extensions of otherness; that is, by retailers who market their own international brands. We explore how firms achieved territorial legitimacy by locating their international branch operation in a specific arena of consumption. Here we draw on an institutional theory framework that suggests that the physical existence of a commercial entity will in itself lend legitimacy.⁶⁴ We extend this understanding of territorial legitimacy by suggesting that clustering activity of international firms reflexively reinforces this legitimization process.

In the findings below, we identify firms’ organisational and marketing responses to institutional voids in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. This response was characterised by the internalisation of distribution activity and the internationalisation of the retail function.

Market Shaping

The primary sources considered here indicate that firms internationalising proto-modern brands in the second quarter of the nineteenth century responded to institutional voids through the organisational expediency of integrated specialist retail outlets (*maisons spéciales*), the adoption of innovative marketing practices and the clustering of activities in a cosmopolitan arena of consumption that lent legitimacy to their commercial activities. The internationalising firms and their proto-modern brands were a product of a vibrant home market in which advertising played a fundamental role.⁶⁵ Most of the firms originated in Paris. They sold luxury products crafted or manufactured within the firm and retailed through in-house outlets. The identity and reputation of the firm, the retail outlet and the locale in which goods were sold were closely intertwined. Consequently, when they came to internationalize, the host market arena of consumption in which these firms clustered their retail activity was crucial. It generated and supported located consumption practices which contributed to a process of market shaping and the establishment of commercial norms. These norms were reinforced by other firms who, on entering the market, adopted the same located practices.

The term international *maison spéciale* is introduced here in order to identify a particular business form. The term is drawn from firms' description of their own retail businesses in contemporary trade directories and advertising material. Representing an early form of international retailer, the international *maison spéciale* emerged in the second quarter of the nineteenth century as a mechanism through which firms could support the internationalisation of proto-modern brands. Their development involved internationalising firms in bridging institutional divides.⁶⁶ The *maison spéciale* represents a reflexive process of legitimation; the physical retailing environment contextualises the proto-modern brand and the proto-modern brand defines the physical retailing environment. These were the specialist retail branches of businesses engaged in the production process, and in this the international replication of the home market store. International *maisons spéciales* are very early examples of multiple site retail organisations and international retailing activity.⁶⁷ They are the precursors of developments that were to define the modernisation of retail activity in the late nineteenth century and the twentieth century. But they were not merely organisational replications of successful retail outlets; they were the physical representation of the proto-modern brand in an international market. They were part of the marketing process as much as they were a sales outlet. Their inherent association with the internationalisation of proto-modern brands highlights the emergence of marketing practices that were later adopted by larger commercial

operations. Here their organisational and marketing characteristics together with their role in addressing institutional deficiencies are considered for the first time.

Arena of Consumption

The arena of consumption considered here is in London: the area of Regent Street bounded by Leicester Street to the south, Argyll Street and Maddox Street to the north.⁶⁸ Three considerations determined its identification. First, the area naturally forms a coherent market space. The term “arena of public consumption” is used in the urban history literature,⁶⁹ where it is defined as a distinct market location encompassed by the consumer gaze.⁷⁰ An abstract planning perspective of a street might encompass more than one arena of consumption. For example, Regent Street north of Oxford Street is a distinct arena compared with the area south of Piccadilly. At street level, the ends of Regent Street are not visible, one to the other. Therefore, avoiding a panoptic perspective and considering the consumer view of consumption,⁷¹ the location identified provides a context within which to consider co-present commercial practices. Second, an unambiguous retail location was required. Identification of multiple store retail activity in the early nineteenth century poses problems. Warehouses, residences and lock-up shops may be inappropriately categorised as full-service retail premises.⁷² When considering international retail operations a further layer of confusion may be associated with wholesaling or buying offices.⁷³ Third, the two international retailers previously recognized as operating in the British market in 1850 were located in this arena of consumption.⁷⁴ At the heart of London’s West End retailing, Regent Street - and this part of Regent Street in particular – represented a centre of cosmopolitan consumption practices.⁷⁵ During the period 1826-1851, there were 91 separate buildings used for retail purposes in this arena.⁷⁶

The study of early international retailing activity is inhibited by the paucity of surviving firm records.⁷⁷ This problem is compounded where data are required on a number of businesses. Consequently, in this research, we engaged with sources that facilitated the construction of a database providing a broad commercial picture. At an initial stage in the research process it became clear that international firms were using dedicated retail outlets in the London market. Therefore, commercial directories were searched on a year by year basis for international firms with retail outlets in London.⁷⁸ General listings, trade listings and street listings were cross-checked in order to clarify the name, activity and location of a firm’s

operations. Firms that appeared to be international and have retail units in the host market were then checked against other sources such as newspaper advertising and home market commercial directories. This process of verification identified the arena of consumption considered here as a market space which attracted firms of this type. In-turn, using a variety of sources - advertisements, newspaper reports, local taxation records, law cases, census returns, exhibition reports and commercial directories - it was possible to identify and analyse the marketing practices that supported the internationalisation of proto-modern brands. By cross-referencing these sources of information, otherwise unavailable historical details were established and verified. Likewise, these sources facilitated the direct comparison of firm activities; an uneven survival of firm records would not support this. Additionally, they facilitated the identification of very early international retail activity at a date that has not been explored previously in the literature.

International Maisons Spéciales: Context and Development

Following the research process outlined above, we were able to identify twelve international firms that established an international *maison spéciale* in the selected arena of consumption between 1828 and 1851 (see table 1). In this section, we place the international *maison spéciale* in its historical context and describe their appearance in the arena of consumption considered here. Of the twelve international *maisons spéciales* that operated in the arena of consumption between 1828 and 1851, most were producer-retailers based in Paris.⁷⁹

Table 1, Here

The first *maison spéciale* appeared in February 1828, when Jean Claude Melnotte opened a retail unit at 186 Regent Street.⁸⁰ Prior to this, he had already gained some knowledge of the market by selling through an agent at 228 Regent Street.⁸¹ In 1830 - committed to a permanent store devoted to his merchandise - Melnotte relocated to 164 Regent Street.⁸² Melnotte entered a market where there was a strong demand for luxury French goods and his merchandise in particular. In popular literature, in private correspondence and in the press, the name Melnotte was both a symbolic reference point for French luxury and a proto-modern brand in its own right. In 1831, when Benjamin Disraeli - in his capacity as young author - required a name associated with luxury shoes to provide artistic verisimilitude in his novel *The Young Duke*, he chose Melnotte;⁸³ and when Elisabeth Fielding (née Fox Strangeways) wrote

to William Fox Talbot in March 1834 asking him to “bring me some shoes Melnotte will send you”,⁸⁴ they acknowledged the proto-modern brand’s distinctiveness and consumer reputation. This proto-modern brand had a recognizable and recognized brand identity in its own right. The brand name conveyed transformational information that leveraged associated meaning through referenced entities: people (Melnotte as brand personification) and place (Paris as a source of authentication and sophistication). This association based identity is captured neatly in an article in *The New Magazine and Literary Journal* in 1836:

“Paris is, *par excellence*, moreover, the fountain head of fashion. When a well-dressed woman enters a London ball-room, it is instantly asserted that she receives from Paris all the appliances and means which render her irresistible; her *coiffeur* arrives from Paris every spring, and her shoes are forwarded by Melnotte in the dispatch bag.”⁸⁵

The *maisons spéciales* listed in table 1 were part of an internationalisation process and were to make a fundamental contribution to the international character of the arena of consumption in which they located. However, they were not the only type of firm that contributed to this cosmopolitan environment, and it is the difference between these other firms and *maisons spéciales* that emphasizes the innovative and distinct contribution made by the *maisons spéciales*. During the period considered here, there were overtly international stand-alone retail operations, often an amalgam of French and local influences, that were also the purveyors of international merchandise and international fashions but they were not the representatives of a single brand. The *maison spéciale* was an integrated business, at the heart of which was a single brand identity. Other retailers, which traded on their reputation for international merchandise, sold the production of other businesses. In contrast to *maisons spéciales*, they represented traditional retailing activity; they bought goods from manufacturers and wholesalers within multi-level distribution channels. For example, Mary Thomel, a milliner from Cornwall, married to Emanuel Thomel a Parisian “importer of French goods”, began retailing at 180 Regent Street in 1845.⁸⁶ Madame Thomel’s “Magasin de Modes et Nouveautés” of the 1840s and “Magasin de Modes Français” by the 1860s, sourced goods in Paris but only retailed in London.⁸⁷ By the 1850s, her buying office was in the fashionable Place Royale, Paris. A firm such as Madame Thomel’s contributed to the cosmopolitanism of the arena of consumption considered here. However, unlike the *maisons spéciales*, her retail firm, and others like it, did not engage in the international transfer of their own branded products. They were importers of goods from various international, particularly French,

sources. In contrast, a *maison spéciale*, such as Melnotte's, was associated exclusively with a recognizable proto-modern brand and represented a new mechanism for market shaping.

Before the establishment of their own international *maison spéciale* many of the firms listed in table 1 were represented in London by other businesses, such as Madame Thomel's. For example, before Houbigant (perfumer) opened a *maison spéciale* at 216 Regent Street in April 1837 the firm's products had been available in London for some time.⁸⁸ In the early 1830s, Houbigant products were available at locations such as Gibbons, a "Coiffer" at 7 King Street, St. James Square,⁸⁹ Brewsters, "Haircutter and Peruke-maker", of 48 New Bond Street,⁹⁰ as well as J. and E. Atkinson of 24 New Bond Street, "Select Perfumery".⁹¹ In a market with institutional deficiencies, proto-modern brands were highly dependent on the marketing activities of service and retail outlets. Firms such as J. and E. Atkinson advertised their own merchandise as well as the proto-modern brands of other firms to attract customers, claiming "an Assortment of Perfumery of those which have been most approved from the houses of Houbigant, Lubin Gervais, and Tessier of Paris."⁹² However, in this context, firms marketing proto-modern brands were dependent on the uneven reputations of other firms to convey their values and due to wider institutional deficiencies - an underdeveloped communications infrastructure and an absence of independent mechanisms to corroborate products marketing messages - they were overly dependent on the reputations of retail firms to legitimate brand messages and offer consumer redress.

The emergence of international *maisons spéciales* is indicative of fundamental change in marketing practices, the development of proto-modern brands and the institutional arrangements in the host market. A brand name is shorthand for the identity (values and associations) generated by the activities of a proprietary firm and the image retained within the mind of the consumer. In the London market in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the firms of Melnotte and Houbigant were building proto-modern brand recognition: they possessed names with reputations that encapsulated meaning, which they sought to project and protect. However, in doing this they encountered institutional voids that restricted marketing activity. They did not have the legal protection of trademark legislation and registration. They encountered underdeveloped promotional and retailing systems. Therefore, firms responded to deficiencies in the host market by internalising operational functions through innovative organisational arrangements which were reified in the marketplace in the form of *maisons spéciales* and their associated marketing practices.

The 1830s saw a steady increase in the number of international businesses opening a *maison spéciale* in the arena of consumption. Four other businesses followed Melnotte during the decade. A further seven firms arrived in the late 1840s: twelve in total for the period 1828 to 1851. Of these, ten were still operating at this location at the beginning of the 1850s.⁹³ This growth in the number of *maison spéciale* coincided with a general increase in imports from France. Following the cessation of the Napoleonic wars, the official value of imports to Britain and Ireland from France increased by over 400% between 1815 and 1840: see table 2. A particular surge in imports occurred in the early 1820s, and tariff reform in the mid-1820s is likely to have contributed to further growth in the value of French imports in the late 1820s and throughout the 1830s. As the wealthy and contiguous export market of London became more accessible to French goods, firms established *maisons spéciales* in order to better control their marketing activities.

Table 2, Here

In a context of increasing trade between France and Britain, *maisons spéciales* were a response to market failure and the institutional deficiencies encountered by firms entering the London market. Internalisation of retail activity facilitated control of marketing activities. However, the establishment of an international retail unit required local management and associated control mechanisms. Some firms maintained their presence for some time. The Parisian fan maker Duvelleroy operated for over seventy years.⁹⁴ Indeed, half of the firms identified operated from this arena for over twenty years, a record that would compare favourably with international retail operations in later periods.⁹⁵ However, others such as Lerolle Frères and Constantin arrived and left relatively quickly: see, table 3.

Table 3, Here

The firms considered here took three different approaches to managing their international retail outlets: direct control, family based arrangements and partnerships. Alexander and Doherty have shown that successful mid-nineteenth century retail internationalisation was possible where a stable partnership arrangement was in place; however, they have also noted the longer term value of centralised management arrangements in supporting an international retail outlet and ensuring consistency of international brand identity.⁹⁶ Partnerships were widely used in nineteenth century retailing. Commonly, they were renegotiated at regular intervals, often for periods of three years.⁹⁷ They provide a flexible mechanism for establishing retail operations in a domestic market, and the periodic review of

relationships facilitated the involvement of new partners. However, in international markets this degree of flexibility was a potential liability as international retail outlets required long-term stability. The firms considered here had difficulty overcoming this dilemma as they encountered the benefits and risks associated with direct and joint control systems. Individual firm experiences outlined below illustrate the management problems encountered in the market. Together these examples show how firms struggled with the problem of balancing centralised management control with the need for local management embeddedness.

While providing the advantages of centralised management, in-house management of an international retail outlet requires advanced control mechanisms. This is particularly difficult to achieve in weak institutional environments where international firms are not embedded in the market and consequently do not have access to information systems: firms, as well as consumers, experience a lack of information in weak institutional contexts.⁹⁸ Therefore, they incur higher costs as they seek to control the daily management of their brand. In contrast, established indigenous brands have an existing reputation and incur lower costs. For example, in July 1851 J.M. Constantin who operated a *maison spéciale* at 134 Regent Street, found himself in the police courts at Marlborough Street, London, describing the role of his employee James Jones.⁹⁹ Pleading guilty to embezzlement, Mr Jones provided a book “in which the names of parties from whom he had received money and had not accounted to his master for were set down”. “The sum embezzled was over 300*l*”, nearly four years’ salary for Mr Jones. Constantin had established a successful business in London; but from a management perspective, he had difficulties exercising direct control within his Regent Street operation. Within twelve months of the court case, Constantin closed his retail outlet. In order to overcome institutional deficiencies firms ideally integrate their operations, as Constantin attempted to do, but this exposes firms to greater commercial risk because they suffer from a relative lack of information and understanding of practices in the host market.

In-house retail expansion, involving direct oversight of the business, requires the transfer of skills and exposes weaknesses in entrepreneurial activity. One means of circumventing the problems associated with direct control was for family members to manage international branches. Here again firms were reliant on informal institutional arrangements and were dependent on entrepreneurial lifespans and interpersonal relationships. Jean-Baptiste Baillière was the entrepreneurial force behind his international medical bookselling business, but he relied on family members to sustain it. While Jean-Baptiste Baillière established the London business in 1832, his brother Hippolyte subsequently managed it.¹⁰⁰ This family

business was finally sold in 1870 after thirty-eight years of trading at 219 Regent Street. However, family based arrangements were not always so successful. The career of François Eugène Doucét (shirt maker) illustrates the potential complexities of family based arrangements, especially where these also involved outside partners.¹⁰¹ In the late 1840s, already resident in England and on behalf of his family's business in Paris, François Eugène Doucét established a partnership with an Englishman who had experience working in France. The partnership was intended to provide the Paris based business with a retail outlet in London. The local partner was Sydney Barlow from Pendleton, Manchester, who was willing to act in the role of resident "Partner in the firm of Doucét & Co."¹⁰² at 133 Regent Street.¹⁰³ However, this partnership arrangement terminated in 1853, only four years after the opening of the international *maison spéciale*.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, the experience of retailing in London encouraged François Eugène Doucét to look for a new partner. In 1853, he entered into partnership with Geoghegan & Co. of 178 Regent Street.¹⁰⁵ The new partnership operated independently of the family business in Paris.

In 1877, arrangements associated with the partnership and Doucét's residency became the subject of a court case.¹⁰⁶ Details from the case show that François Eugène Doucét, "by origin a Frenchman, carried on business for many years as a shirtmaker in England and France, and at the time of his death was in partnership with W.J. Geoghegan, at 178 Regent-street, London, and 23, Rue de Luxembourg, Paris".¹⁰⁷ Doucét died in June 1874 and left in his will "all his property to his partner in trust for the benefit of his children" and "widow".¹⁰⁸ However, his widow believed his will should be subject to French law and asserted he "was resident in England for 27 years" and "he always intended, when he had made sufficient money, to retire to France". The Court of Chancery disagreed, finding "during his [Doucét's] earlier visits to his native country he had always stated his intention of ultimately returning there [France] when he had made sufficient money to retire from business" but following the death of his parents and the sale of the family property in France "his intention entirely changed".¹⁰⁹ Hinging on Doucét's residency, the case illustrates the fluid nature of family-based international businesses. Doucét had originally established a retail operation in London connected with the family's well established shirt making business in Paris. Nevertheless, ultimately, in partnership with a firm originally associated with the Irish linen trade, he was involved in managing a retail operation in Paris in Rue de Luxembourg, in the 1870s.¹¹⁰ His priorities and circumstances had changed, family members had died, and the locus of his business and personal interests had shifted across international borders.

Partnerships not involving family members offered another method of market entry; they also facilitated the establishment of an international branch without recourse to direct control. However, again such arrangements were not always robust enough to sustain branches beyond the career lifespan of a key individual. What they did offer was a means of bringing much needed business experience into a firm operating a retail unit in a foreign market. This included retail skills, merchandise specific knowledge, an awareness of the local market, and an ability or willingness to work with an international firm.

A resident partner, as opposed to a local manager, offered the potential for a relationship underpinned by common purpose and mutual interest. However, retail partnerships could be terminated amicably after an agreed period, usually two or three years.¹¹¹ Further, where they involved a partner from the host (British) market the resulting organisational arrangements might not be sufficient to address the institutional weaknesses encountered by the internationalising firm. One way of avoiding this problem was to enter into partnership with someone from the home market. Partnerships with fellow nationals, had the potential to ensure shared institutional expectations were normalised within the host market. However, this strategy did not guarantee operational longevity. Jacobs of 32 Rue de la Paix, Paris,¹¹² entered into partnership with Paris born shoemaker, Jules Dupuis,¹¹³ and began operating from 179 Regent Street in 1847.¹¹⁴ However, by July 1853 the partnership had been dissolved. The firm had left its premises in Regent Street and Madame Jacobs was selling off the remaining “small portion of her stock” of Ladies’ and Children’s boots and shoes “much under cost prices” at another address in London.¹¹⁵

Nevertheless, an entry strategy that involved fellow French nationals as local partners was successful in some cases where the right mix of skills and experience addressed problems of market failure and a reliance on informal institutions overcame institutional deficiencies. For example, when L.T. Piver opened an establishment at 160 Regent Street the firm was in partnership with the Lauvergnat brothers: Charles and Jules. The Lauvergnat brothers brought valuable business experience and embedded socio-commercial host market relationships within the partnership. They brought merchandise specific commercial skills and experience of retailing in the London market acquired while working for Houbigant-Chardin (216, Regent Street) for twelve years.¹¹⁶ Additionally, they had extensive social connections among the French business community in London and wider London society. During the business relationship with Piver, Jules Lauvergnat was a donor to the Société Française de Secours,¹¹⁷ a leading member of the French Benevolent Society,¹¹⁸ a member of the London Committee

responsible for receiving subscriptions for the wounded soldiers of the Franco-Prussian War¹¹⁹ and a fellow of the Zoological Society of London.¹²⁰

Table 4, Here

The Piver-Lauvergnat relationship is worth considering in further detail as it highlights the tensions and benefits inherent in partnership arrangements and the strategizing required as firms responded to institutional deficiencies. Piver's representation in the arena of consumption spans the period 1846-1879; however, the firm's relationship with the Lauvergnat brothers evolved over the years (see table 4). The balance of commercial relations changed on more than one occasion, and included a hiatus in the relationship in the mid-1860s. The initial relationship was one in which Piver provided branded merchandise and was financially responsible for the retail property at 160 Regent Street.¹²¹ The brothers filled the role of resident partners and retail managers.¹²² Although the name of the business, as it appeared in trade directories, was Piver & Lauvergnat (Brothers), advertising projected the name of L.T. Piver and not the partnership name. However, by 1866 the Lauvergnat brothers were acting independently of Piver. In early 1865, Alphonse Piver's partnership with Charles Lauvergnat and Jules Lauvergnat was dissolved.¹²³ Piver's name disappears from trade directories, and instead the Lauvergnat brothers are listed selling gloves at the Regent Street address.¹²⁴ Nevertheless, this arrangement was clearly unsatisfactory for the brothers. So much so that from 1868 they were willing to re-establish the relationship with Piver on terms that made them directly liable for costs associated with the retail property and accept that Piver's name alone should be used in commercial listings.¹²⁵ On Piver's return to Regent Street in 1868 there was a fundamental shift in the relationship; that is, between the firm of Piver as international brand and the Lauvergnat brothers as providers of retail management functions. From 1868, the local retail operation is known as L.T. Piver not Piver & Lauvergnat Brothers. Advertising for the *maison spéciale* recommenced using the name of L.T. Piver in 1872.

The hiatus in the relationship between Piver and the firm's resident partners is a strong reminder of why international *maisons spéciales* came into being in the first place.¹²⁶ They were venues through which the proto-modern brand gained commercial advantage not merely retail warehouses where merchandise was made available for sale. Further, by the late 1860s institutional deficiencies evident in the second quarter of the nineteenth century had begun to disappear as the regulation of trademarks, better communication systems and a modernising distribution system altered the institutional landscape. By the last quarter of the century, many

of the institutional deficiencies that had encouraged the emergence of *maisons spéciales* were no longer present. Consequently, Piver's *maison spéciale* in London was ultimately dependent on the relationship with the firm's long-term local partners the Lauvergnat brothers. At Jules' death in 1879,¹²⁷ Charles having predeceased him, Piver's in-house representation in the market ended. By December 1880, Peter Robinson's in Oxford Street was selling Piver's old stock of gloves "at little more than Half-price";¹²⁸ and in early 1881, Piver appointed Victor Givry of 23 Old Bond Street to a "sole agency" in their perfume.¹²⁹ Announcing the appointment of Givry of Old Bond Street as their new agent, Piver explained their own retail facilities had closed "in consequence of the manager's demise".¹³⁰ This incidental observation poignantly illustrates the fragility of international retail partnerships, reliant as they were on individual entrepreneurs, their personal skills, their knowledge, their informal networks, and ultimately their lifespan.

In a market characterised by institutional voids, these examples illustrate the way in which partnerships and family relationships could sustain the internationalisation of proto-modern brands through the establishment of international *maisons spéciales*. Nevertheless, these examples also show that organisational arrangements were heavily reliant on the continuation of shared objectives and were vulnerable to shifting priorities. In many cases, the business lifespan of key personalities proved a crucial determinant of business survival and continuity of operations. Flawed as many of these management arrangements clearly were, they provided a response to the institutional deficiencies incoming firms experienced in the market. The use of in-market partners capable of bridging the institutional gap between the home and host market emerged as a clear example of this. These arrangements all had the same purpose: to provide an organisational structure that facilitated the establishment of an international *maison spéciale*; which in turn, supported the marketing of a proto-modern brand, thus overcoming institutional voids present in the market.

Previous research identifies only two international retail operations in Regent Street during the 1850s.¹³¹ Therefore, collectively these twelve *maisons spéciales* provide a new insight into the extent of early international retailing activity and the way in which it supported the internationalisation of proto-modern brands. In the following section we analyse the manner in which firms projected proto-modern brand identity and deepen our understanding of the secondary meanings that supported the development of proto-modern brands in an international market.

Communicating Proto-Modern Brand Identity

In the absence of a developed communications infrastructure and independent mechanisms to corroborate marketing messages, firms communicated proto-modern brand identity by asserting legitimacy through other entities. In this case, sources of secondary meaning were derived from provenance and endorsement. At a primary level, in the case of the proto-modern brands considered here, provenance was derived from place; endorsement from individuals or institutions. At a secondary level, provenance came from three sources: country of manufacture, home market retail location and host market retail location. Endorsement came from two sources: patronage and exhibitions. Where institutional voids made it difficult for incoming firms to establish credibility within the market, promotional messages emphasising provenance and endorsement were used to establish legitimation in the host market. Modern branding practices utilise cultural cues such as “language, aesthetic systems, and story themes” in order to emphasise cultural origin.¹³² These themes emerge in the advertising messages of these firms as they sought to reinforce cultural associations and place their proto-modern brands in the context of cosmopolitan lifestyles.

Provenance

Place of origin was fundamental to the marketing messages of these proto-modern brands. This was conveyed through statements of fact about the market of origin but it was also conveyed through the style and medium of the message itself. The language of advertising messages was used to emphasise provenance. In some cases, early newspaper advertisements were printed in French only. For example, on Tuesday, 1 May 1849, the London newspaper *The Morning Post* carried on its front page an advertisement for the Parisian fan making firm of Duvelleroy:

“Eventails Duvelleroy.- Seule maison spéciale à Londres, 167, Regent-street.- La Maison Duvelleroy, si comme à Paris, Passage des Panoramas, pour sa fabrique spéciale d’Eventails (Fans) vient d’établir à Londres un dépôt quise recommande aux dames par son grand assortiment d’Eventails en tout genre et à tout prix.-167, Regent-street.”¹³³

In the advertisement, Duvelleroy, of the Passage des Panoramas in Paris, recommends to female customers his great assortment of fans of all types and all prices, available at his only *maison spéciale* in London, which is located at 167, Regent Street. Use of French throughout an advertisement was particularly popular in the 1840s but less so thereafter. Later, firms

flavoured their advertising message with the French language; English was used for the main advertising message and French was used for trade or product names. For example, Doucét advertised as “Chemisiers” rather than shirtmakers.¹³⁴ Houbigant advertised the firm’s “Pate au Miel, for improving the skin” and “Pomade de Moelle de Boeuf ... for the growth and sustenance of the hair”.¹³⁵

To reinforce brand provenance, place of production and associated functions were important in marketing messages. In December 1849, the stationery firm of Marion emphasized “designs” are “executed by the first artists in Paris”.¹³⁶ Similarly, physical transportation of the latest fashions and merchandise from the place of production was a common theme. In the late 1820s, Melnotte emphasized merchandise came directly from his business at 22 Rue de la Paix, Paris.¹³⁷ While thirty years later, Duvelleroy advertised he “has just received from his Paris Manufactory an Elegant Assortment of Fans for the present season”.¹³⁸ In-house design, production, transportation and retail presentation were consistent themes which collectively authenticated the proto-modern brand.

Table 5, Here

While firms emphasized international manufacture in their advertisements, their domestic retail unit was the most prominent and sustained means of communicating provenance and assuring customers the merchandise was genuine. Parisian firms in particular emphasized their home retail address. Table 5 lists the earliest retail locations of the ten firms with retail outlets in Paris. Only one firm in the list, the short lived Jacobs & Dupuis (ladies shoemakers), did not specify their Paris address in London newspaper advertisements. As table 5 shows, six firms were clustered in the first or second arrondissements, and in four quarters: Italiens, Opéra, Madeleine and Tuileries. Of these, three firms were located in Rue de la Paix: numbers, 21, 22 and 32.

On one level, a firm noting its Paris address in a London advertisement is a simple assertion of fact. However, contextually it is clear that firms were going beyond this simple message. Reference to their Parisian address was a method by which they could place their proto-modern brand within a framework of cosmopolitan consumption. In doing this, they both pre-empted modern branding practice and overcame institutional deficiencies by seeking legitimacy through place of origin. For example, in 1835, in their first London advertisement, Houbigant-Chardin prominently displayed their Paris address; while the London address was placed a discrete second. They promised their customers they would be “supplied with

Perfumery of the same quality, and in the same variety, as at the house in Paris”.¹³⁹ Similarly, when L.T. Piver entered the London retail market, the firm described itself as the “Proprietor of the two largest houses of the kind, 103, Rue St. Martin, Paris, and also at Brussels”, deriving legitimation from both store locations.¹⁴⁰ In listing two international store locations Piver is the exception rather than the rule. Most firms only had one domestic and one London store. The listing of international addresses in Parisian trade directories indicates the importance of London as a primary and early international destination market for the establishment of *maisons spéciales*.¹⁴¹

International retail locations connected London customers to their international counterparts; firms consciously evoked shared consumption experiences by referring to their Parisian customers in advertising material. In May 1850, Constantin informs his customers: “All the Nouveautés d’Automne and d’Hiver lately introduced by M. Constantin retain their choice character, having as yet only been submitted to the haute noblesse of Paris”.¹⁴² The stationers Marion (“Papeterie”), at its opening in 1847, emphasised the variety of its products (“la variété des produits spéciaux de cette maison, qui embrasse les papiers de luxe en general”) and the place where such products would be found: in the “le bureau de l’homme du monde” and “le boudoir aristocratique de la femme élégante”.¹⁴³ The sharing of the Parisian customer experience is fundamental to London advertising messages, and in this the brand is being associated with secondary sources of brand knowledge. An association is inferred between consumers in London and consumers in Paris who enjoy the sophisticated consumption opportunities available in that market.

Place of origin messages were reinforced in *maisons spéciales* through the employment of sales staff from the market of origin. To the customer entering an international *maison spéciale*, this method of creating an authentic consumption environment would have enhanced considerably the firm’s assertions of provenance. In 1851, Regent Street was still a location where the workforce lived above the shop. The census of that year provides evidence of the extent to which customers encountered an international voice in their service experience. At 150 Regent Street, Charles Lehocq’s shoe shop housed four individuals from Boulogne-Sur-Mer: the manager Elandone Coarbet, two shopwomen and one shopman.¹⁴⁴ At 160 Regent Street, L.T. Piver’s shop selling perfume and gloves housed the firm’s local partner Jules Lauvergnat, along with three shopmen born in France.¹⁴⁵ At 216 Regent Street, Houbigant was represented by Ferdinand Pinault, Perfumer and Glover. Born in France and the long term manager of Houbigant’s London operation, he was assisted by a shopman from France.¹⁴⁶ Their

voices intimated authenticity, reinforced merchandise provenance, and illustrated the strength of the proto-modern brand associations generated within international *maisons spéciales*.

However, proto-modern brand identity was not only derived from the original, home market, retail outlet. A retail unit in a suitably prestigious location in the host market was in itself an indication of brand reputation and reliability. The marketing messages of these firms drew both on sources of legitimation from their home market and the host market. In the absence of institutional frameworks that offered consumer reassurance, other means had to be found to corroborate claims associated with these proto-modern brands. Built in the early 1820s,¹⁴⁷ Regent Street provided customers with a new architecture of consumption.¹⁴⁸ It cut through London's existing street plan and provided a purpose built "boulevard".¹⁴⁹ When Melnotte's store opened in 1828, the street was of recent construction. It quickly became established as a desirable location. International *maisons spéciales* appeared as the arena was being defined; in turn they helped to define it.

Hobhouse notes, in 1835 "within ten years of the street's virtual completion", the rental value "of houses in the street itself had risen by about a third, and it had raised the value of all properties in the streets near it".¹⁵⁰ This was a location where the modernity of presentation remodelled and defined consumption practices. In 1861, when "a large flint stone" was thrown at the windows of L.T. Piver's shop, it broke "two squares of plate-glass" to the value of £30.¹⁵¹ Jules Lauvergnat observed: "some years ago similar mischief was done, and the damage was equally great". Amounting to the value of £50, the previous damage included windows and the china ornaments which were there to display the firm's merchandise. Defined by their large plate-glass windows and the elaborate displays of merchandise that stood behind them, these stores were symbols of consumption. They used retail display techniques that would come to define retailing in an era of mass consumption later in the century.¹⁵² The international proto-modern brands present at this location simultaneously contributed to, and derived benefit from, its aura of legitimation; thereby, overcoming the problems of corroboration and redress associated with institutional deficiencies.

The process of market entry provides further evidence of the value of a prestigious host market location. The medical bookseller Jean-Baptiste Baillière began advertising his Paris store in the London press in 1827.¹⁵³ In 1828, he opened a London store at number 3 Bedford Street, Bedford Square,¹⁵⁴ and in 1832 transferred it to 219 Regent Street.¹⁵⁵ In May 1835, Houbigant opened their own store at 13 Thayer Street, Manchester Square,¹⁵⁶ before

transferring to their Regent Street address two years later. Charles Lehocq followed the same logic in 1839 when he “removed from 21. Buckingham-street, Strand, to 150, Regent-street” to premises he considered “larger and more commodious than the former”.¹⁵⁷ Such a move to a “more commodious” property provided legitimation in the London retail market as well as the provincial wholesale market. Provincial customers could experience vicariously the sophistication of brands associated with a prestigious London address. For example, in the mid-1840s, G. Summers, the proprietor of a “French Boot and Shoe Emporium” in Liverpool, announced he had “*personally* selected from the extensive and celebrated Stock of Mons C. Lehocq, of Boulogne, and Regent-street, London” and had “entered into an arrangement with Mons. C. L. for a constant supply of his first-rate Goods *direct* to this establishment only”.¹⁵⁸ A prestigious Parisian address enhanced brand identity in London; a prestigious London address enhanced brand identity in Liverpool.

This clustering of *maisons spéciales* in a prestigious location in the international market illustrates the importance of mechanisms through which firms could legitimate claims about their proto-modern brand in the context of institutional voids. It also provides evidence of emerging modern branding practices that emphasise cosmopolitan lifestyles in marketing communications.

Endorsement

Firms marketing their goods through an international *maison spéciale* also sought to address institutional voids by seeking legitimation through patronage and exhibition prizes. Royal patronage, both domestic and foreign, was a distinct feature of advertising messages. In 1849, Lerolle Frères described themselves as suppliers to the Courts of Naples and Sardinia.¹⁵⁹ Duvelleroy asserts in January 1858: “Fan Manufacturer to her Majesty, her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent, and the Court of France”.¹⁶⁰ By January 1861, this had changed to “maker to their Majesties the Queen of England and the Empress of the French”.¹⁶¹ A royal warrant was awarded to Aubert & Klafthenberger in 1859.¹⁶² However, while references to royal patronage remained a feature of advertising messages, credibility derived from prizes awarded at London’s Great Exhibition of 1851 soon came to represent an important component of this legitimation process in promotional messages.¹⁶³ In both their home and host markets, firms celebrated their awards. Of the twelve firms that entered the arena of consumption between 1828 and 1851, eleven exhibited their goods at the Great Exhibition, ten were honoured at the Exhibition and one complimented in the report of the Juries.¹⁶⁴ One firm received a council

medal, six a prize medal, three an honorary mention: see table 6. During the Exhibition, press coverage of their exhibits gained them considerable publicity. For example, an engraving of Constantin's display of merchandise at a French "lounge" appeared in the *The London Illustrated News* of 7 June 1851.¹⁶⁵ After the Exhibition, prize winners were reported in various publications. In France, the exhibitors and winners of prizes were listed in business directories for 1852.¹⁶⁶ However, it was the firms' themselves that generated the most coverage for their prizes. Doucét & Co.'s advertising in November 1851- a month after the exhibition closed - appears under the banner headline "Prize Medal of the Great Exhibition".¹⁶⁷ Such messages became embedded in advertising material. In 1853, Doucét was still advising their customers that the firm was "The only French Shirt Makers to whom was awarded the Medal at the Exhibition".¹⁶⁸

Table 6, Here

Success at the Great Exhibition was a means by which firms could communicate the quality of their merchandise but it was also a means of protecting their reputation from other firms who passed-off their goods as those of the proprietary firm. It was a reminder to the consumer that the quality of goods from other sources that claimed to be genuine could not be guaranteed. In contrast to other spurious traders, the *maison spéciale* not only corroborated a genuine source of an international proto-modern brand, additionally it addressed directly a fundamental problem associated with institutional deficiencies in a developing market place by providing a location where product claims would be supported by redress in circumstances where customers considered claims to be unfounded. In advertising messages, positive assertions of proto-modern brand legitimacy appeared alongside equally important warnings about other firms. In 1850, Constantin warns "M. Constantin is not in partnership with any person, either in London or Paris ... Any statements as to M. Constantin's being connected with any other establishment are therefore altogether destitute of foundation".¹⁶⁹ Further, this desire to emphasise exclusivity of distribution is also evident where the international *maison spéciale* was involved in the selling of merchandise from other manufacturers. In 1848, having "made arrangements with the Patentee for the exclusive sale of Jouvin's Patent French Kid Gloves" Piver warns:

"In consequence of the rapidly increasing demand for these celebrated gloves, the Nobility and Gentry are cautioned that none are genuine unless stamped "Brevet d'Invention, Gant Jouvin" on one glove, and on the other "L. T. Piver and Co., Paris

and London,” to be procured only of L. T. Piver and Co., Perfumers and Glovers, 160, Regent-street, London.”¹⁷⁰

Maisons spéciales played a pivotal role in protecting proto-modern brands in their international market. In this, it is not only the identity conveyed by the market of origin but also the identity conveyed by place of retail in the international market that is important. In the Piver-Jouvin example, there is an explicit representation of the relationship between manufactured proto-modern brand and proto-modern brand as retailer. The establishment of an international retail outlet in a prestigious host market location legitimised the proto-modern brand and protected its reputation, thus helping to overcome institutional deficiencies in the market.

Discussion

The findings presented above show that firms internationalising proto-modern brands in the second quarter of the nineteenth century responded to institutional voids by shaping organisational structures and marketing strategies. In particular, by strategizing their organisational response, they were better placed to develop innovative marketing activities. The institutional voids they encountered encouraged them to manage contractual hazard through the use of specific assets; in this case, the international *maison spéciale*. This operational form underpinned firms’ attempts to internalise their international commercial activities. However, as a specific asset, it offered much more to the firm than economic benefits: it facilitated communication of proto-modern brand values in the host market. This contextualised synthesis of organisational and marketing response was to have long-term influences in the marketplace. Until the early activities of these firms are considered it is not possible to understand fully the significance of the role international retailing had in supporting internationalising brands later in the nineteenth century.

By considering the response of international firms to the institutional voids encountered in the London market in the early nineteenth century this article makes a contribution to our historical understanding of international proto-modern branding activity and our understanding of institutional voids. First, from an historical perspective, it identifies the previously unrecognized extent, characteristics and significance of international retailing activity at this early date. Within the locale considered here, the findings suggest that at the beginning of the

1850s there were five times the number of international retail stores than previously identified in the literature.¹⁷¹ They were merchandise specialists and small firms compared to those firms with retail outlets that internationalised later in the nineteenth century. Second, it shows how organisationally the international *maison spéciale* provided support for the development of proto-modern brands in international markets. Retail operations promoted and protected proto-modern brands in the international market context and in a number of cases firms sought to bridge institutional differences through the use of in-market partners who were originally from the home market. Third, it identifies the emergence of marketing practices, associated with this organisational innovation, that were to have a long-term impact on how firms communicated brand identity in international markets. The firm's considered here communicated and legitimated the identity of their proto-modern brands through an emphasis on provenance and endorsement; practices associated with modern branding activity that emphasise cultural symbols such as market of origin language, aesthetics and stories that reinforce cultural associations and a cosmopolitan lifestyle. They successfully leveraged sources of secondary meaning associated with people or places to evoke the transfer of attributes, benefits, images, thoughts, feelings, attitudes and experiences.¹⁷² In this, the proto-modern brands represented here conveyed not only the transactional information of proto-brands but transformational information characteristic of modern brands. Fourth, it explores the role of place, as represented by an arena of consumption, in facilitating innovation. The arena of consumption within which these international *maisons spéciales* operated helped to define their commercial practices and was in turn defined by them. The findings indicate that a duality of organisational and marketing innovation occurred at a much earlier date than the literature currently suggests; that is, international *maisons spéciales* illustrate how organisational and marketing innovations were mutually supporting processes that occurred in a context of developing consumption practices within specific arenas of consumption. These located consumption practices were the context for organisational and marketing innovations that were adopted by specialist international retail firms, such as Liberty and Tiffany, or larger international manufacturing firms with retail networks, such as Kodak and Singer, later in the century.¹⁷³ They were brought together by the market conditions which incoming firms encountered in the host market. While the market was attractive from the perspective that it offered a lucrative opportunity for firms internationalising their proto-modern brands, it did not offer an advanced institutional framework in which to market them. As a consequence of this, firms responded with market shaping activities. In so doing they laid the foundations for the development of retailing activities and marketing practices that characterised later international initiatives.

Together, these four contributions show that international *maisons spéciales* mark an early fundamental change in retail structural development and the modernisation of retail systems. They show that simplistic assumptions about retail modernisation predicated on regional, national and international stages of development neither reflect the realities of historical change nor its complexity. Indeed, the activities of these firms suggest that innovative international activity helped to support commercial responses to institutional voids that were holding back innovation and structural development in the retail sector. Previous research on foreign retail investment identifies three firms operating in Britain during the 1850s, two of which operated in Regent Street.¹⁷⁴ The research presented here shows that within a single arena of consumption in the London market twelve foreign firms opened retail units between Melnotte's arrival in 1828 and the opening of the Great Exhibition of 1851. Ten were still resident in 1851. This volume of activity reflects the vibrancy of the Parisian home market, from which the overwhelming majority of these firms came, and the extent of host market consumer demand in London. These findings suggest the origins of modern international retailing itself may be found in the vibrant Parisian market of the early nineteenth century; an interpretation that would require a reconceptualization of the early history of international retailing and reevaluation of the contribution early innovating firms made to the shaping of later international marketing and retailing activity. This article provides very early evidence of firms prepared to manage international retail outlets and hence operate branch systems across international boundaries. These are not the local branch offshoots of businesses within one town or neighboring towns.¹⁷⁵ This evidence shows that 1850 should not be seen as the point of origin for inward investment in British retailing.¹⁷⁶ This occurred at an earlier date; inward investment was already underway by the late 1820s.

The variety of firm responses to institutional voids shows how they grappled - not always successfully - with the organizational options available to them. Practices such as the establishment of partnerships and the engagement of trusted family members were adopted to exercise operational control over international branches. This is consistent with previous observations in the management literature that suggest a reliance on existing networks is a useful strategy to avoid opportunism in the context of institutional voids.¹⁷⁷ Further, if these networks are already embedded in the host market, as they were in some of the cases described here, incoming firms acquire access to existing networks of exchange.¹⁷⁸ In so doing they are able to bridge institutional divides.¹⁷⁹ As the evidence presented shows, family members and partners could sustain international retail operations for considerable periods. Indeed, the

longevity of some operations compare favourably with larger businesses that developed international branch networks in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, that said, the international operations that were established were vulnerable to changes in individual priorities and from an economic (FDI) point of view, these firms were not on the same scale as firms that began to build extensive retail distribution networks in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, these firms began addressing the challenge of establishing international branch networks at an early date, making these relatively small enterprises the forerunners of firms that established larger international retail networks at the end of the century. These findings support previous research on early American retail internationalisation: incorporation was ultimately the means by which to overcome the limitations associated with other organisational forms and the integration of managerial capabilities.¹⁸⁰ Organisational responses, such as the partnerships described above were a half way stage toward internationalisation of the international operation.

The symbiotic relationship between proto-modern brands and international retail outlets emerges strongly from our analysis. The international retail organisations described here were different to domestic shops that simply specialized in retailing internationally sourced merchandise. Such domestic shops were also present in the arena of consumption and clearly appealed to a market eager for international, especially Parisian, merchandise. However, these domestic shops were not defined by a single brand in the same way as the international *maison spéciale*. International *maisons spéciales* performed two important roles in supporting the internationalisation of proto-modern brands. First, in a market where protection of proprietary rights in a proto-modern brand was weak, international *maisons spéciales* were a means of identifying legitimate sources of branded merchandise. Second, through the location of the firm's retail unit in a prestigious arena of consumption in the host market, the firm derived in-market legitimation. This was beneficial to retailing as well as wholesaling activity. These roles were a response to the institutional voids encountered: the underdeveloped communications infrastructure in the market, the absence of market wide mechanisms to corroborate claims by firms about their products, and the absence of market wide mechanisms providing redress if customers were dissatisfied. The firm specific asset of the international *maison spéciale* provided a focus for marketing activities that addressed these voids.

The clustering of international *maisons spéciales* contributed to an aura of cosmopolitan consumption in the commercial arena they inhabited. This led to the creation and

reinforcement of institutional practices; thereby supporting other findings on the value of creating micro-level institutional conditions within markets exhibiting institutional voids.¹⁸¹ Firms achieved territorial legitimacy by locating their international branch operation in a specific arena of consumption. Building on the assertion that the physical existence of a commercial entity will in itself lend legitimacy, these findings suggest that the clustering activity of international firms reflexively reinforced this legitimation process and created enhanced territorial legitimacy for the proto-modern brands discussed here.¹⁸² In the 1820s and 1830s, Regent Street offered a new architecture of consumption. The earliest international *maisons spéciales* in this market space were transfers-in from other London locations. In this transition, they benefited from the better facilities and reputation offered by their new location. Later entrants, those of the 1840s, did not need to experience other locations first. By then it had become a natural destination for incoming firms of this type. Within this arena of consumption these firms institutionalised marketing and retail location practices that were to have a long-term impact on how firms communicated cosmopolitan luxury brand identity in international markets. For example, they asserted provenance in three ways: through country of merchandise manufacture, through the location of the home market retail unit, and through the location of the host market retail unit. Brand origin was a fundamental message in the advertising material; place of production provided a tangible representation of cosmopolitan consumption. Through advertising, firms sought to reassure customers in the host market that they were experiencing the same merchandise as customers in the home market, while sales personnel drawn from the home market helped to authenticate the service experience.

Additionally, and importantly, in the absence of market wide mechanisms to corroborate claims about their proto-modern brands - conditions that are associated with institutional voids - firms sought legitimation through royal patronage and through prizes obtained at exhibitions. In particular, the Great Exhibition of 1851 provided a major opportunity for firms to assert legitimacy by virtue of their exhibits and the prizes won. All but one of the firms considered here exhibited at the 1851 exhibition. All of the Parisian firms did. The London Exhibition had important precursors in exhibitions organized in Paris during the previous two decades. As Hahn notes, in the French market “Expositions of 1837, 1839, and 1844 were publicized intensively via brochures, posters, and the press including fashion magazines and literature”.¹⁸³ Most of the firms discussed here were at the very heart of a market already familiar with the value of such exhibitions. However, the London market did not offer such a national source and mechanism for product quality corroboration until the Great

Exhibition in 1851. When it did, these firms took full advantage of this mechanism, and in so doing, contributed to the development of proto-modern branding practices and the long-term development of international branding activity.

Conclusion

Institutional voids shield accepted social practice and existing commercial structures from innovation and competition. However, within a mere quarter of a century, the firms discussed here enacted a dynamic process of market shaping by engaging in a form of collective strategizing within the host market in general and their self-defined arena of consumption in particular. In their domestic market a semblance of regulatory structuring provided rudimentary trademark protection, there existed a means to corroborate normative advertising behaviours and, as established indigenous proto-modern brands, consumers could take for granted their market positioning. In contrast, in the host market, there was an absence of readily accessible trademark protection and normative legitimizing mechanisms to corroborate product quality were noticeably absent. In this context, consumers might understand the extrinsic values associated with a proto-modern brand's market of origin but were dependent on independent local retailers for information and redress.

The marketing strategies adopted by the firms considered here developed in a context of limited trademark protection, an emerging communication structure and limited mechanisms through which consumers could corroborate claims made by commercial organisations. In this context, consumers were in great part dependent on the reputation of retailers to guarantee product quality and provenance. Therefore, internalising retail provision was a logical organisational response to host market challenges. However, this was only one stage in the collective strategizing and market shaping undertaken by incoming firms. Having internalised the retailing of goods in the host market, firms were then required to build values around their proto-modern brands.

The establishment of international *maisons spéciales* in an iconic arena of consumption provided firms with enhanced territorial legitimacy and the opportunity to establish cultural-cognitive expectations through normalising socio-commercial practices. The clustering of international *maisons spéciales* strengthened territorial legitimacy and encouraged other incoming firms to adopt similar marketing strategies to those already established within the

locale. Internalization of the international retail function created organisational challenges. The variety of methods used to overcome these challenges is indicative of dynamic processes associated with the presence of institutional voids: informal institutional frameworks such as family and socio-ethnic networks being foremost amongst them. Nevertheless, as these firms wrestled with organisational challenges they established marketing practices that would be adopted later in the century by firms entering this market. Within a specific arena of consumption, these firms illustrate that the development of retail organisational structures and marketing practices were closely interlinked. They show there was a duality of organisational and marketing innovation. The emergence of strong proto-modern brands with international reputations facilitated the cross-border expansion of retail networks, while organisational development supported the creation of proto-modern brand identity in international markets. These organisational changes and marketing innovations required an arena that supported advanced consumption practices.

In this article, we have considered how firms both overcame institutional voids and took advantage of institutional deficiencies. Our context has been an arena of cosmopolitan consumption in early nineteenth century London. In so doing we have sought to explore institutional voids in an historical context and encourage further research which considers how commercial responses to institutional voids shape market practices within an historical timeframe. The findings presented here illustrate the value of stepping beyond the implementation of organisational and marketing practice by modern industrial firms to consider the practices of proto-modern commercial activity: in this case firms internationalising proto-modern brands. Taking this approach provides an opportunity to understand how normative and cultural-cognitive practices become enshrined and ultimately regulated in more advanced institutional environments.

Notes on contributors

Nicholas Alexander is Professor of Marketing at Lancaster University Management School, Lancaster University, United Kingdom. His research is in the area of international marketing, branding and business history, with particular emphasis on advancing theoretical perspectives on brand building, the management of brand authenticity and brand development.

Anne Marie Doherty is Professor of Marketing at Strathclyde Business School, University of Strathclyde, United Kingdom. Her research is in the area of international retail marketing, particularly employing an institutional lens to explore market entry methods, franchising and retail internationalization in emerging markets and historical contexts.

Table 1, International *Maisons Spéciales* in the Arena of Consumption: 1828-1851

Name of Business	Trade	Regent Street	Entry Date	Market of Origin
Aubert & Klafthenberger	Watchmaker	157	1834	Switzerland, Geneva
Baillière, J-B.	Foreign bookseller	219	1832	France, Paris
Constantin, J.M.	Artificial florist	134	1849	France, Paris
Doucét & Co.	French shirt makers	133	1849	France, Paris
Dùvelleroy	Fan manufacturer	167	1849	France, Paris
Houbigant-Chardin	Perfumer &c	216	1837	France, Paris
Jacobs & Dupuis	Ladies' shoemakers	179	1847	France, Paris
Lehocq, C.	French boot & shoe mfr.	150	1839	France, Boulogne
Lerolle Frères	Bronzes	147	1847	France, Paris
Marion, A. & Co.	Stationers	152	1847	France, Paris
Melnotte, J.C.	Ladies' shoemaker	186/164*	1828	France, Paris
Piver, L.T.	Perfumers	160	1846	France, Paris

Note: *Moved from 186 to 164 in 1830

Source: Various Kelly's and Robson's Directories; firm names as they appear in the earliest newspaper advertisements in London.

Table 2, Official Value of Imports to Britain and Ireland from France: 1815-40

Year	Value: £	Change	% Change
1815	754,372	--	--
1820	775,132	20,760	3%
1825	1,835,985	1,060,853	137%
1830	2,317,686	481,701	26%
1835	2,746,999	429,313	19%
1840	3,775,754	1,028,755	37%

Source: House of Commons Papers, *Trade with France. An account of the trade of the United Kingdom with France, in each year from 1814 to 1844*. Parliament: 1845. Paper Number: 628. House of Commons Sessional Papers CH Microfiche Number: 49.333-334

Table 3, Longevity of International *Maisons Spéciales* in the Arena of Consumption

Firm	Entry	Exit	Years
Dùvelleroy	1849	1921	72
Houbigant-Chardin	1837	1879	42
Baillière, J-B.	1832	1870	38
Piver, L.T.	1846	1879	33
Aubert & Klaftenberger	1834	1861	27
Marion, A. & Co.	1847	1870	23
Lehocq, C.	1839	1858	20
Melnotte, J.C.	1828	1845	17
Jacobs & Dupuis	1847	1853	6
Doucét & Co. *	1849	1853	4
Constantin, J.M.	1849	1852	3
Lerolle Frères	1847	1849	1

Note: * A new London based partnership of Geoghegan & Doucet of 178 Regent Street was formed in 1853. The new firm remained in the arena of consumption until 1890.

Source: Various Kelly's and Robson's Directories; firm newspaper advertising.

Table 4. Piver and Associates, 1846-1879: 160 Regent Street, London

Date	Name of Business*	Merchandise*	Rate Payer†	Advertising±
1846	Not listed≠	Not listed≠	Not listed≠	L.T. Piver
1847-1852	Piver & Lauvergnat	Perfumers	Piver, Alphonse	L.T. Piver
1853-1858	Piver & Lauvergnat Bros.	Perfumers	Piver, Alphonse	L.T. Piver
1859-1863	Piver & Lauvergnat Bros.	Glovers & Perfumers	Piver, Alphonse	L.T. Piver
1864-1865/Apr	Piver & Lauvergnat Bros.	Glovers	Piver, Alphonse	n/a
1865/Apr-1867/Jul	Lauvergnat Bros.	Glovers	Piver, Alphonse	n/a
1867/Jul-1875	L.T.Piver	Perfumer & Glover	Lauvergnat, Charles & Jules	L.T. Piver
1876-1878	L.T.Piver	Perfumer & Glover	Lauvergnat, Jules	n/a
1879	L.T.Piver	Perfumer & Glover	Lauvergnat, Jules (deleted)	n/a

Source: *Kelly's Directory for London, 1847-1879; †Westminster Rate Books, St. James, Church Ward, 1847-1880; ± Name used in newspaper advertisements. ≠ This *maison spéciale* opened in the second half of 1846 after these lists had been compiled for 1846.

Table 5, Parisian Firms' Home Market Retail Location

Name of Business	Trade	Paris Retail Location*	Arrondissement†
Baillière, J-B.	Foreign bookseller	13, Rue de l'Ecole de Medicine	10 ^{ème} , Monnaie
Constantin, J. M.	Artificial florist	7, Rue d'Antin	2 ^{ème} , Italiens
Doucét & Co.	French shirt makers	21, Rue de la Paix	1 ^{ème} , Tuileries
Dùvelleroy	Fan manufacturer	17, Passage des Panoramas	2 ^{ème} , Opéra
Houbigant-Chardin	Perfumer &c	19, Faubourg St. Honore	2 ^{ème} , Madeleine
Jacobs & Dupuis	Ladies' shoemakers	32, Rue de la Paix ±	1 ^{ème} , Tuileries
Lerolle Frères	Bronzes	1, Rue Chaussee des Minimes	8 ^{ème} , Marais
Marion, A. & Co.	Stationers	14, Cité Bergère	2 ^{ème} , Opéra
Melnotte, J.C.	Ladies' shoemaker	22, Rue de la Paix	1 ^{ème} , Tuileries
Piver, L.T.	Perfumers	103, Rue St Martin	6 ^{ème} , Temple

Note: * Earliest locations identified in London newspaper advertising. † Old Arrondissements and Quartiers, 1795-1859. ± Paris address does not appear in London newspaper advertising: source, *Bottin Almanach du Commerce de Paris, 1852*.

Sources: Newspaper advertising and *Bottin Almanach du Commerce de Paris, 1852*.

Table 6, Exhibits and Awards at London’s Great Exhibition of 1851

Name of Business	Exhibited	Award	Objects Rewarded
Aubert & Klafthenberger	Yes	HM	“Watches”
Baillière, J-B.	Yes	None*	-----
Constantin, J. M.	Yes	CM	“Flowers, in cambric”
Doucét & Co	Yes	PM	“Shirts, embroidered with crests and names”
Dùvelleroy	Yes	PM	“Fans ornamented with artistic paintings”
Houbigant-Chardin	Yes	PM	“Gloves of excellent quality and colour”
Jacobs & Dupuis	Yes	HM	“Ladies’ boots and shoes suited to the higher classes of society”
Lehocq, C.	No	N/A	-----
Lerolle Frères	Yes	PM	“Bronzes, clocks, candelabra, groups and figures mostly gilt”
Marion, A. & Co	Yes	HM	“Fancy, ornamental, and plain paper, and stationery”
Melnotte, J.C.	Yes	PM	“Excellent workmanship in boots and shoes”
Piver, L.T.	Yes	PM	“Toilet soaps and perfumery”

Notes: CM, Council Medal; PM, Prize Medal; HM, Honorary Mention

*Complemented in *Reports by the Juries*.

Source: *Exhibition MDCCCLI, Reports by the Juries on The Subjects of the Thirty Classes into Which the Exhibition was Divided*, Royal Commission, Vol. 1, London, 1852.

References

- Alden, D.L., Steenkamp, J-B.E.M. and R. Batra. "Brand Positioning through Advertising in Asia, North America, and Europe: The Role of Global Consumer Culture." *Journal of Marketing* 63, no. 1 (1999): 75-87.
- Alexander, D. *Retailing in England during the Industrial Revolution*. London: University of London Press, 1970.
- Alexander, N. "British Overseas Retailing, 1900-60: International Firm Characteristics, Market Selections and Entry Modes." *Business History* 53 (2011): 530–556.
- Alexander, N. and AM. Doherty. "The Origins of American International Retailing: Tiffany of New York in London and Paris, 1837-1914", *Business History Review* 91 (2017): 301–328.
- Alexander, N., and B. Quinn. "International Retail Divestment." *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management* 30, no. 2 (2002): 112-125.
- Anonymous, ""The Désennuyée" and "Female Domination"", Colburn's New Monthly Magazine, *The New Magazine and Literary Journal*, 1836, Part II, Published by Henry Colburn, 13 Great Marlborough Street London, Printed by William Clowes and Sons, Stamford Street, London: 363-367.
- Atherton, A. and A. Newman. "The Emergence of the Private Entrepreneur in Reform Era China: Re-birth of an Earlier Tradition, or a More Recent Product of Development and Change?" *Business History* 58, no. 3 (2016): 319-344.
- Barbero, M.I. and N. Puig. "Business Groups around the World: An Introduction." *Business History* 58, no. 1 (2016): 6-29.
- Belfanti, C.M. "Branding before the Brand: Marks, Imitations and Counterfeits in Pre-Modern Europe." *Business History* 60, no. 8 (2018): 1127-1146.
- Boddewyn, J., and J. Doh. "Global Strategy and the Collaboration of MNEs, NGOs, and Governments for the Provisioning of Collective Goods in Emerging Markets." *Global Strategy Journal*, 1 (2011): 345–361.
- de Certeau, M. "Practices of Space." In Marshall Blonsky, ed. , *On Signs*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1985, 122-45.

Cairns, P. Quinn, B., Alexander, N. and Doherty, A.M. “The Role of Leadership in International Retail Divestment and Corporate Restructuring.” *European Business Review* 22, no. 1 (2010): 25-42.

Carney, M., Dieleman, M., and M. Taussig. “How are Institutional Capabilities Transferred across Borders?” *Journal of World Business* 51, no. 6 (2016): 882–894.

Chandler, A. *Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Colpan, A.M., and G. Jones. “Business Groups, Entrepreneurship and the Growth of the Koç Group in Turkey.” *Business History* 58, no. 1, (2016): 69-88.

Coquery, N. “Language of Success: Marketing and Distributing Semi-Luxury Goods in Eighteenth-century Paris.” *Journal of Design History* 17, no. 1, (2004): 71-89.

Corrigan, P. *The Sociology of Consumption*. London: Sage Publications, 1997.

Dahan, N., Doh, J. P., Oetzel, J., and M. Yaziji. “Corporate-NGO Collaboration: Creating New Business Models for Developing Markets.” *Long Range Planning* 43 (2010): 326–342.

Disraeli, B. *The Young Duke*, Volume II, London, 1831.

Doh, J., Rodrigues, S., Saka-Helmhout, A., and M. Makhija. “International Business Responses to Institutional Voids.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 48 (2017): 293-307.

Doherty, AM., and N. Alexander. “Liberty in Paris: International Retailing, 1889-1932.” *Business History* 57, no.4 (2015): 485-511.

Dubarry, J.J. “Le Premier Siècle d'une des doyennes des Maisons d'édition Médicales et Scientifiques: J.-B. Baillière (fondée en 1818)”, présentée à la séance du 31 mai 1986 de la Société Française d'Histoire de la Médecine (1986), 259-266,

Duguid, P. “The French Connections: The International Propagation of Trade Marks in the Nineteenth Century.” *Enterprise & Society* 10, no.1 (2009): 3–37.

Duguid, P. “Developing the Brand: The Case of Alcohol, 1800–1880.” *Enterprise & Society* 4, no.3 (2003): 405-441.

Duguid, P., T. Lopes and J. Mercer. "Reading Registrations: A Comparative Overview of a Hundred Years of Trade Mark Registration Data". In Teresa da Silva Lopes and Paul Duguid (Eds.), *Trade Marks, Brands, and Competitiveness*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Erçek, M. and O. Günçavdı. "Imprints of an Entrepreneur and Evolution of a Business Group, 1948–2010." *Business History* 58, no. 1 (2016): 89-110.

Glennie, P.D., and N.J. Thrift. "Consumers, Identities, and Consumption Spaces in Early Modern England." *Environment and Planning A* 28 (1996): 25-45.

Godley, A. "Selling the Sewing Machine around the World: Singer's International Marketing Strategies, 1850–1920." *Enterprise & Society* 7, no. 2 (2006): 266-314.

Godley, A. "Foreign Multinationals and Innovation in British Retailing, 1850-1962." *Business History* 45, no.1 (2003): 80-100.

Godley, A., and H. Hang "Collective Financing among Chinese Entrepreneurs and Department Store Retailing in China." *Business History* 58, no.3 (2016): 364-377.

Godley, A., and S. Fletcher. "International Retailing in Britain, 1850-1994." *The Service Industries Journal* 21, no.2 (2001): 31-46.

Grey, E.C. *Hyacinthe*, London, 1835.

Hahn, H.H. *Scenes of Parisian Modernity: Culture and Consumption in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Hang, H., and A. Godley. "Revisiting the Psychic Distance Paradox: International Retailing in China in the Long Run (1840–2005)." *Business History* 51, no.3 (2009): 383-400.

Hilt, E., and K. O'Banion. "The Limited Partnership in New York, 1822–1858: Partnerships without Kinship." *Journal of Economic History* 69, no. 3 (2009): 615–45.

Hilton, M. "Retailing History as Economic and Cultural History: Strategies of Survival by Specialist Tobacconists in the Mass Market." *Business History* 40, no. 4 (1998), 115-137.

Hobhouse, H. *A History of Regent Street*, London: Macdonald and Jane's, 1975: 52.

House of Commons Papers, *Trade with France. An account of the trade of the United Kingdom with France, in each year from 1814 to 1844*. Parliament: 1845. Paper Number: 628. House of Commons Sessional Papers CH Microfiche Number:49.333-334

Humphreys, A. "Semiotic Structure and the Legitimation of Consumption Practices: The Case of Casino Gambling". *Journal of Consumer Research* 37, no.3 (2010): 490-510.

Jefferys, J.B. *Retail Trading in Britain: 1850-1950*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1954.

Jones, G. *Beauty Imagined: A History of the Global Beauty Industry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Keller, K.L. "Brand Synthesis: The Multidimensionality of Brand Knowledge." *Journal of Consumer Research* 29, no. 4 (2003): 595-600.

Khanna, T. and K.G. Palepu. "Why Focused Strategies May Be Wrong for Emerging Markets." *Harvard Business Review* 75, no. 4 (1997): 41-51.

Lamoreaux, N.R. "Constructing Firms: Partnership and Alternative Contractual Arrangements in Early Nineteenth-Century American Business." *Business and Economic History* 24, no. 2, (Winter 1995): 43-71.

Lancaster, B. *The Department Store: A Social History*. London: Leicester University Press, 1995.

Lee, K. and X. Jin. "The Origins of Business Groups in China: An Empirical Testing of the Three Paths and the Three Theories." *Business History* 51, no. 1 (2009): 77-99.

Lopes, T. and M. Casson. "Brand Protection and the Globalization of British Business." *Business History Review* 86 (Summer 2012): 287-310

Lopes, T. and P. Duguid. "Introduction: Behind the Brand." *Business History Review* 86, (Summer 2012): 235-238.

Lundan, S.M. "The New Eclectic Paradigm and International Business Strategy". In A. Verbeke and H. Merchant (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on International Strategic Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2012.

Martin, M. *Trois Siècles de Publicité en France*. Paris : Éditions Odile Jacobs, 1992.

McCracken, G. "Culture and Consumption: A Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods." *Journal of Consumer Research* 13, no. 1 (1986): 71-84.

Mercer, J. "A Mark of Distinction: Branding and Trade Mark Law in the U.K. from the 1860s." *Business History* 52, no. 1 (2010): 17-42.

Meyer, K.E., and S. Estrin. "Brownfield Entry in Emerging Markets." *Journal of International Business Studies* 32, no.3 (2001): 575-584.

Meyer, K. E., Estrin, S., Bhaumik, S. K., and M. W. Peng. "Institutions, Resources, and Entry Strategies in Emerging Economies." *Strategic Management Journal* 30, no. 1 (2009): 61–80.

Meyer, K. E., and M. W. Peng. "Theoretical Foundations of Emerging Economy Business Research". *Journal of International Business Studies* 47, no. 1 (2010): 3–22.

Moore, C.M. Doherty, AM. and S.A. Doyle. "Flagship Stores as a Market Entry Method: The Perspective of Luxury Fashion Retailing." *European Journal of Marketing* 1/2 (2010): 139-161.

Moore, K. and S. Reid. (2008) "The Birth of Brand: 4000 Years of Branding." *Business History* 50, no. 4: 419-432

Narayanan, V.K., and L. Fahey. "The Relevance of the Institutional Underpinnings of Porter's Five Forces Framework to Emerging Economies: an Epistemological Analysis." *Journal of Management Studies* 42 (2005): 207–223.

Nayak, A. and M. Maclean. "Co-evolution, Opportunity Seeking and Institutional Change: Entrepreneurship and the Indian Telecommunications Industry, 1923–2009." *Business History* 55, no. 1 (2013): 29-52.

Nead, L. *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Rappaport, E. *Shopping for Pleasure: Women in the Making of London's West End*. Princetown, NJ: Princetown University Press, 2000.

Riddle, L., Hrivnak, G.A. and T.M. Nielsen. "Transnational Diaspora Entrepreneurship in Emerging Markets: Bridging Institutional Divides." *Journal of International Management* 16, no. 4 (2010): 398-411.

Rydell, R.W. "Preface." In *Meet Me at the Fair: A World's Fair Reader*, edited by L. Hollengreen, C. Pearce, R. Rouse, B. Schweizer, i-vi. Carnegie Mellon University: ETC Press, 2014.

Sáiz, P. and P. Fernández Pérez. "Catalonian Trademarks and the Development of Marketing Knowledge in Spain, 1850–1946." *Business History Review* 86, Summer (2012): 239–260.

Steenkamp, J-B.E., Batra, R., and D.L. Alden. "How Perceived Brand Globalness Creates Brand Value." *Journal of International Business Studies* 34, no. 1 (2003): 53-65.

Stobart, J. "Shopping Streets as Social Space: Leisure, Consumerism and Improvement in an Eighteenth-Century County Town." *Urban History* 25 (1998): 3-21.

Stobart, J., and A. Hann. "Retailing Revolution in the Eighteenth Century? Evidence from North-West England." *Business History* 46, no. 2 (2004): 171-194.

Tallis, J. *John Tallis's London Street Views 1838-40*, Introduction and Biographical Essay by Peter Jackson, London: London Topographical Society, 2002.

Wilkins, M. "The Neglected Intangible Asset: The Influence of the Trade Mark on the Rise of the Modern Corporation." *Business History* 34, no. 1 (1992): 66-95.

Williams R.H. *Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Notes

- ¹ Doh, Rodrigues, Saka-Helmhout and Makhija, “Responses to Institutional Voids”.
- ² Khanna and Palepu, “Focused Strategies”.
- ³ Barbero and Puig, “Business Groups”; Colpan and Jones, “Business Groups”; Erçek and Günçavdı, “Imprints of an Entrepreneur”; Nayak and Maclean, “Co-evolution, Opportunity Seeking”.
- ⁴ Colpan and Jones, “Business Groups”; Lee and Jin, “Origins of Business Groups”.
- ⁵ Atherton and Newman, “Emergence of the Private Entrepreneur”; Colpan and Jones, “Business Groups”; Erçek and Günçavdı, “Imprints of an Entrepreneur”; Lee and Jin, “Origins of Business Groups”; Nayak and Maclean, “Co-evolution, Opportunity Seeking”.
- ⁶ Alexander, “British Overseas Retailing”; Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”; Doherty and Alexander, “Liberty in Paris”; Godley, “Foreign Multinationals”; Godley, “Selling the Sewing Machine”.
- ⁷ Moore and Reid, “The Birth of Brand”.
- ⁸ Keller, “Brand Synthesis”, 599.
- ⁹ Riddle, Hrivnak and Nielsen “Transnational Diaspora”.
- ¹⁰ Khanna and Palepu, “Focused Strategies”.
- ¹¹ Hilton “Retailing History as Economic and Cultural History”.
- ¹² Doh, Rodrigues, Saka-Helmhout and Makhija “Responses to Institutional Voids”.
- ¹³ Dahan, Doh, Oetzel, and Yaziji “Corporate-NGO Collaboration”; Meyer, Estrin, Bhaumik, and Peng “Institutions, resources, and entry strategies”; Meyer and Peng “Theoretical Foundations”.
- ¹⁴ Boddewyn and Doh “Global Strategy”.
- ¹⁵ Boddewyn and Doh “Global Strategy”.
- ¹⁶ Carney, Dieleman and Taussig “Institutional Capabilities”.
- ¹⁷ Khanna and Palepu, “Focused Strategies”.
- ¹⁸ Duguid “French Connections”.
- ¹⁹ Hahn, *Scenes of Parisian Modernity*.
- ²⁰ Hahn, *Scenes of Parisian Modernity*.
- ²¹ Hahn, *Scenes of Parisian Modernity*, 36.
- ²² Hahn, *Scenes of Parisian Modernity*, 36.
- ²³ Martin, *Trois Siècles de Publicité en France*, 56.
- ²⁴ Duguid “French Connections”.
- ²⁵ Duguid “French Connections”, 23.
- ²⁶ Duguid “French Connections”, 24.
- ²⁷ Duguid “French Connections”, 24.
- ²⁸ Duguid “French Connections”, 24.
- ²⁹ Mercer, “Mark of Distinction”, 20.
- ³⁰ Khanna and Palepu, “Focused Strategies”.
- ³¹ Coquery, *Language of Success*, 74.
- ³² Alexander, “British Overseas Retailing”; Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”; Doherty and Alexander, “Liberty in Paris”; Godley, “Foreign Multinationals”; Godley, “Selling the Sewing Machine”; Godley and Fletcher, “International Retailing”; Godley and Hang, “Collective Financing”; Hang and Godley, “Revisiting the Psychic Distance Paradox”.
- ³³ Alexander, “British Overseas Retailing”.
- ³⁴ Godley, “Selling the Sewing Machine”; Doherty and Alexander, “Liberty in Paris”.

-
- ³⁵ Godley and Fletcher, “International Retailing”; Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”.
- ³⁶ Godley and Fletcher, “International Retailing”.
- ³⁷ Godley, “Foreign Multinationals”, 93.
- ³⁸ Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”.
- ³⁹ Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”.
- ⁴⁰ For Example: Wilkins, “The Neglected Intangible Asset”; Mercer, “Mark of Distinction”; Duguid, “French Connections”; Duguid, Lopes and Mercer, “Reading Registrations”; Sáiz and Fernández, “Catalonian Trademarks”; Lopes and Duguid, “Behind the Brand”; Duguid, “Developing the Brand.”
- ⁴¹ For an example of the organisational context in which brands are developed and retailed internationally, see: Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”.
- ⁴² For further observations on the nature of proto-brands see: Moore and Reid, “The Birth of Brand”.
- ⁴³ Doherty and Alexander, “Liberty in Paris”; Godley, “Selling the Sewing Machine.”
- ⁴⁴ See Lopes and Casson, “Brand Protection” for a recent article on counterfeiting during this period.
- ⁴⁵ Hilton, “Retailing History.”
- ⁴⁶ Belfanti “Branding before the Brand”.
- ⁴⁷ Stobart, “Shopping Streets”; Glennie and Thrift, “Consumers.”
- ⁴⁸ Stobart, “Shopping Streets”; Glennie and Thrift, “Consumers.”
- ⁴⁹ Rappaport, *Shopping for Pleasure*, 5.
- ⁵⁰ Hahn, *Scenes of Parisian Modernity*, 36.
- ⁵¹ Rappaport, *Shopping for Pleasure*, 9.
- ⁵² Steenkamp, Batra and Alden “Perceived Brand Globalness”, 55; Alden, Steenkamp and Batra “Brand Positioning”; McCracken “Culture and Consumption”.
- ⁵³ Corrigan, *Sociology of Consumption*. Stobart and Hann, “Retailing Revolution.”
- ⁵⁴ Jefferys, *Retail Trading in Britain*. Alexander, *Retailing in England*.
- ⁵⁵ Lancaster, *The Department Store*.
- ⁵⁶ Chandler, *Scale and Scope*.
- ⁵⁷ Chandler, *Scale and Scope*. Jefferys, *Retail Trading in Britain*.
- ⁵⁸ Lancaster, *The Department Store*.
- ⁵⁹ Doherty and Alexander, “Liberty in Paris”; Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing.”
- ⁶⁰ Coquery, *Language of Success*, 78.
- ⁶¹ Coquery, *Language of Success*, 79.
- ⁶² Coquery, *Language of Success*, 79.
- ⁶³ Moore, Doherty, and Doyle, “Flagship Stores”.
- ⁶⁴ Humphreys “Semiotic Structure”.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 36.
- ⁶⁶ Riddle, Hrivnak and Nielsen “Transnational Diaspora”.
- ⁶⁷ A later example of a specialist international retail outlet is the Paris operation of Tiffany of New York. Tiffany’s international retailing operation in Paris developed out of its role as commissionaire or merchant in the 1860s; see, Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing,” 315.
- ⁶⁸ This area was rebuilt in the 1920s. Although the original buildings are no longer visible the street numbering still provides the observer with an indication of where the original buildings stood.
- ⁶⁹ See: Stobart, “Shopping Streets,” 3-4.
- ⁷⁰ Nead, *Victorian Babylon*.

-
- ⁷¹ de Certeau, “Practices of Space.”
- ⁷² Alexander, *Retailing in England*, 104.
- ⁷³ Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing.”
- ⁷⁴ Godley and Fletcher, “International Retailing.”
- ⁷⁵ Rappaport, *Shopping for Pleasure*, 9.
- ⁷⁶ *Kelly’s London Directory* and *Robson’s Directory of London*, various 1828-1851.
- ⁷⁷ See: Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing.”
- ⁷⁸ *Kelly’s London Directory* and *Robson’s Directory of London*, various.
- ⁷⁹ The two firms that were not based in Paris have different but particular characteristics. Aubert & Klaftenberger was an amalgam of Swiss and British production facilities. They exhibited at the Great Exhibition of 1851 as a British firm. In contrast, Lehocq, based in Boulogne, is a firm indicative of a larger scale of manufacturing production than the other firms included in the list.
- ⁸⁰ *The Morning Post*, 21 February 1828, 1d.
- ⁸¹ *The Morning Post*, 21 February 1828, 1d.
- ⁸² *The Morning Post*, 4 August 1830, 1a.
- ⁸³ Disraeli, *The Young Duke*, 11: “Shall we forget the panniers of shoes which Melnotte had placed in every quarter of the gardens?” In the 1830s, Melnotte became a convenient reference point for luxury consumption in general and the consumption of luxury fashion items in particular. In her novel *Hyacinthe*, published in London in 1835, Elizabeth Caroline Grey also makes reference to Melnotte when seeking to express luxurious living: “A small pair of Melnotte’s shoes soon decked her pretty feet”. Grey, *Hyacinthe*, 115.
- ⁸⁴ The Correspondence of William Henry Fox Talbot, De Montfort University, Leicester, LA34 (MW)-42.
- ⁸⁵ Anonymous, ““The Désennuyée” and “Female Domination”,” 366.
- ⁸⁶ Census, 1851: 107/1485/29 PRO. *The Morning Post*, 22 May 1845, 2c. The firm appears at the address 180 Regent Street in Kelly’s for the first time in 1846 in *Kelly’s London Directory*, Streets, 458.
- ⁸⁷ *The Morning Post*, 22 May 1845, 2c. *The Morning Post*, 1 June 1863, 1f.
- ⁸⁸ *The Morning Post*, 7 April 1837, 1c.
- ⁸⁹ *The Morning Post*, 21 February 1831, 1d.
- ⁹⁰ *The Morning Post*, 19 January 1832, 1b; *The Morning Post*, 5 May 1834, 2d.
- ⁹¹ *The Morning Post*, 19 April 1832, 1e.
- ⁹² *The Morning Post*, 19 April 1832, 1e.
- ⁹³ Melnotte’s *maison spéciale* was relocated to 23 New Bond Street in 1845. Melnotte was succeeded in the business by Dufossée. The value of this proto-modern brand was recognised and retained by his successor. *The Morning Post*, 14 April 1845, 1f. *Bottin Almanach du commerce de Paris, 1842*, 32. *Galignani’s New Paris Guide, 1844*, 504. Lerolle Frères left the market altogether in 1849.
- ⁹⁴ The firm left the London market for a short period, reopening a retail unit at 121 New Bond Street in the 1920s. When referring to this firm we use the spelling Duvelleroy unless we are quoting from a source that uses the form Duvelleroy, in which case we reproduce the spelling as it appears in the original.
- ⁹⁵ Alexander and Quinn, “International Retail Divestment”; Cairns, Quinn, Alexander and Doherty, “The Role of Leadership in International Retail Divestment.”
- ⁹⁶ Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing.”
- ⁹⁷ For a discussion of partnership arrangements at this time see: Lamoreaux, “Constructing Firms”; Hilt and O’Banion, “The Limited Partnership”.
- ⁹⁸ Khanna and Palepu, “Focused Strategies”.
- ⁹⁹ *The Morning Post*, 29 July 1851, 7f.

¹⁰⁰ *Kelly's London Directory, 1839 and 1840*. The business of foreign bookseller is listed under Jean-Baptiste Baillière's name for the last time in 1839 and under Hippolyte Baillière's name from 1840.

¹⁰¹ When referring to this individual, or a business with the same name, we use the spelling Doucét unless we are quoting from a source that uses the form Doucet, in which case we reproduce the spelling as it appears in the original.

¹⁰² Census, 1851: 107/1485/8 PRO.

¹⁰³ *Kelly's London Directory, 1851*. The French birthplace of two of his children suggests Barlow was resident and working in France in the late 1830s and early 1840s. The firm opened a retail unit in Regent Street: 1849. Census, 1851: 107/1485/8.

¹⁰⁴ *The Morning Post*, 17 September, 1853, 1d.

¹⁰⁵ This new arrangement was advertised through the winter of 1853-4: *The Morning Post*, 17 September 1853, 1d; *The Morning Post*, 29 April 1854, 8c. Geoghegan & Co. was a well-established firm that had been operating in the arena of consumption since 1823: just after the building of that part of Regent Street. Then operating as "The Belfast Linen Warehouse", they were "manufacturers, bleachers, and importers" of Irish linen: *The Morning Post*, 25 October 1823, 1c.

¹⁰⁶ National Archives, Kew. Reference C 16/1053/D154. Doucet v Geoghegan, 1875.

"Madame Doucet sought a declaration that her late husband, François Eugène Doucet, was a domiciled Frenchman, and that his estate should be administered according to French law": *The Morning Post* (London, England), Tuesday, February 20, 1877; 7b. Fawcett, J. J. (1985) "Result Selection in Domicile Cases", *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 3: 378-390. *Doucet v Geoghegan* (1878) 9 Ch D 441, 457 (Brett LJ).

¹⁰⁷ *The Morning Post*, 20 February, 1877; 7b.

¹⁰⁸ *The Morning Post*, 20 February, 1877, 7b.

¹⁰⁹ *The Morning Post*, 20 February, 1877, 7b.

¹¹⁰ *The Morning Post*, 20 February, 1877, 7b. Didot-Bottin, 1870, p.303. The firm's Paris branch was originally established at 4 Rue de la Paix as "Géoghegan et Doucet, chemisiers". This was the same street as Doucét's family ran their business: 21 Rue de la Paix. Subsequently, the firm operated from 23 Rue de Luxembourg. *La Presse*, 19 Janvier 1874. *Courrier Des Hotels*, 17 Janvier 1874. National Archives, Kew. Reference C 16/1053/D154. Doucet v Geoghegan, 1875.

¹¹¹ Lamoreaux, "Constructing Firms."

¹¹² *Bottin Almanach du commerce de Paris, 1852*: Rue de la Paix, number 32, "Jacobs, Chasseurs de dames," 1030.

¹¹³ Census, 1851, 107/1485/29.

¹¹⁴ *Kelly's London Directory, 1847*: streets, 453.

¹¹⁵ At 40 Great Castle Street, near Regent Street: *The Morning Post*, July 25, 1853, 1c.

¹¹⁶ *The Morning Post*, 4 July 1846, 8 c.

¹¹⁷ *The Morning Post*, 8 February 1856, 3c.

¹¹⁸ *The Morning Post*, 19 February 1867, 5a.

¹¹⁹ *The Morning Post*, 29 August 1870, 1b.

¹²⁰ *Daily News*, 20 August 1869, 2c.

¹²¹ Westminster Rate Books, St. James, Church Ward, 1847-1867.

¹²² In 1851, Jules is resident on census night: Census, 1851, 107/1485/19 PRO; in 1861, Charles is resident at the retail unit on census night; Census, 1861, 9/64/66/8 PRO.

¹²³ *The Morning Post*, 22 April, 1865, 3c.

¹²⁴ *Kelly's Directory for London, 1866*.

¹²⁵ From 1868, L.T. Piver is the listed firm in the street listing in Kelly's directory; while in local tax records, the brothers (later Jules on his own) are the ratepayers.

¹²⁶ Piver had maintained its wholesale business with the rest of the British market throughout the firm's time in Regent Street. Advertising shows that wholesaling was dealt with at their warehouse at 121 Cheapside, London: *Birmingham Daily Post*, 31 May 1875, 6f; *The York Herald*, 23 December 1875, 1c.

¹²⁷ Calendar of the Grants of Probate and Letters of Administration made in the Probate Registries of the High Court of Justice in England. Probate Date, 21 January 1880.

¹²⁸ *The Graphic* (London, England), Saturday, December 4, 1880; p. 576 Col.D.

¹²⁹ *The Morning Post* (London, England), Thursday, March 17, 1881; 4a.

¹³⁰ *The Morning Post* (London, England), Thursday, March 17, 1881; 4a. Jules Lauvergnat died on "29 December 1879 at 160 Regent - street" Principal Probate Registry. Calendar of the Grants of Probate and Letters of Administration made in the Probate Registries of the High Court of Justice in England. London, England: Jules Lauvergnat, Probate proved 21 January 1880. His brother Charles predeceased him.

¹³¹ Godley and Fletcher, "International Retailing," 33.

¹³² Alden, Steenkamp and Batra "Brand Positioning", 84.

¹³³ *The Morning Post*, 1 May 1849, 1f.

¹³⁴ *The Examiner*, 8 March 1851, 157d.

¹³⁵ *The Examiner*, 17 May 1835, 316b.

¹³⁶ *The Examiner*, 1 December 1849, 767b-c.

¹³⁷ *The Morning Post*, 5 June 1829, 1c.

¹³⁸ *The Morning Post*, 16 January 1858, 4a.

¹³⁹ *The Examiner*, 17 May 1835, 316b. At this time, their retail unit was at 13, Thayer Street.

¹⁴⁰ *The Morning Post*, 4 July 1846, 8c.

¹⁴¹ Having established an international retail outlet firms were keen to emphasize this fact in Parisian trade directories. Early entrants such as Baillièrè established the practice of listing their Regent Street address in French commercial directories in the 1830s: *Bottin, Almanach du commerce de Paris, 1833*, 163. Houbigant established their Regent Street store in 1837 and the following year listed it as one of their two addresses in Bottin's commercial directory for Paris: "Fg-St-Honoré, 19, et 216 Regent street à Londres": *Bottin, Almanach du commerce de Paris, 1838*, 261. By the early 1850s, Piver's Regent Street address appears prominently in their listing after the firm's Paris address, "St-Martin, 155", and before their Brussels address "G.Rue-des-Bouchers, 41", their only other international address: *Bottin, Almanach du commerce de Paris, 1854*, 950.

¹⁴² *The Morning Post*, 1 May 1850, 1b.

¹⁴³ *The Morning Post*, 26 November 1847, 1b.

¹⁴⁴ Census 1851, 107/1485/16.

¹⁴⁵ Census 1851, 107/1485/19.

¹⁴⁶ Census 1851, 107/1485/39 and 107/1485/40.

¹⁴⁷ Blocks numbered 132-154, 171-195 and 133-167 "were leased, and therefore almost completed, but not necessarily let, between 1820 and 1823": Hobhouse, *A History of Regent Street*, 52.

¹⁴⁸ *John Tallis's London Street Views* of the 1830s and 1840s provides illustrations of the new retail architecture.

¹⁴⁹ Hobhouse, *A History of Regent Street*, 70.

¹⁵⁰ Hobhouse, *A History of Regent Street*, 51.

¹⁵¹ *London Evening Standard*, 8 February 1861, 5b.

¹⁵² Rosalind H. Williams, *Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France*, (Berkeley, Calif., 1982).

¹⁵³ *The Morning Post*, 25 May 1827, Unnumbered. Paris store: Rue de l'Ecole de Medicine.

-
- ¹⁵⁴ Dubarry, “Premier Siècle,” 262; *London Land Tax Records*. London, England: London Metropolitan Archives, St Giles in the Fields and St George Bloomsbury, Camden, England MR/PLT/3620. Proprietor, Duke of Bedford; tenant, J B Baillière.
- ¹⁵⁵ *Robson’s Directory of London, 1832*. *The Morning Post*, 29 December 1832, 1b.
- ¹⁵⁶ *The Examiner*, 17 May 1835, 316b.
- ¹⁵⁷ *The Times*, 30 October 1839, 7e.
- ¹⁵⁸ *Liverpool Mercury*, 4 October 1844, 1f.
- ¹⁵⁹ *The Morning Post*, 24 April 1849, 3e. Here Sardinia refers to the Kingdom of Piedmont.
- ¹⁶⁰ *The Morning Post*, 16 January 1858, 4a.
- ¹⁶¹ *The Standard*, 16 January 1861, 1e.
- ¹⁶² <https://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/4777/watch>: Accessed: 16 July 2015. A watch with the movement marked as “Aubert and Klaftenberger 157 Regent’s Street” was purchased by Queen Victoria and presented to Prince Albert on his birthday on 26 August 1859. It is engraved “To Dearest Albert, from his ever devoted Victoria R, Aug 26th 1859”.
- ¹⁶³ The London Exhibition of 1851 is now considered the first world’s fair. See Rydell, *Meet Me at the Fair* for a discussion of the terminology used to describe these events.
- ¹⁶⁴ *Exhibition MDCCCLI, Reports by the Juries on The Subjects of the Thirty Classes into Which the Exhibition was Divided*, Royal Commission, Vol. 1, London, 1852.
- ¹⁶⁵ *The London Illustrated News*, 7 June 1851, 523.
- ¹⁶⁶ *Annuaire Général Du Commerce, 1852*, 15th edition, published by Firmin Didot Frères, Paris.
- ¹⁶⁷ *The Morning Chronicle*, 17 November 1851, 1e.
- ¹⁶⁸ *The Morning Post*, 23 April 1853, 1e.
- ¹⁶⁹ *The Morning Post*, 1 May 1850, 1b.
- ¹⁷⁰ *The Morning Post*, 18 May 1848, 8b. “The perfumery trade in France was the preserve of glovemakers, or “gantiers-parfumeurs”, who were organized into a guild association of craftsmen”. Jones, *Beauty Imagined*, 16. Jouvin won a prize medal at the 1851 Exhibition for its gloves. *Exhibition MDCCCLI, Reports by the Juries on The Subjects of the Thirty Classes into Which the Exhibition was Divided*, Royal Commission, Vol. 1, London, 1852, clxi.
- ¹⁷¹ Godley and Fletcher, “International Retailing”.
- ¹⁷² Keller, “Brand Synthesis”, 599.
- ¹⁷³ Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”; Doherty and Alexander, “Liberty in Paris”; Godley, “Selling the Sewing Machine”.
- ¹⁷⁴ Godley and Fletcher, “International Retailing”.
- ¹⁷⁵ Alexander, *Retailing in England*, 104.
- ¹⁷⁶ Godley and Fletcher, “International Retailing”.
- ¹⁷⁷ Narayanan and Fahey “Institutional Underpinnings”.
- ¹⁷⁸ Meyer and Estrin “Brownfield Entry”.
- ¹⁷⁹ Riddle, Hrivnak and Nielsen “Transnational Diaspora”.
- ¹⁸⁰ Alexander and Doherty, “Origins of American International Retailing”.
- ¹⁸¹ Lundan “New Eclectic Paradigm”.
- ¹⁸² Humphreys “Semiotic Structure”.
- ¹⁸³ Hahn, *Scenes of Parisian Modernity*, 34.