Telling "Spatial Stories": Urban Space and Bourgeois Identity in Early Nineteenth-Century Paris*

Victoria E. Thompson
Arizona State University

Writing about Paris in 1835, the Englishwoman Fanny Trollope lamented: "You must remember . . . before the last revolution [of 1830],—how very agreeable a part of the spectacle at the Louvre and in the Tuileries garden was constituted by the people. . . . But now, till the fresh dirt . . . of the Three Days' labour be worn off, dingy jackets, uncomely *casquettes* . . . must all be tolerated; and in this toleration appears to consist at present the principal external proof of the increased liberty of the Parisian mob."[1]

Mrs. Trollope's comment reveals her anxiety concerning the changes wrought in the people by the July Revolution, which ousted Charles X and replaced him with Louis-Philippe during three days of public protest and street fighting. In expressing this anxiety within a specifically urban context, linking the transformation of the popular classes to the question of urban mobility, Mrs. Trollope was also crafting a "spatial story." French theorist Michel de Certeau used the term "spatial stories" to emphasize the interdependency of textual narratives and spatial practices.[2] According to de Certeau, as individuals move through urban space, they craft personal itineraries that they infuse with meaning.[3] This meaning can be expressed to others through writing. Although they are highly personal, he believes that these itineraries, which he

* I am extremely grateful to those who have read and commented on any of the many versions of this article. Thanks in particular to John Fairfield, Rachel Fuchs, Matthew Ramsey, and participants in the History Workshop at the University of Arizona. I also owe tremendous thanks to the anonymous readers of the *Journal of Modern History.*

[1] Fanny Trollope, *Paris and the Parisians in 1835,* 2 vols. (London, 1836), 1:30–31.

[2] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life,* trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley, 1984), pp. 115–30.

[3] This concept is similar to that of the "mental map" posited by Richard Rodger. Rodger argued that individuals create their own personal maps of the cities in which they live by including landmarks, routes, and monuments that have personal significance to them and excluding those aspects of the urban landscape to which they cannot ascribe a meaning. See Richard Rodger, "Theory, Practice and European Urban History," in *European Urban History: Prospect and Retrospect,* ed. Richard Rodger (Leicester, 1993), pp. 1–18.

[*The Journal of Modern History* 75 (September 2003): 523–556]

also labels "spatial practices," "secretly structure the determining conditions of social life."[4] In this statement, his view of space echoes that of Henri Lefebvre, who argued in *The Production of Space* that "new social relationships call for a new space, and vice versa."[5] Both theorists thus considered the use and understanding of space to be important in the formation and maintenance of social structures and relationships.[6]

Given the importance of urban growth and urban renovation in Paris during the first half of the nineteenth century, it is perhaps not surprising that this period witnessed a blossoming of such "spatial stories" that sought to link spatial practices and spatial organization to changes in the social order. A vast body of work that sought to describe the capital and its inhabitants was produced in the first half of the nineteenth century. Drawing on the model of Louis Sébastien Mercier's twelve-volume *Tableau de Paris,* published in the 1780s, these works placed the inhabitants of Paris within specific urban neighborhoods and, moreover, established correspondences—both implicitly and explicitly—between the various social types that were said to make up the capital's population and the spaces and places they inhabited. In addition to producing guidebooks, destined for new arrivals to the capital during a period of increasing migration and tourism, and novels, such as those of Honoré de Balzac, set in Paris, writers and journalists contributed to multiauthored works such as the fifteen-volume *Paris; ou, Le livre des cent-et-un* (1831–34) and to the widely circulated series of *physiologies.* These works, written primarily by middle-class authors, were designed for a middle-class audience. While those in its upper ranks bought the lavishly bound multiauthored *tableaux,* the inexpensive *physiologies* had a broader middle-class audience. Many of the writers made contributions to works on both ends of the spectrum, and the same topics, concerns, and images appear repeatedly throughout the various genres

[4] de Certeau, p. 96.

[5] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space,* trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford, 1991), p. 59.

[6] This notion is also contained in the work of Pierre Bourdieu, who explains his concept of the "habitus" in spatial terms. According to Bourdieu, the habitus is the cultural, social, and spatial environment in which an individual lives. This environment is shaped by overriding structural elements, such as the dominant political or economic system in existence, and helps, in turn, to shape the worldview of the individual. However, the individual can also shape his or her habitus and, by extension, have an impact on the overriding structures of his or her society. In one example, Bourdieu likens the habitus to a home in which the experience of space shapes the individual's outlook on his or her place in the world. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice,* trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 90–92. The link between the spatial environment and the formation of identity has likewise been explored by Gaston Bachelard, *La poétique de l'espace* (Paris, 1978).

of this literature on Paris and the Parisians. For the purposes of this article, this literature provides a rich and telling source base.[7]

The proliferation of such works and their attention to the urban landscape demonstrate that Mrs. Trollope was not alone in her preoccupation with the proper use and delineation of urban space. Although most Parisian authors did not directly invoke the 1830 Revolution in their descriptions of the city, they shared the perception voiced by this English visitor that the presence and appearance of the popular classes in the city's streets and public squares had become a cause for alarm. In the literature on Paris and the Parisians contemporaries expressed this concern at the same time that they sought to "map" the city in the wake of continual social, economic, and political change. Although these texts often reflected actual changes in the physical landscape of Paris, they were more than straightforward depictions of the early nineteenth-century cityscape. Scholars have argued that these works attempted to provide a "panoramic," or all-inclusive, view of Parisian life, one that, through the classification of Parisians into easily recognizable social types, rendered the social hierarchy of the city "transparent," or easily legible.[8] However, by focusing on the organization and use of urban spaces in these texts we are able to discern a more complex vision of the city and its inhabitants, one that is characterized as much by exclusion and opacity as by inclusion and transparency. The authors of these texts, in their choice of metaphors, in the juxtapositions they created, and in their decisions regarding what to describe and what to leave out, were creating "stories" about urban space. De Certeau argues that the stories created while walking the city take on characteristics of legends or superstitions that in turn confer a larger social and cultural significance on the spaces they describe.[9] Similarly, the stylistic choices authors made impart to these texts a fictional, even mythic element, which in turn gives these works their symbolic importance, revealing the role of the urban landscape in the articulation of class identity. As visions of what was, what is, and what could

[7] On the respective readership, circulation, and prices of the *physiologies* in relation to the *tableaux,* see Richard Sieburth, "Une idéologie du lisible: Le phénomène des 'Physiologies,'" *Romantisme* 15, no. 47 (1985): 39–60; various aspects of the *physiologies* are treated in Andrée Lhéritier et al., *Les physiologies* (Paris, 1958).

[8] The term "panoramic literature" comes from Walter Benjamin, *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism,* trans. Harry Zohn (London, 1983). Sieburth emphasizes the motive of legibility in his study on the *physiologies.* Priscilla Ferguson agrees that this was a motive in the creation of these "literary guidebooks," as she refers to them, but argues that it largely failed and that the image of Paris produced by the *tableaux* and *physiologies* resisted attempts to impose coherence upon it. See Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson, *Paris as Revolution: Writing the Nineteenth-Century City* (Berkeley, 1994), esp. chap. 2.

[9] de Certeau, pp. 106–7.

be, the literature on Paris and the Parisians was an important tool in the reconfiguration of interrelated social and spatial dispositions during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Although a significant historiography exists on Paris during this period, few historians have examined the way in which the understanding and use of space was changing.[10] Theorists Roger Friedland and Deirdre Boden suggest that the presumed "naturalness" of space may make it a less attractive category of inquiry for scholars, including historians.[11] Yet recent work in medieval history has begun to illustrate just how fruitful attention to space as a category of historical analysis can be.[12] On a most basic level, by illustrating differences between medieval and modern understandings and organizations of space, these works highlight the historical nature of space as a category of analysis and topic of inquiry. In addition, works such as Daniel Lord Smail's *Imaginary Cartographies: Possession and Identity in Late Medieval Marseille* provide insight into the way in which the conceptualization of space is linked to questions of identity.[13] Smail uses notarial records to show how different social groups "mapped" the city in different ways. Similarly, my article argues that in nineteenth-century Paris, a period during which the city was undergoing tremendous upheaval, space functioned as a central category in the creation of middle-class identity.

Middle-class individuals began during the late eighteenth century to use the urban landscape as a means to articulate their difference from the aristocracy.

[10] The historiography on Paris is truly enormous for the first half of the nineteenth century and includes studies that address, among other topics, immigration, labor, disease, prostitution, criminality, and leisure. Many of these studies refer in passing to changes in the urban landscape, and most of them make use of the distinction between public and private space. However, even those that discuss renovation devote little attention to perceptions and use of space. Literary critics and geographers have begun to move into this area of exploration. Among the former, the work of Ferguson, *Paris as Revolution;* Christopher Prendergast, *Writing the City: Paris and the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 1992), and Sharon Marcus, *Apartment Stories: City and Home in Nineteenth-Century Paris and London* (Berkeley, 1999), are important contributions to our understanding of perceptions of urban space, while among the latter the most significant work to date is David Harvey, *Consciousness and the Urban Experience: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization* (Baltimore, 1985).

[11] Roger Friedland and Deirdre Boden, eds., *NowHere: Space, Time, and Modernity* (Berkeley, 1994), p. 5. Henri Lefebvre comments upon this same phenomenon when he writes of the dual, and mutually reinforcing, illusion of space as transparent and real; see Lefebvre, pp. 27–30.

[12] See, e.g., Elisabeth Crouzet-Pavan, *Espaces, pouvoir et société à Venise à la fin du moyen âge* (Rome, 1992); Barbara Hanawalt, ed., *Medieval Practices of Space* (Minneapolis, 2000).

[13] Daniel Lord Smail, *Imaginary Cartographies: Possession and Identity in Late Medieval Marseille* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1999).

The Revolution furthered this tendency in that, as Pricilla Ferguson has argued, it "opened the city to redefinitions from every quarter." Reorganization of the social order and reorganization of the urban landscape went hand in hand, as "struggles over the designation of city space gave a distinctly urban resonance to the larger political conflicts that played out in post-revolutionary France."[14] After the Revolution, questions of urban space—who occupied it, how it was partitioned, and its accessibility—continued to serve also as questions on the nature and organization of postrevolutionary society.[15] Middle-class writers mapped real and perceived changes in social composition onto the urban landscape. In this context, as new notions concerning the relationship between social class and urban space gained hold, urban renovation helped create a physical city that matched the ideological city elaborated by middle-class writers. This article explores the relationship between ideological assumptions about the organization of society, textual visions of the urban landscape, and the shaping of the physical landscape of Paris during the years surrounding the July Revolution of 1830, with a special focus on the way in which space was used by members of the middle class to craft a distinctive, and authoritative, urban identity.

Social and Spatial Transformations

In order to understand middle-class attitudes toward urban space in the early nineteenth century, we must first turn our attention to the late eighteenth century. During this period, as the middle class sought to define its place within a social hierarchy in transition, attention to urban space took on a new dimension. Previously, urban space had been of interest only insofar as it served as a backdrop for the celebration of the monarchy. Public spaces such as the Place Royale (currently the Place des Vosges) or the Place Louis XV (currently the Place de la Concorde) were designed to place the royal imprint on the city, to serve as part of a monumental Paris that existed within the larger urban landscape.[16] This larger urban landscape was of little interest to most commentators

[14] Ferguson, *Paris as Revolution,* p. 46.

[15] Scholars have recognized the political importance of architecture as a medium used to convey an ideological agenda: for French history, important works on this topic include Donald Olsen, *The City as a Work of Art: London, Paris, Vienna* (New Haven, Conn., 1986); and Gwendolyn Wright, *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago, 1991). The way in which spatial relationships reflect political and social relations has received attention primarily within the context of discussions on the development of the suburbs or the use of zoning regulations: for nineteenth-century France, an important work is John M. Merriman, *The Margins of City Life: Explorations on the French Urban Frontier, 1815–1851* (New York, 1991).

[16] See Ferguson, *Paris as Revolution,* p. 39; Hervé Maneglier, *Paris impérial: La vie quotidienne sous le Second Empire* (Paris, 1990), p. 8.

until the late eighteenth century, when writers such as Louis Sébastien Mercier turned their attention to describing the everyday life of Parisians within a specific urban context.

In order to do this, Mercier descended into the streets. His texts often highlighted the way in which the use of public spaces by the common people was hampered by the practices of the aristocracy. For Mercier, the primary distinction between the two groups consisted of their use of the streets: while the common people traveled on foot, the aristocracy traveled in carriages. As a result, this latter group was less aware of, and less concerned with, the inconveniences of the city. The following complaint is typical:

> The well-to-do and well-born [*gens qualifiés*] have dirty straw thrown in front of and around their carriage entrances [*portes cochères*] when they are ill, so that the noise of traffic bothers them less. This abusive privilege turns the street into a terrible sewer if it rains, and forces one hundred thousand people a day to walk in liquid manure, black and stinking, that comes halfway up the leg. This practice [also] makes the carriages more dangerous, for you can no longer hear them.
>
> In order to spare one sick man the noisy jolting [of a carriage], the lives of thirty thousand infantrymen are put at risk, of whom the *cavalry* care nothing, it is true; but no one should die under the silent wheels of a carriage because M. le Marquis has a touch of fever or some indigestion.[17]

This complaint is part of a new attitude toward the city, one that recognized the importance of all urban spaces, not just those associated with royal display. Although he was the most famous, Mercier was not the only author to equate knowledge of the city with the common man or woman rather than the aristocracy. For example, in the introduction to his project to make the city easier to navigate by creating a more rational system of street signs, M. Teisserenc wrote, "Seigneurs and those with carriages have no personal interest in the execution of this project, because . . . it is their coachman's job to drive them where they wish to go."[18] Other signs of this new attitude toward the city include the decision in the late eighteenth century to begin placing statues of illustrious commoners around the city, the creation of the first plan for urban improvement in 1769, and increased attention to the rational organization of space within middle-class homes.[19] By the late eighteenth century the entire

[17] Louis Sébastien Mercier, *Le tableau de Paris,* ed. under the direction of Jean-Claude Bonnet, 2 vols. (1781–88; Paris, 1994), 1:834–35.

[18] Abbé Etienne Teisserenc, *Géographie parisienne en forme de dictionnaire* (Paris, 1754), p. ix.

[19] These changes are discussed in James A. Leith, *Space and Revolution: Projects for Monuments, Squares and Public Buildings in France, 1789–1799* (Montreal, 1991); François Loyer, *Paris, Nineteenth Century: Architecture and Urbanism,* trans. Charles Lynn Clark (New York, 1988); Annick Pardailhé-Galabrun, *The Birth of Intimacy: Privacy and Domestic Life in Early Modern Paris,* trans. Jocelyn Phelps (Cambridge, 1991).

urban landscape, including some of its private spaces, was being subjected to a new scrutiny with an eye to making it more commodious, hygienic, and edifying for the general population.

The quote from Mercier is also significant in that the urban filth it describes is situated in front of an aristocratic home. As with others who described the condition of the capital in the late eighteenth century, Mercier rarely makes distinctions between rich and poor neighborhoods. While authors might mention a wealthy home, the texts in general give the impression of a high degree of social integration. Indeed, Paris in the late eighteenth century was, for the most part, characterized by a vertical rather than a horizontal stratification, in which the poor lived on the upper floors of buildings inhabited by those who were better off.[20]

Mercier drew attention to the everyday spaces of the city, and, in so doing, argued for the importance both of these spaces and of those who used them. For example, Mercier followed up his complaint with the assertion that "Socrates went on foot; Horace went on foot . . . ; Jean-Jacques Rousseau went on foot."[21] His complaint thus sought to associate the awareness, and experience, of urban ills with a more democratic approach to urban space. Others followed his lead. In 1787, the viscount Dampmartin, a visitor to Paris who expressed his sympathies with social and political reform in part by walking the streets of the capital, wrote that Paris had become a city of "those who run over others [with their carriages] and those who are run over."[22] In contrasting the careless and reckless use of the city by the few with the more hazardous, yet more concerned, use of the city by the many, these authors provided concrete examples of the way in which socioeconomic power shaped the urban landscape. They thereby tied the issue of political and social reform to a physical entity that was extremely familiar to their readers: the city of Paris. Thus portrayed, the city served as a bond that could help forge a common identity. In the nineteenth century, concern with the safety and convenience of traveling on foot through the streets would increasingly serve as an assertion of middle-class identity.[23]

[20] In the early eighteenth century, the beginnings of horizontal stratification could be seen as those enriched by the speculative bubbles created by John Law, Scottish economic advisor to the Duke d'Orleans, began to build in the northwest. Movement of the wealthy in this direction accelerated in the early nineteenth century. In addition, some segments of the city were organized primarily according to trades. Nonetheless, vertical stratification was the general rule in the late eighteenth century. See Roger Chartier et al., *La ville des temps modernes: De la Renaissance aux Révolutions* (Paris, 1998), pp. 432–38.

[21] Mercier, 1:835.

[22] Anne-Henri Cabet Dampmartin, *Un provincial à Paris pendant une partie de l'année 1789* (Strasbourg and Paris, n.d.), p. 161.

[23] This connection is discussed in Harvey (n. 10 above).

During the French Revolution, urban space became an important symbol of popular sovereignty. In storming the Bastille, the people initiated a transformation of the cityscape that would include not only the dismantling of that hated edifice but also the erection of new monuments to the Revolution, the substitution of new street names designed to reinforce revolutionary virtues, and the institution of new ways of occupying urban space—such as knitting in front of the guillotine—that manifested a claim to both political power and urban space.[24] Following the Terror, the popular occupation of urban space was curtailed, but curiosity about the way in which the popular classes used the city remained. Indeed, both the Empire and the Restoration witnessed a growing interest in works that described, in the manner of Mercier, the city of Paris and its inhabitants.

In these texts, the organization and use of space by different social groups was presented as largely unproblematic. Authors relied on an exaggerated sense of spatial segregation, combined with a presumption that popular and middle-class uses of urban space were compatible, to create a vision of a capital in which social and urban distinctions produced social and urban stability. In 1804, Louis Prudhomme stated that "each neighborhood of this city is inhabited by a group of individuals whose language, style of dress, and lifestyle would make one believe that the immense population of this capital was composed of different peoples."[25] Similarly, the urban observer Victor-Joseph-Etienne de Jouy wrote in 1813 that "each neighborhood is in some sense a separate nation, all of which come together to form the general character of Parisians and the particular physiognomy of this great city."[26] These views are characteristic of descriptions of the city during this period, which tended to present the city as a harmonious juxtaposition of diverse spaces associated with different social groups.

Early nineteenth-century guidebooks, such as Ricard's *Véritable conducteur,* published in 1828, emphasized this vision through their attention to differences among neighborhoods. According to Ricard, the (former) First Arrondissement was the commercial heart of the capital; those seeking pleasure were directed to the Palais Royal and the Boulevard des Italiens. Manufactured articles could be found in the Rues Grenata and du Temple and the western part of the Marais, while the stock exchange stood at the center of the banking and financial

[24] See Leith; Ferguson, *Paris as Revolution* (n. 8 above); and Dominique Godineau, *The Women of Paris and Their French Revolution* (Berkeley, 1998), pp. 228–35.

[25] L. Prudhomme, *Miroir de l'ancien et du nouveau Paris, avec treize voyages en vélocifères dans ses environs* (Paris, An XIII [1804]), pp. ix–x.

[26] Victor-Joseph Etienne [Etienne de Jouy, pseud.], *L'hermite de la chaussé d'Antin; ou, Observations sur les moeurs et les usages parisiens au commencement du XIXe siècle,* 5 vols. (Paris, 1812–14), 3:293.

world.[27] Similarly, the author of *Le petit diable boiteux* argued that "Paris has several successive physiognomies in the course of twenty-four hours, depending upon which neighborhoods you traverse." While the conservative Marais sleeps at nine P.M., for example, the "proud" Chausée d'Antin plays cards, dances, and listens to music.[28] As these examples illustrate, before 1830 authors emphasized the distinctive characteristics of each part of this city, where "each neighborhood is inhabited by a people that does not in any way resemble that of any other neighborhood."[29] The neighborhood—as a discrete geographical entity—thus established and indicated the boundaries between different segments of society. These works "map" the city according to socioeconomic status while also introducing a more complex vision of Parisian society. For example, distinctions in these works between the Marais and the Chausée d'Antin draw attention to different segments of the middle class that, before the Revolution, tended to be lumped together in larger entities such as "those who are run over."

Furthermore, several of these texts revealed a greater interest in the use of the city by the popular classes. In his *Mémorial parisien* (1821), P.-J.-S. Dufey began his description of the capital with the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, to which "Mercier drew attention only . . . with a single passage in an imperceptible corner of his vast *Tableau.*"[30] In contrast to Mercier's *Tableau,* early nineteenth-century descriptions of Paris portray the "people" as a highly variegated group. In accordance with the vision of society discussed above, popular neighborhoods were increasingly associated with a specific trade. It was this association that was believed to give its inhabitants their particular characteristics and appearance. Nowhere was this attention to differences among popular neighborhoods more evident than in the text by Auguste Luchet, written in the months before the July Revolution. According to Luchet, the Rues Saint-Denis and Saint-Martin were at the heart of the manufacture of *articles de Paris,* various luxury goods that formed a staple of the Parisian economy; the Faubourg Saint-Antoine was dominated by the furniture trade; the area around the Place de Greve was the home of construction workers and day laborers; and in the streets surrounding the Palais Royal one would see the attractive young women employed in the clothing trades.[31]

[27] Richard, *Le véritable conducteur parisien* [1828], ed. Les Editions les Yeux Ouverts (Paris, 1970), p. 36.

[28] M., *Le petit diable boiteux; ou, Le guide anecdotique des étrangers à Paris* (Paris, 1823), p. 137.

[29] Auguste Luchet, *Paris: Esquisses dédiées au peuple parisien et à M. Dulaure* (Paris, 1830), p. 11.

[30] P.-J.-S. Dufey, *Mémorial parisien; ou, Paris tel qu'il fut, tel qu'il est* (Paris, 1821), p. vii.

[31] Luchet, *Paris: Esquisses,* p. 64.

This attention to the popular classes may have indicated an egalitarian impulse for some authors. Luchet, for example, painted a favorable portrait of the various trades of Paris at a time when an alliance between reformist segments of the middle class and the elite ranks of the artisanal class was being forged. A stable, permanent, and highly skilled artisanal workforce populated the neighborhoods of the Rue Saint-Martin and the Faubourg Saint-Antoine. Luchet emphasized the respectability of these neighborhoods, whose streets, although busy, were never described as anything but clean and wide. These neighborhoods were usually described as busier (due to work) and calmer (due to good morals) than those of the rich; however, they did not appear to differ significantly in their spatial organization. Thus, these texts imply that, despite the crowds, middle-class observers would feel welcome to stroll the streets, reveling in the sight of so many people hard at work around them.

The implied invitation to the middle-class stroller, or *flâneur,* hints at an assumption that while the middle classes and working classes might use space differently—some for working and some for relaxation and observation—the two groups could coexist in the same spaces harmoniously. This assumption is evident in descriptions of members of the popular classes in areas outside "their" neighborhoods as well.

Although in these texts Parisian workers appeared to possess limited mobility within the city, their movement throughout the capital was presented in such a way as to reinforce divisions within society while at the same time presenting an image of social harmony. Workers who lived around the Place de Greve, for example, who hired themselves out by the day at any construction site that would take them, could be seen, in these texts, in the wealthy northwestern areas of the city that were undergoing considerable expansion at this time. Their presence in these neighborhoods was not, however, presented as a threat to the bourgeoisie, since authors took pains to emphasize that these neighborhoods were destined for the wealthy. Likewise, workers of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine and the Rues Saint-Denis and Saint-Martin were often described in their Sunday outings to the edges of Paris, where popular cabarets and the forest of Romainville provided entertainment. Here too, authors emphasized the exclusively popular nature of these outings, which they described as harmless and charming spectacles. The women of the clothing districts were depicted as the most mobile of all. In addition to participating in the Sunday outings, these women could sometimes be seen moving throughout the city, usually delivering a finished item of clothing to a wealthy client. Luchet thus described a typical itinerary of a delivery girl from a shop in the Place Vendôme: "This clean and attractive young girl, carrying a box almost as high and twice as wide as she is, comes out from the shop of Madame ——, rue de la Paix, she passes by the Carrousel, crosses the Pont Royal, and brings a duchess

of the Faubourg Saint-Germain the turban she could not do without."[32] Once again, the mobility of the working woman reinforces, rather than upsets, the social hierarchy. Her long voyage from the shop to the home of the duchess is recounted in such a way as to reinforce the power and privilege of the duchess and the submission of the working woman.[33]

While working-class mobility was a topic of some interest, middle-class mobility was less apparent in these texts. The 1826 text *Le flâneur* described its namesake in terms that emphasized the importance of observation but not of movement. Thus the author criticized "provincial *flâneurs* or foreigners that one sees stopped everywhere, examining everything, fixed in front of libraries, novelty stores, fixed-price menus, merchants of engravings, of porcelains, and especially in front of shops where everything sells for twenty-five sous."[34] The problem with such "faux" *flâneurs,* the author complained, was that, although they looked at everything, the next day they could describe nothing that they had seen. He wanted these individuals not to move along at a rapid pace but, rather, to pay attention to what they were seeing. For this reason, he opposed plans to continue the Rue de Rivoli toward the east of the city, arguing, "Nothing is as boring and sad as straight streets. In leaving from one end, to arrive at the other, one sees everything at a glance; your walk reveals nothing new to see."[35] Like many of his contemporaries, this author celebrated a slow and irregular movement through the city, punctuated by frequent stops to watch, think, and dream.

The desire on the part of authors to emphasize distinctions among the urban population and in the urban landscape while at the same time presenting these distinctions as part of a stable and harmonious whole may have been, in part, a reaction against the attempt made during the Revolution to create a more uniform urban environment in the hope of forging a new "revolutionary" citizenry. Revolutionary authorities, seeking to make the city a school for revolution, sought a systematic and unified plan that could reshape the urban landscape and the collective consciousness. In a report submitted to the Committee for Public Instruction in January 1794, the abbé Grégoire advocated a system

[32] Ibid., pp. 43–44.

[33] Luchet thus indicates, for example, that she does not pass through the Tuileries garden to cross to the Left Bank of the Seine, even though it would be a shorter route, because this garden was off-limits to anyone wearing or carrying any item that connoted manual labor. This changed in 1830. See also Joseph-Marie Pain, *Nouveaux tableaux de Paris; ou, Observations sur les moeurs et usages parisiens au commencement du XIXe siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1828), 1:81.

[34] J.-B.-Auguste d'Aldeguier, *Le flâneur: Galerie pittoresque, philosophique et morale de tout ce que Paris offre de curieux et de remarquable* (Paris, 1826), p. 189.

[35] Ibid., p. 139.

in which short, easily comprehensible street names, employed within a rational and logical system, taught the revolutionary catechism. Such a system would move citizens "from the Place de la Révolution to the rue de la Constitution and on to the rue du Bonheur."[36] Municipal authorities in the postrevolutionary period, however, rejected such unifying and all-encompassing schemes, associating them with the period of the Terror.[37] Urban renovation during both the Restoration and the July Monarchy was characterized by a more piecemeal approach.[38] While many urban historians have explained this approach by referring to budgetary constraints, the relatively low priority given to large-scale urban renovation can also be seen as a manifestation of a rejection of any unified vision for the urban landscape.[39]

At the same time, limited structural changes in the urban landscape may have contributed to the emphasis on difference in these texts. For although government-financed development was minimal during this time, private development was increasingly altering the topography of the city, especially during the Restoration. Chabrol, prefect of the Seine during the Restoration, depended upon the cooperation of private entrepreneurs in creating the new neighborhoods of François-I[er], Europe, Saint-Georges, and Poissonière, all in the northern and northwestern sections of the city, as well as numerous streets and covered arcades. This construction, undertaken at the expense of private

[36] Quoted in Ferguson, *Paris as Revolution* (n. 8 above), p. 28.

[37] Authorities were careful, during both the Restoration and the July Monarchy, to distance themselves from the Revolution in matters of municipal affairs. The 1834 law that reorganized the municipal council, for example, allowed for the election of council members (who had previously been appointed) but limited both the size and composition of the council (only those meeting the qualifications for suffrage could be elected). See Philippe Vigier, *Nouvelle histoire de Paris: Paris pendant la Monarchie de Juillet (1830–1848)* (Paris, 1991), pp. 135–37.

[38] Authorities focused much of their energy, and their budgets, on completing projects begun during the Empire. During the Restoration, the construction of churches and the restoration of monuments to royalty (such as the statue of Henri IV on the Pont Neuf) also received high priority.

[39] Guillaume de Berthier de Sauvigny points out (in *Nouvelle histoire de Paris: La Restauration, 1815–1830* [Paris, Hachette, 1977], p. 61) that neither Louis XVIII nor Charles X had "the ancestral taste for building" that characterized French monarchs during the Old Regime. In addition, he states, taxpayers did not wish to see their funds used for urban construction or renovation. Likewise, Philippe Vigier maintains that Louis-Philippe limited Prefect of the Seine Rambuteau's ability to undertake urban construction, a sentiment of restraint shared by many taxpayers as well (p. 185). According to Pierre Lavedan (*Histoire de l'urbanisme à Paris* [Paris, 1975], p. 404), some plans treating the city as an entirety were produced during the July Monarchy, although the Municipal Council seemed to value them only insofar as they could help establish budgetary priorities. It was really only after 1848 that we begin to see the acceptance of the idea of a "master plan" that would serve to create a coherent urban landscape.

entrepreneurs and later maintained by the city of Paris, raised property values and rents in an area of the city that was increasingly associated with wealthy banking and financial elites. The movement of this population to the northwestern corner of Paris would continue during the July Monarchy. This new construction increased social and geographic stratification within the city.

According to Philippe Vigier, the construction of these new quarters heightened the perception that the city was divided into bourgeois west and popular east.[40] It also drew attention to different groups within the bourgeoisie. Of equal importance, in these new neighborhoods both public and private spaces were organized, and thus experienced, differently. These differences did not significantly shape the way in which the city was described before 1830, but they did lay a foundation for crucial distinctions that would be made repeatedly after the 1830 Revolution. In these areas, streets were straighter and wider, and neighborhoods contained more public parks and squares.[41] These new neighborhoods were thus characterized by a different disposition of space than could be seen in the older areas of the city. Greater familiarity with wider streets made older streets seem even narrower. The contrast became more evident as immigration to the city picked up during the first half of the century. As the population increased, the old heart of the city expanded in the only way possible: courtyards and other empty spaces were filled in with new structures and additional stories were added on. These taller buildings blocked the sunlight in narrow, winding streets, rendering residences that already possessed few windows even darker. Because of these developments, some contemporaries recommended that older areas of the city be renovated for hygienic reasons. For example, Hippolyte Mazier du Heaume argued in 1824 that "vile" neighborhoods should be "purified by innumerable and salutary fountains, by the total disappearance of narrow and crowded houses, [and] of small and filthy streets."[42] However, whereas after 1830 it would become a commonplace to make an explicit association between such narrow, dark streets and poverty, that relationship was rarely remarked on before the July Revolution.

Growing differentiation in the disposition of public space was accompanied by changes in the organization of private space. Most inhabitants of Paris had long lived in multifamily buildings in which they rented a series of unconnected rooms. Beginning in the late eighteenth century, middle-class families began to rent rooms that were connected, creating a more private, familial space.[43] In addition, new buildings began to include antechambers that served as a transitional space between the public space of the street and the interior

[40] Vigier, p. 497.
[41] Loyer (n. 19 above), pp. 75–77.
[42] Hippolyte Mazier du Heaume, *Voyage d'un jeune grec à Paris* (Paris, 1824), p. 35.
[43] Pardailhé-Galabrun (n. 19 above), pp. 55–56.

of the residence, as well as boudoirs, which represented the residence's most private core.[44]

These changes were incorporated into the numerous apartment buildings put up during the Restoration. Yet they did not imply complete retirement into a private space. In *Apartment Stories,* Sharon Marcus has argued that these middle-class apartment buildings were characterized by porous boundaries between public and private space. The apartment house was open to the street in various ways, while elements of "private" life extended into the streets.[45] Given the political meaning associated with the occupation of public urban space by the middle class since the late eighteenth century, this porous quality makes sense, for it served to articulate the notion that even while in one's home one was still connected to the public space of the city. These buildings thus made manifest in stone Mercier's linkage between middle-class identity and public urban space.

The relationship between public space and private space in these residences differed from that in the homes of the nobility. Compared to the aristocratic *hôtel particulier,* the middle-class apartment house appeared more open to public view. During the Restoration, apartment builders increased the number of windows in each apartment, while by the early July Monarchy they included balconies on the most prestigious third-floor apartments, balconies that by the end of the Second Empire would be placed on all floors. These balconies facilitated the public display of wealth by, as François Loyer has argued, "showing the world outside the location and size of an apartment's salon," while simultaneously creating the "illusion" that the interior was open to the public gaze.[46] The perception of openness to the public space of the street was accompanied by a concern for privacy within the residence. The changing function of the bedroom and the inclusion of new private spaces such as the boudoir demonstrated this concern. These spaces served not as reception areas, as the bedroom had in noble homes, but as spaces for intimacy, introspection, and the fostering of an individual psyche. Middle-class apartments were thus increasingly characterized by a continuum of public and private spaces that served to regulate the different aspects of middle-class life and to bring together, in a rational and harmonious way, distinctions between display and introspection, between exterior and interior, and between the community and the individual.

Those who lived in these apartment buildings located in new neighborhoods had begun to experience urban space—both public and private—in new ways. Descriptions of Paris devoted little attention, however, to the private urban

[44] Ibid., pp. 65–66.
[45] Marcus (n. 10 above), p. 24.
[46] Loyer, p. 139.

spaces of the well-off and virtually no attention to those of the poor. Similarly, comments on narrow and dark streets were few and were not explicitly associated with poverty (even less with crime and revolt). This would change radically after 1830, when alterations in the way middle-class inhabitants of Paris experienced urban space would serve as a means to articulate middle-class fears concerning revolution, differentiate between the middle and the popular classes, and justify middle-class social and political authority. Before 1830, however, despite increased focus on socioeconomic status in the "mapping" of Paris, different social groups were largely presented as occupying the same sorts of spaces in compatible, if not identical, ways. Although these texts depicted a city that was socially and spatially segregated, urban topography and social stratification worked together to give the impression that the organization of Parisian society was orderly and stable. Distinctions based on the different functions of urban space for different groups predominated, but these were not indicative of disorder and incoherence. In arguing that "Paris unites every contrast," writers were implying that the distinctions emphasized within these texts when describing the city did not undermine the social order but served as its very foundation.[47]

"Hidden Life is Full of Evil"

As we have seen, Empire- and Restoration-era descriptions of Paris did not ignore the popular classes. Nonetheless, the writer Alfred-Auguste Cuvillier-Fleury was struck during the 1830 Revolution by the appearance of "these faces that one never encounters in Paris, except in these troubled times and when sovereignty takes to the streets again."[48] Cuvillier-Fleury was not alone in his belief that the popular classes had not been visible before 1830. Both during and after the 1830 Revolution, writers repeatedly gave the impression that the presence in the city of the popular classes, and especially the poor, posed a new and troubling problem. In particular, they implied not only that the poor occupied different urban spaces but also that they occupied them in different ways and for different purposes. In addition to expressing alarm over the heightened visibility of the popular classes in predominantly middle-class neighborhoods, middle-class authors conveyed a sense of danger when confronted by poor neighborhoods, which they characterized as difficult to access and even more difficult to "see." In the first installment of *Les mystères de Paris,* for example, Eugène Sue invoked the "fearful curiosity" of his readers, certain that it would excuse his decision to open his tale in the frightful, dark,

[47] *Le paravoleur; ou, L'art de se conduire prudemment en tout pays, notamment à Paris* (Paris, 1830), p. 31.

[48] Ernest Bertin, ed., *Journal intime de Cuvillier-Fleury,* 2 vols. (Paris, n.d.), 1:227.

and dirty neighborhood of the Cité. In describing this neighborhood, Sue emphasized its mazelike quality; it was a territory "hidden" from middle-class observers, who found its streets hard to navigate and its inhabitants dangerous and mysterious. More than just associating different neighborhoods with different social groups, these authors began to imply that individuals of different classes used and understood urban space in different and conflicting ways.

The Revolution of 1830 changed middle-class perceptions of the urban landscape by making the people of Paris visible in a different way, as the peaceful cohabitation of urban space gave way to insurrection. Dulaure, in his *Histoire physique, civile et morale de Paris,* recorded some of the scenes that had shocked and frightened the bourgeoisie. In the following passage, for example, the imagery of a young working woman in a neighborhood that was previously identified with the luxury clothing trades was radically altered: "A woman that the police had killed lay stretched out in the area of the Bank of France, bathed in her own blood. A man of the people, whose extraordinary strength would be difficult to explain without a sense of the patriotic enthusiasm that must have moved him at that moment, lifted up this woman, whom he carried above the shoulders of the crowd, and carried her thus, with outstretched arms, to the statue of Louis XIV, crying *Revenge!*"[49] The itinerary described is less extensive than that of the hat delivery girl described by Luchet, cited earlier, but it includes movement through similar types of neighborhoods. In Dulaure's text, however, the meaning of the popular presence and of popular mobility in the center of Paris had become associated with violence and disorder. The city no longer appeared as a coherent reflection of a well-ordered society, as it had in earlier texts; it was instead intimately implicated in the social upheaval caused by revolution.

Movement of the working classes out of their neighborhoods into the center of the capital during the "Trois Glorieuses" made a strong impression on middle-class observers, who henceforth became virtually obsessed with the implications of the public presence of the popular classes in the city. This obsession was fed by continued urban turmoil following the accession of Louis-Philippe to the throne. Workers and members of the lower middle class, who did not meet the new qualifications for suffrage and, thus, felt betrayed by a government that they had helped bring to power, took to the streets repeatedly, sometimes with violent consequences. Economic crisis added fuel to the fire. Whereas portrayals of Paris from the Restoration had included descriptions of the popular classes as a means of emphasizing stability, July Monarchy authors tended to use the people of Paris to indicate instability and unrest. Dulaure aside, most authors chose to invoke the Revolution only

[49] J. A. Dulaure, *Histoire physique, civile et morale de Paris depuis 1821 jusqu'à nos jours,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1835), 2:298.

obliquely, as an event that could not be recalled directly but whose profound effect on the urban landscape and its inhabitants could be read in the changed physical geography of the city.

In the years following the July Revolution, texts describing the city of Paris often portrayed it as a city under siege. Mrs. Trollope, for example, noted that after five o'clock in the evening the "elegant" society left the Tuileries gardens and was replaced by the "multitude." She remarked that since the July Revolution the dirty and the poor could be seen in many such places in Paris that had previously been closed to them.[50] Middle-class authors bemoaned their inability to escape the poor. As one author put it, "Whether sitting or walking, mendicity encircles you and follows on your heels: this specter who is hungry and whose look devours you!"[51] The omnipresence of the poor in these texts tended to imply a city in which neighborhood boundaries had lost some of their significance. This sense of "invasion" was reinforced by repeated references to dirt; unlike the "clean and attractive" delivery girl described by Luchet before the July Revolution, the poor in these later texts brought dirt with them everywhere in the city. If, as anthropologist Mary Douglas has argued, dirt signifies "matter out of place," the dirt associated with the poor indicated a strong sense of anxiety concerning boundaries and distinctions.[52] Dirt was symbolic of a larger problem of things not being in their proper places: household waste accumulated in the streets, the poor gathered in middle-class parks and public places, and middle-class authors found themselves facing enormous difficulties in moving through popular neighborhoods.

Complaints concerning the dirt of Paris were not new, but after 1830 they became more frequent and more explicitly linked to questions of poverty, criminality, and revolution. Already in the late eighteenth century, Mercier had departed from earlier works devoted to the capital when he described contemporary urban experience rather than compiling an inventory of art and architecture or an etymology of street names. As a result, he drew attention to urban ills. In discussing the Cité, for example, he complained of the inconveniences to circulation in its "compressed plazas" and its "strangled outlets."[53] However, although some urban problems were more obvious in the Cité than elsewhere, Mercier did not present this area as remarkably different from other parts of the capital. As the population grew, early nineteenth-century authors drew more frequent attention to the narrow and dirty streets of Paris, particularly its

[50] Trollope (n. 1 above), pp. 266.

[51] Raymond Brucker, "Les promenades de Paris," in *Nouveau tableau de Paris au XIXe siècle* (hereafter abbreviated *Nouveau tableau de Paris*), 7 vols. (Paris, 1834), 4:305.

[52] Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London, 1988), p. 5.

[53] Mercier (n. 17 above), 1:277.

older areas. In 1824, Mazier du Heaume thus asked, "Why . . . this eternal and revolting uncleanness in the center or faubourgs of Paris? Why in certain areas of the Cité and the Marais aren't the streets, whose odor can further corrupt the air one breathes, cleaned?"[54] On the eve of the Revolution of 1830, another author declared in his *Cri de douleur sur l'horrible état des rues de Paris* that "the streets of Paris are constantly hideous and very encumbered."[55] Following the 1830 Revolution, these complaints rose in number, as authors outdid each other to decry the wretched state of certain areas of the city. At the same time, authors increasingly associated poor street conditions with the popular classes. Discussion of unsanitary conditions thus drew attention to the way in which the poor used the streets of Paris, in addition to a more traditional focus on structural problems, such as narrow streets.

Middle-class authors commented again and again on how difficult it was to move through popular neighborhoods because of their dirt and refuse. The area around the open-air market des Innocents, for example, revealed, according to one author, "the primitive city in all of its original dirt . . . the Middle Ages in a state of agony." The "narrow and muddy" streets in this area, he continued, were notoriously difficult to navigate.[56] In addition, women of the popular classes congregated in these streets, blocking traffic. Likewise, as the covered arcades designed during the Restoration to protect pedestrians from street traffic lost favor, many came to associate these areas with the poor and the supposed criminals who gathered there, considering them dangerous and unnavigable territories.[57]

In these texts, popular neighborhoods also lost the reassuring quality they had possessed during the Restoration and became sites of middle-class fear. The *Physiologie des quartiers de Paris* (1841) noted that young men just arrived from the countryside fled in fright when confronted by the "poetry in rags and tatters" of the Cité.[58] Restoration texts had not displayed this level of anxiety regarding the neighborhoods of the Ile de la Cité. Moreover, in these later texts even the neighborhoods of "respectable" artisans were depicted as dangerous for the bourgeoisie. Thus at the Porte Saint-Martin one might see, one author wrote, "in the morning, a gathering of workers drawn by *café à la crème;* at noon, and particularly in winter, a meeting of chimney sweeps and of porters of wood for heating; on days of disturbances, a home for rioters."[59]

[54] Mazier du Heaume (n. 42 above), p. 212.

[55] Pierre-Gaspard Chaumette, *Cri de douleur sur l'horrible état des rues de Paris en décembre 1829 et janvier 1830* (Paris, 1830), p. 1.

[56] Raymond Brucker, "Le plan de Paris," in *Nouveau tableau de Paris,* 6:363.

[57] Auguste Luchet, "Les passages," in *Nouveau tableau de Paris,* 6:99–100.

[58] Léon Guillemin, *Physiologie des quartiers de Paris* (Paris, 1841), p. 80.

[59] Léon Gozlan, "Les deux boulevards," in *Nouveau tableau de Paris,* 3:355. Police kept working-class cafés, believed to be centers of revolutionary planning and propaganda, under close surveillance after 1830. On the role of the café in working-class

Descriptions such as this tended to blur the line between manual labor and revolution. In 1841 an observer of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine wrote that upon approaching this neighborhood, one could hear "the song of the worker; make sure not to interrupt it; the worker who sings wants his song to be heard; if not, he will no longer sing; and if it's not one thing it's another: either he sings or he gets angry." He continues, "I repeat, respect these brave workers! In their anger they will close the workshops, only to open the store of the nearest arms depot."[60] The ease with which workers were believed to move from work to insurrection was mirrored, in this quote, by the threat of their mobility in the city, as the author invoked memories of armed workers descending into central Paris during the three days of the July Revolution.

Women workers were also increasingly presented as a threat to middle-class inhabitants of the city. Mrs. Trollope commented on the obstacle posed by mattress cleaners who stationed themselves around the Place du Caire and in other areas of the city, complaining, "You cannot at this season pass through any street in Paris, however pre-eminently fashionable . . . without being frequently obliged to turn aside that you may not run against two or more women covered with dust, and probably with vermin."[61] For many authors, the greater "impudence" of the people of Paris since 1830 could be most easily remarked upon in the female merchants who sold their wares in the city's markets and on city streets.[62] J. C. Maldan, writing in 1840, remarked that the sidewalks had been "invaded" by merchants and complained that the merchants in markets such as the Temple Market for used clothes posed a serious obstacle to middle-class mobility.[63] "Why," he asked, "in passing through the Temple is one assailed by merchants who call to you, pursue you, harass you, and plague you?"[64] Female merchants were frequently compared to prostitutes, who could be seen openly plying their trade in the streets of the most populous and run-down quarters, most notably around the Halles and in the Cité. In describing the streets in these neighborhoods, the prolific novelist Paul de Kock wrote, "Many young girls, fruit and vegetable merchants, are led into these caverns by other hideous creatures of their sex who make a shameful profit from their youth and sometimes their face."[65] Even the smoking parlor, which had been depicted in earlier texts as a site of middle-class relaxation, was now shown

---

life, see W. Scott Haine, *The World of the Paris Café: Sociability among the French Working Class, 1789–1914* (Baltimore, 1996).

[60] Guillemin, pp. 71, 73.

[61] Trollope (n. 1 above), pp. 113–14.

[62] Gaetan Niépovié, *Etudes physiologiques sur les grands métropoles de l'Europe occidentale: Paris* (Paris, 1840), p. 187.

[63] J. C. Maldan, *Première facétie: Les embarras de Paris,* 3d ed. (Paris, 1840), p. 7.

[64] Ibid., p. 10.

[65] Paul de Kock et al., *La grande ville: Nouveau tableau de Paris comique, critique et philosophique,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1844), 1:148.

to be invaded by the popular classes. One author described the sense of physical danger he felt on entering a smoking parlor where "six of those hideous women who make one blush to have a mother ran at the sound [of my opening the door]; I was surrounded. . . . I trembled all over. The owner of the establishment saw my torment; he made a sign [and] I escaped from danger."[66]

In these texts the city, and especially its popular neighborhoods, become areas of danger for the bourgeoisie. The anxiety felt by members of the middle class about popular neighborhoods such as the Faubourg Saint-Denis, where one author warned that if you spoke like an aristocrat you might get sent "à la lanterne," was palpable in these texts.[67] Whereas Restoration authors presented the people of Paris as picturesque characters through whose neighborhoods one could stroll without harm, July Monarchy texts emphasized the disturbing physical proximity and unsettling ubiquitous presence of the popular classes. The city had become "a huge satanic dance, in the midst of which men and women are thrown together any which way, crowded like ants, feet in the mud, breathing a diseased air, trying to walk through encumbered streets and public places."[68] Venturing into popular neighborhoods risked bringing one into contact with "a crowd of pariahs of our civilization, of workers and courtesans, [where] you will elbow with horror a corruption in rags, with cheeks hollowed by hunger."[69] Popular neighborhoods gave middle-class adventurers the desire "to turn on one's heels and go back."[70] Whereas the urban vision of Restoration texts connoted a city in which physical and social boundaries were clearly visible, July Monarchy descriptions revealed a fear that urban boundaries had broken down. "The barbarians," wrote Eugène Sue, "are in our midst."[71]

The intense anxiety felt by the bourgeoisie about the popular presence in the capital was exacerbated by the cholera epidemic of 1832. Cholera hit the city hard, killing 20,000 out of a population of 861,000. Although the rich were not spared, the epidemic created the greatest devastation in poor neighborhoods such as that of the Cité, where the mortality rate was nearly double

[66] Eugène Briffault, "La nuit de Paris," in *Paris; ou, Le livre des cent-et-un,* 15 vols., 2d ed. (Paris, 1832), 3:140–41.

[67] This expression evoked the 1789 Revolution and referred to the practice of hanging people from lampposts; see Guillemin (n. 58 above), p. 55.

[68] Charles Duveyrier, "La ville nouvelle; ou, Le Paris des saint-simoniens," in *Paris; ou, Le livre des cent-et-un,* 8:317.

[69] J. B.-Rose Bonaventure Violet d'Épagny and Francis Girault, *Les abus de Paris* (Paris, 1844), p. 353.

[70] Honoré de Balzac, "Les boulevards de Paris," in *Le diable à Paris: Paris et les parisiens. Moeurs et coutumes, caractères et portraits des habitants de Paris. Tableau complet de leur vie privée, publique, politique, artistique, littéraire, industrielle, etc., etc.,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1845–46), 2:100.

[71] Eugène Sue, *Les mystères de Paris* (Paris, 1989), p. 31.

that of the capital in general.[72] Public health officials conducted exhaustive studies to determine what factors contributed to the spread of disease. Ultimately, they, along with middle-class writers and journalists, pointed to what they perceived to be the misuse of space among the poor. Some, for example, concluded that the undue presence of the poor in public areas of the city contributed to their likelihood of succumbing to the disease. A report on cholera in 1832 stated that the disease had less effect on those able to "protect themselves from the inclemency of the air," while street merchants, prostitutes, and vagabonds who spent a great deal of time outdoors were harder hit.[73] This assessment corresponded to middle-class fears regarding the omnipresence of the poor.

Yet excessive exposure to the outdoors was not the only factor that made individuals susceptible to cholera; such exposure combined with nights spent in a *hôtel garni,* or rooming house, where lodgers lacked complete privacy, created the greatest danger. In his *Paris malade: Esquisses du jour* (1832), Eugène Roch linked these two explanations: "That part of the people which comes closest to the established population, which possesses at the very least a small domicile and sheltered work . . . hurried to read the hygiene instructions posted at the corner of every street . . . but the class that is even lower, for which work is more occasional, life more precarious, a roof less assured, for whom food is prepared out of doors, whose meal is taken on a [street corner] and whose bed is in a virtually public garret, [this class shows itself to be] strongly unmanageable, and especially strongly incredulous."[74] It was among this class, the author warned, that the belief that cholera was a plot of the rich against the poor would lead to insurrection. The lack of an appropriately private personal space was thus dramatically associated with revolution, the most frightening example of an excessive popular presence in the public spaces of the city. The harmonious continuum between private and public space that characterized middle-class neighborhoods was thereby shown to be lacking among the poor.

Despite belief that both cholera and revolution were associated with an excessive presence of the poor in the public spaces of Paris, authorities concluded that the solution to both problems was to open up more public space. Creating wider streets and more public squares would, they argued, prevent both urban revolt and the spread of disease. Such assumptions were based in

[72] David P. Jordan, *Transforming Paris: The Life and Labors of Baron Haussmann* (New York, 1995), p. 96.

[73] Benoiston de Chateauneuf, *Rapport sur la marche et les effets du choléra-morbus dans Paris et les communes rurales du département de la Seine* (Paris, 1832), pp. 137, 191.

[74] Eugène Roche, *Paris malade: Esquisses du jour* (Paris, 1832), pp. 54–55.

part on public health ideas articulated during the eighteenth century that associated open space with the circulation of air, believed necessary for good health.[75] Yet these conclusions are odd when one considers that in the case of both revolution and cholera the presence of the poor in public was considered dangerous. Clearly, observers must have felt that public space could be used in different ways by different groups. This sense of difference is evident in the growing number of descriptions, both in journalistic texts on the city and in medical reports, of the poorest urban neighborhoods—neighborhoods such as the Cité.

In their descriptions of the Cité, observers emphasized the darkness caused by narrow streets and high buildings that made it difficult to see. According to H. A. Frégier, for example, the Cité contained "streets, at most eight feet wide and edged with houses blackened by time. These very tall houses . . . render the streets sad and damp, and they are themselves without much light, especially on the ground floor. . . . The darkness of the shops combined with the repulsive physiognomy of the streets and the neighborhood inspires a secret horror in the passerby who is led there by a spirit of curiosity."[76] He was convinced that such conditions were an ideal breeding ground for crime, and he complained that stopping crime in these neighborhoods was difficult, since authorities faced the challenge of first penetrating into hidden interiors.[77]

Writers such as Eugène Sue emphasized, in addition to the lack of sunlight, the lack of windows that could provide outsiders with a view inside. Sue described the neighborhood of the Cité as a "maze of obscure, narrow, and twisted streets," lined with "houses the color of mud, . . . pierced by a few rare windows with worm-eaten sashes and almost without panes. Black, foul alleys led to even blacker and fouler stairways, stairways so perpendicular that one could barely climb them with the aid of a cord . . . attached to the humid walls with cramp-irons."[78] Access was additionally difficult because it meant overcoming one's fears, something that some were unable or unwilling to do. The author of the *Physiologie des quartiers de Paris,* for example, stated, in discussing the Cité, "that which is ugly frightens us. Let us thus throw a veil over the Cité and its decrepitude."[79] Whether due to the lack of sunlight, the lack of windows, or the observers' own lack of courage, the Cité was often portrayed as a dangerously "hidden" space, difficult to see and thus frightening.

The opacity of the poorest neighborhoods of Paris contrasts sharply in these

[75] V. Hannin, "La ville dans le discours medical, 1760–1830" (master's thesis, University of Paris VII, 1978), pp. 51–65.

[76] H. A. Frégier, *Des classes dangeureuses de la population dans les grandes villes, et des moyens de les rendre meilleures,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1840), 1:8.

[77] Ibid., 1:30–31.

[78] Sue, pp. 32–33.

[79] Guillemin (n. 58 above), p. 81.

texts with the transparency of its middle-class spaces. Sharon Marcus has argued that "by depicting the apartment house as though its facades and walls were transparent, Parisian chroniclers demonstrated that even the city's most private spaces posed no impediment to their vision."[80] Yet when describing neighborhoods such as the Cité, the "panoptical gaze" adopted by the authors of these texts gave way to an averted, imperfect vision, one that could not penetrate fully into poor neighborhoods, or poor interiors. These spaces are absent from the literature on Paris and the Parisians produced during the July Monarchy.

This opacity and absence are all the more striking when one realizes that, in the aftermath of the cholera epidemic, public hygienists were engaged in what Catherine Kudlick has described as an "unprecedented penetration into private space."[81] In search of the reasons for the higher mortality rate in poor neighborhoods, investigators such as Louis-René Villermé and Eugène Buret visited the interiors of the poor, leaving descriptions of these spaces that are familiar to us. Yet while such descriptions imply that these spaces need not be hidden from middle-class eyes, they also emphasize the lack of individual and conjugal privacy in poor interiors—in contrast, designated private space was a defining characteristic of the bourgeois apartment. According to Eugène Buret, for example, in the poor neighborhoods of Paris "misery . . . piles together *pêle-mêle* those of all ages and both sexes . . . in narrow habitations and sometimes in the same bed."[82] Likewise, Frégier wrote of many poor families who "only possess one bed to sleep a whole family, which offers a *pêle-mêle* contrary to the health of all, and capable of staining early on the modesty of children."[83] In contrast to the authors of the literature on Paris and the Parisians, who portray these interiors as excessively private because hidden, public health investigators emphasized the excessively public nature of poor households.

Yet perceptions of the "hidden" interiors of the poor in the literature on Paris and the Parisians and the "public" nature of those interiors in the work of investigators such as Buret both result from a growing conviction that the poor understood and used space differently than did the middle class. Such perceptions are the counterparts to the excessive visibility of the poor in middle-class, public areas of the city and are indicative of a belief in class-based approaches to the use and understanding of urban space. The elaboration of this belief corresponds to the development of a similar distinction in regard to the sense

[80] Marcus (n. 10 above), p. 34.

[81] Catherine J. Kudlick, *Cholera in Post-Revolutionary Paris: A Cultural History* (Berkeley, 1996), p. 73.

[82] Eugène Buret, *De la misère des classes laborieuses en Angleterre et en France,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1840), 1:415.

[83] Frègier, 1:87.

of smell. Alain Corbin has argued that during the July Monarchy, as middle-class individuals became more sensitive to both public and private odors, they began to argue that workers possessed a less refined sense of smell, which allowed them to tolerate offensive odors. "The inequality between the organs [of smell]," Corbin states, "reflect[ed] that which reigned between individuals" and between classes.[84]

Attention to other senses also increased during the July Monarchy. Corbin's study of aurality, and his suggestive comments on luminosity, indicate that the creation of a middle-class identity was associated with a redefinition of the senses.[85] Along these same lines, Jonathan Crary has argued that vision was increasingly understood as a subjective sense, one rooted in the body of a distinct individual, in the early nineteenth century.[86] These works suggest that what was smelled, heard, or seen was believed to be determined less by an objective reality—an odor, sound, or sight that existed independently outside the body doing the smelling, hearing, or seeing—and more by the sense of smell, hearing, or vision possessed by the individual in question. Along these lines, the perception and use of space, which was also closely associated with the body and its senses, seemed to become less absolute and more subjective during this period as well. The emergence of the notion that the senses, including what we might call the "sense of space," were subjective provided middle-class individuals with a range of categories of perception closely associated with the individual body through which to define class belonging and exclusion.

This change influenced middle-class solutions to the problem of the use of space by the poor. The anxiety that was clearly manifested in descriptions of the city during the July Monarchy led to a desire to "clean up" the streets and public places of Paris. A city where vice was believed to be "everywhere, stand[ing] in each public garden, in each street, on each square, at the corner of every sidewalk," required drastic changes.[87] However, although middle-class observers wished to control the popular presence in public, they did not wish to return to the vision of the city that was so popular during the Restoration. Earlier texts had presumed that the middle and popular classes could navigate each other's neighborhoods, for although each group might use different spaces of the city, or the same spaces for different purposes, they did not understand space differently. During the July Monarchy, however, horrified

[84] Alain Corbin, *Le miasme et la jonquille: L'odorat et l'imaginaire social, XVIIIe–XIXe siècles* (Paris, 1986 [1982]), p. 165.

[85] Ibid., pp. 181–83.

[86] Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990).

[87] Henri Lecouturier, *Paris incompatible avec la République: Plan d'un nouveau Paris où les révolutions seront impossibles* (Paris, 1848), p. 35.

descriptions of the popular classes and popular neighborhoods were combined with an assertion that middle-class individuals possessed a privileged relationship to urban space. In reconfiguring urban space, writers such as Raymond Brucker linked the middle-class emphasis on a continuum between public and private space to the problem of the lack of visibility of the poor. In an essay published in 1834 he thus maintained that the city needed more public parks in which, when occupied by families, "[d]omestic mores will be under the censorship of all, and will only be better for that. Hidden life is full of evil."[88] Such comments played on the growing belief that the classes possessed fundamentally different approaches to urban spaces—both public and private. These different approaches made envisioning a city in which they could coexist extremely difficult. For while the popular presence in the city was associated with poverty, vice, and revolution, the middle-class presence was identified with social mobility and sovereignty. Descriptions of Paris thus revealed, during the July Monarchy, the existence of two cities: a popular city that demanded surveillance and control, and a middle-class city that required freedom and mobility.

A Tale of Two Cities

If the Revolution of 1830 had produced a new vision of "popular" Paris, it also altered perceptions of the Paris of the middle classes. Most notable in this sense is the prominence of the Latin Quarter in descriptions of the city after 1830. The Latin Quarter housed the University of Paris as well as the major professional schools, such as the Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées and the Ecole Polytechnique. Students of the Latin Quarter had played a prominent role in the 1830 Revolution.[89] After leaving school, a number of students became writers and journalists and contributed to the numerous descriptions of Paris so popular during the July Monarchy. Many of these authors did not abandon their reformist approach to politics, not least because most writers did not pay enough in taxes to qualify for the vote. Thus, at the same time that these texts reveal a fear of popular revolution, they also manifest a desire for continued reform.

Those who were sympathetic to the principles behind the July Revolution

[88] Brucker, "Les promenades de Paris" (n. 51 above), 4:317.

[89] On student life in the Latin Quarter, see Jean-Claude Caron, *Générations romantiques: Les étudiants de Paris et le quartier latin (1814–1851)* (Paris, 1991). On their role in the Revolution of 1830 and subsequent disillusionment, see also Alan B. Spitzer, *The French Generation of 1820* (Princeton, N.J., 1987); and César Graña, *Modernity and Its Discontents: French Society and the French Man of Letters in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1967).

used the theme of mobility to evoke a city in which corporate boundaries had dissolved and different social groups (the poor excluded) had begun to merge into a unified public. According to Raymond Brucker, the French Revolution of 1789 enhanced opportunities for social mobility by breaking down both urban and social barriers. "The revolution . . . arrived at exactly the right moment to open, in Paris, neighborly relations between areas that large convents and oversized [aristocratic homes] had separated. . . . Democracy made its path through all that, and made it by storm."[90] Brucker advocated creating more such "paths" through the city—for example, a bridge in between the Pont Royale and the Pont de la Concorde, one that would open into the Tuileries, because then "the hereditary aristocracy of the Faubourg Saint-Germain would give its hand to the bourgeoisie of the neighborhood of the Bank of France, titles [of nobility] and coins would sign a peace treaty. . . . [This would be] a situation highly desirable for this hermaphrodite dynasty."[91] The bridge metaphor proved to be popular not only for describing the composition of the new elites governing France, as in this quotation from Brucker's essay, but also for encouraging a more general movement of upward social mobility. Thus another author, invoking the important role played by students in the 1830 Revolution, warned, "The Latin Quarter is too crowded; if we do not soon find the means for the movement of this great knowledge throughout the city, we must continually fear that it will take some strange, fantastic, menacing form."[92] Of course the presumed destination of the students of the Latin Quarter, students of the elite studying law or medicine, was the neighborhood of the Chaussée d'Antin, a neighborhood associated with the bourgeoisie of banking and high finance that had come into positions of power with the 1830 Revolution. The Chaussée d'Antin was "the promised land of all ambitions that seek to find happiness," ambitions that were often depicted as having their start in the Latin Quarter.[93] In various itineraries throughout the city, then, the Latin Quarter became the linchpin, the *juste milieu* linking the Faubourg Saint-Germain and the Chaussée d'Antin, the two centers of power in the new Paris. As one author put it, "Republic and royalty can come together only in the Latin Quarter."[94]

In these texts, the city becomes a conduit for power and money; its streets no longer served to separate one corporate group from another but instead facilitated social mobility. This mobility could be between different segments

[90] Brucker, "Le plan de Paris" (n. 56 above), 6:376.

[91] Ibid., p. 377. The proposed bridge was built during the Second Empire and named the Pont de Solferino.

[92] A. Bazin, *L'epoque sans nom: Esquisses de Paris, 1830–1833,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1833), 2:84.

[93] Ibid., p. 82.

[94] Guillemin (n. 58 above), p. 102.

of the elite, as the quotations just cited imply, or could be understood as upward social mobility. Consider, for example, this description from 1841 of the Rue Saint-Honoré and its surrounding neighborhood on the west side of Paris, the Faubourg Saint-Honoré: "Its cradle is of plebeian origin. But soon, as with any parvenu, it takes on worldly airs. It becomes aristocratic. It is especially proud of the son to which it has given birth—the Faubourg Saint-Honoré."[95] The Rue Saint-Honoré was one of the few streets, before 1830, that crossed the right bank from east to west. The Rue Saint-Honoré began at the Place de la Bastille in the east, the center of a popular neighborhood and the entrance to the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, and it ended in the west in the wealthy and fashionable Faubourg Saint-Honoré. In linking one segment of the population to another, the Rue Saint-Honoré was an anomaly before 1830. Such connecting streets received little attention in pre-1830 descriptions of the city, which, as we have seen, tended to emphasize the spatial and social segregation of the city. After 1830, however, when the idea of social mobility gained in popularity, such streets came to be seen as metaphors for movement up the social hierarchy.

Unlike political theorists during the Restoration, when social order was believed to depend on the division of society into highly differentiated segments, political theorists of the July Monarchy made the idea of social mobility the cornerstone of *juste milieu* politics. The political system of the July Monarchy was set up to encourage the rational movement of the population up the social ladder. Since suffrage qualifications were based on income and assets, all one had to do to participate in politics was, as Louis-Philippe's minister François Guizot famously stated, "get rich." The July Monarchy sought to find a balance between stagnation and radical change by allowing for the "natural" movement of the population up the social ladder and into the polity as the economy grew. A gradual and controlled mobility, such as that which contemporaries saw in the slow evolution of the character of the Rue Saint-Honoré as it moved from east to west, was thus integral to the political philosophy of the regime.[96]

One of the signs of the greater acceptance of the idea of urban mobility after 1830 (in comparison to the Restoration) was the increased importance of the *flâneur* in texts describing the city. The verb *flâner* literally means "to stroll";

[95] Ibid., pp. 49–50.

[96] Not everyone desired to facilitate this type of spatial and social mobility. Jacques-Séraphin Lanquetin, who became the president of the municipal council in 1850, thus criticized a prefectoral plan to create a similar east-west connecting route on the Left Bank by saying that it would be better to facilitate movement between the two banks of the Seine. "An inhabitant of the Faubourg Saint-Germain," he wrote, "has twenty times, one hundred times perhaps the need to go to the area around the Stock Exchange before he is called one time for business in the Faubourgs Saint-Marceau or Saint-Jacques, and visa versa": qtd. in Lavedan (n. 39 above), p. 405.

the *flâneur* was one who strolled throughout the city. The *flâneur* became, during the July Monarchy, a symbol for the newly victorious bourgeoisie, as a text from 1833 reveals. Whereas before 1830, the author wrote, public thoroughfares were known as the "pavement of the king," after 1830 they became the "pavement of the *flâneur.*"[97] In the 1830s and 1840s, book-length descriptions of Paris regularly included a chapter on the *flâneur,* describing his traits and characteristics. The *flâneur,* as he appeared in texts published during the Restoration, was the quintessential urban observer, present in the streets of the capital but often immobile. His lack of mobility in these texts was perhaps a holdover from the earliest usage of the term, during the Empire, which associated it with laziness, idleness, and lounging about.[98] Yet by the July Monarchy the *flâneur* had become highly mobile and highly productive. Authors of descriptions of Paris increasingly took on the subject position of the *flâneur,* whom they depicted as moving throughout the various neighborhoods of the city, imparting to themselves his mobility and powers of observation in order to argue for the accuracy of their texts. Through the *flâneur* they claimed an ability to define the city; by choosing what was seen and how it was to be understood, they created maps of Paris for bourgeois readers who then occupied the city as imaginary *flâneurs.* In redefining the *flâneur,* middle-class writers articulated a new understanding of the proper use of urban space, thereby asserting the right of the middle class to possess and define the public spaces of the city. Walking the streets of the city without being diverted, run over, or accosted came to be considered, by the July Monarchy, a sign of sovereignty and control over the city and its inhabitants.

The connotation of urban control implied by the *flâneur*'s itinerary throughout the city led to increased calls for improved circulation. Throughout the history of the capital, observers have complained about the difficulty of circulation in Paris. Yet, as Philippe Vigier has noted, the number and vehemence of such complaints reached a new height during the July Monarchy.[99] Such complaints arose as much from increased traffic in a rapidly growing city as from fears regarding the popular presence in the capital.[100] These many com-

[97] Bazin, p. 296.

[98] Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson, "The *Flâneur* on and off the Streets of Paris," in *The Flâneur,* ed. Keith Tester (London, 1994), pp. 24–26.

[99] Vigier (n. 37 above), p. 489.

[100] The extent to which traffic was on the rise in Paris, and its effect on Parisians, has not been definitively determined. Some authors, such as Vigier or Chevalier, imply that demographic growth necessarily resulted in increased traffic. Lavedan, however, argues that traffic in Paris was "mediocre" and implies that its volume cannot explain the many complaints regarding circulation (p. 395). Although Bernard Marchand cites both demographic growth and the creation of public transportation, which may have led to more vehicles using the city's streets, he argues that the center city was actually

plaints focused attention on streets and thoroughfares in descriptions of the city. One contributor to the 1834 *Nouveau tableau de Paris* wrote, for example, "people in a hurry to live must have straight streets. A straight line is not only the shortest distance between two points; it is also the cleanest, healthiest, and best lit."[101] Such comments emphasized the inadequacy and primitive nature of the crooked, dark, and dirty streets that were said to characterize popular Paris at the same time as they established an opposition between the city of the middle classes and that of the people. Middle-class writers placed their popular characters within dark and crowded interiors—often described as dens or lairs—while at the same time expressing their own preference for open spaces. For another contributor to the 1834 collection, this preference for open spaces signaled the demise of the previously celebrated covered arcades, which many during the July Monarchy indicated had become hiding places for thieves and prostitutes. The covered arcades were thus destined for decline, this author wrote, because, "the street is conspiring against them. The street has become long and wide, flanked by covered doorways and adopted sidewalks. The street is saved."[102]

Those interested in urban space had, as early as the eighteenth century, emphasized the importance of facilitating circulation (of people, goods, and air) throughout the city as a means of creating a more healthy and prosperous society. Little was done toward this end during the Restoration; although a few streets were widened and some bridges were constructed, the most notable urban improvement during this time—the covered arcades—was designed to protect pedestrians from the circulation of vehicles. During the July Monarchy, however, attempts were made to facilitate the movement of both pedestrians and vehicles through the city. According to Vigier, five hundred royal ordinances were issued ordering the enlargement of streets in several central neighborhoods.[103] Notable improvements included the extension of the Rue Rambuteau, which served as a link between the western edge of the Marais and the Pointe Sainte Eustache, crossing through the Halles. Circulation was also made easier in the areas around Notre Dame, the Palais de Justice, and the Hôtel de Ville.

It is difficult to ascribe one single motivation to these changes in the urban

---

emptying out during the July Monarchy, as the rich moved to the northwest and the poor moved to the Left Bank of the Seine (*Paris, histoire d'une ville, XIXe–XXe siècle* [Paris, 1993], p. 50). David Harvey (n. 10 above) emphasizes the ideological nature of this concern with circulation, arguing that increased attention to this issue is indicative of the triumph of a capitalist mindset.

[101] Léon Gozlan, "Esquisse chorégraphique," in *Nouveau tableau de Paris* (n. 51 above), 1:133.

[102] Luchet, "Les Passages" (n. 57 above), 6:113.

[103] Vigier, p. 188.

landscape; rather, multiple factors probably influenced government authorities in making these renovations. The extension of the Rue Rambuteau was in part a response to petitions asking for a thoroughfare that could facilitate traffic in the area around the Halles.[104] The desire to improve middle-class mobility was thus one factor behind the renovations. At the same time, urban renewal targeted neighborhoods that had been centers of insurrection during the 1830 Revolution. All of the renovations mentioned above required, for their completion, the destruction of much working-class housing. Areas of dense population and old, dilapidated housing began to disappear from the center city during the July Monarchy, a process that would be accelerated during the Second Empire. The new wider and straighter streets rendered the city easier to defend, as potential insurgents would find it more difficult both to erect barricades and to hide from the forces of order once the "labyrinth" of small, narrow streets was gone from central Paris. Authorities furthermore justified the demolition of these neighborhoods, which had been hit hard by the cholera epidemic of 1832, as a necessary public health measure.[105] Finally, as David Van Zanten has argued, the renovations carried out by Prefect of the Seine Rambuteau also served to redefine, and reinforce, the "ceremonial topography of Paris."[106] The expansion of the Hôtel de Ville, which was to be attached to the Louvre by the Rue Louis-Philippe, as well as the construction of the column commemorating the July Revolution at the Bastille, extended and completed an axis of royal power in the capital that began on the Pont Neuf with the statue of Henri IV (replaced during the Restoration).[107]

Yet despite the monarchy's desire to celebrate itself, July Monarchy texts describing Paris paid virtually no attention to the royal cityscape. Rather, these texts emphasized middle-class mobility, in order to justify renovation and reiterate bourgeois mastery—both of physical space and of urban institutions. In discussions of the middle classes, physical mobility was perceived as a metaphor for both social mobility and economic growth. The author of a text from 1840 thus described the streets of Paris as "an anthill of men, swarms of men who are busy like ants, tireless like bees, moving rapidly in search of the myrrh and honey conventionally known as *money.*"[108] The endless quest for money and power drove the middle classes through the city; straight streets, unencumbered thoroughfares, and open spaces were perceived as facilitating their journey toward success. Popular mobility, in contrast, was, as we have

[104] Ibid.

[105] Marchand argues that the shock of the cholera epidemic was one of the main motivations behind such schemes (p. 39).

[106] David Van Zanten, *Building Paris: Architectural Institutions and the Transformation of the French Capital, 1830–1870* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 104.

[107] Ibid., p. 97.

[108] Niépovié (n. 62 above), p. 108.

seen, associated with disease, vice, and insurrection and was most frequently depicted as emanating from dark, enclosed, and "hidden" spaces.

This binary understanding of mobility and of the use and organization of urban space, strongly influenced by class-based anxiety, necessitated a dual approach to urban renovation, one that would take full shape during the Second Empire under Prefect of the Seine Haussmann and Napoleon III. This approach called for the eradication of the poorest neighborhoods and facilitation of bourgeois movement throughout the city. It also helps to explain the relative lack of interest, throughout the nineteenth century, in providing housing or transportation for the working population of Paris. Texts describing the city presented the "natural" habitat of the popular classes as one characterized by a lack of work-related mobility (they moved throughout the city only for criminal or insurrectional purposes), one whose topography was confusing because barely visible and not easily navigable and whose structures were overcrowded and unsanitary. As the working class moved to the outskirts of Paris during the July Monarchy and Second Empire, these assumptions meant that questions of public transport, public sanitation, urban layout, and the construction of housing were barely discussed. Thus, while wishing to rid the central city of such neighborhoods, bourgeois observers were uncertain—given their belief that the poor understood space differently than they did—about how alternative working-class neighborhoods might look.

This question became crucial following the Revolution of 1848, which was followed, in 1849, by another outbreak of cholera. The responses to this crisis seem to indicate that authorities wished to increase their ability to "see" into the dwellings of the poor. In July 1848, in an effort to encourage new construction in Paris, the Constituent Assembly passed a decree that offered, among other incentives, a ten-year exemption from the doors-and-windows tax. In 1850, the Melun Law was passed, which allowed public health officials unprecedented access to private dwellings in order to inspect, and order the repair of, unsanitary housing.[109] The passage of such legislation seems to imply, as Rémy Butler and Patrice Noisette have argued, that the bourgeoisie wanted to create workers' housing "in its own image."[110] Yet, as Ann-Louise Shapiro has significantly argued, officials of the Second Empire suffered from a "blind spot" when trying to come up with policies to house the poor.[111] Projects such as the Cité Napoléon, one of the rare working-class housing schemes supported by the imperial government, were criticized by reformers who feared that,

[109] Ann-Louise Shapiro, *Housing the Poor of Paris, 1850–1902* (Madison, Wis., 1985), pp. 16–17.

[110] Rémy Butler and Patrice Noisette, *Le logement social en France, 1815–1981: De la cité ouvrière au grand ensemble* (Paris, 1983), p. 50.

[111] Shapiro, p. 48.

despite creating housing that in many respects followed bourgeois spatial organization, workers' understanding of space would render these buildings dangerous. Louis-René Villermé, for example, feared that corridors and stairways would be conducive to "troublesome meetings" that could undermine morality and public safety.[112] Rather than proposing a continuum of public and private spaces—a characteristic of bourgeois apartment buildings—Villermé advocated the nearly complete isolation of one working-class family from another. At the same time, however, he concluded that creating better housing for the poor was ultimately impossible, since they were destined "to live in the least expensive lodgings, that is, in uncomfortable, insufficient, and largely unhealthy lodgings in run-down or badly kept buildings."[113] In the end, the Cité Napoléon housed the middle classes, while the working class—the poor, in particular—moved to the outskirts of Paris, where they lived in unsafe, unsanitary housing that was out of sight of the middle classes. The middle classes, convinced that the poor possessed a different relationship to urban space than they themselves did, were not surprised that the same conditions that characterized poor neighborhoods in the center of Paris were replicated in its outskirts.

Conclusion

In descriptions of Paris dating from the Empire and Restoration, public space and urban mobility reinforced a stable vision of society. Public spaces were presented in these texts as highly differentiated and reflective of socioeconomic status; each street had its particular character and fulfilled a clear role in the social order. Likewise, although mobility was not a dominant theme in these texts, writers who depicted movement tended to use it to reinforce social distinctions in a society presented as static and orderly. These guidebooks portrayed a stable city in which an approach to urban space shared by the middle and the popular classes seemed to make revolution impossible. After 1830, this vision of society held less currency. Authors of the literature on Paris and the Parisians, many of whom were excluded from the expanded suffrage, called for greater reform and freedom. These demands were transferred onto the cityscape via attention to streets and public spaces. At the same time, however, continued unrest, economic crisis, and repeated bouts of cholera gave rise to a growing sense of anxiety about the potential danger of the popular classes. A new vision of a segregated Paris thus emerged in these guidebooks. Instead of each segment of Paris coming together to form a united whole, the Paris of

[112] Louis-René Villermé, *Sur les cités ouvrières* (Paris, 1850), p. 8.
[113] Ibid., p. 19.

the July Monarchy was a city divided in two, a city whose populations were depicted as inherently different in their use of urban space. The renovation of Paris begun during the July Monarchy and continued during the Second Empire, although undertaken for a number of different reasons, was based on, and reinforced, this assumption that Paris was a city divided in two.

The belief that different social groups understood space differently, as significant as it was for the renovation of the urban landscape, had a wider import. The French middle classes used differences in the understanding of space not only to create a distinctive class identity but also to forge a distinctive national identity. Middle-class travelers to London, for example, remarked on what they considered to be an excessive privacy in the disposition of urban space. Such travelers were surprised by the prevalence of the single-family home as well as by the practice of limiting access to public gardens through the use of iron fences.[114] In commenting on his travels to Greece, in contrast, Edmond About remarked on the lack of private space in a country where men used the streets as "salon and bedroom."[115] Likewise, in traveling to Africa, members of the French middle class remarked on spatial distinctions. Travelers to Algiers during the Second Empire, for example, depicted the native heart of the city, the Casbah, in terms that were reminiscent of earlier descriptions of the Cité. Théophile Gautier thus remarked on a lack of windows in older Algerian homes, rendering them "blind," while Louise Vallory described the streets of old Algiers as "narrow, twisting, crossing, tangled, encumbered with blind alleys, with stairways, with arches thrown like bridges over a sewer."[116] This attention to the use and organization of space helped to forge a distinctive national identity, and, as in Paris, had implications for the organization of the urban environment. By the 1930s, colonial authorities increasingly responded to social and political unrest by instituting zoning regulations that resulted in a spatial segregation implemented along ethnic lines.[117] As the renovated Paris became a template for cities around the world, these attitudes toward, and techniques of, spatial differentiation were also widely adopted.

Perceptions of assumed differences in the use and organization of space

[114] Marcus (n. 10 above) discusses different approaches toward housing in Paris and London. See also Claire Hancock, "Your City Does Not Speak My Language: Cross-Channel Views of Paris and London in the Early Nineteenth Century," *Planning Perspectives* 12, no. 1 (1997): 1–18.

[115] Edmond About, *La Grèce contemporaine* (Paris, 1858), p. 401.

[116] Théophile Gautier, *Loin de Paris,* new ed. (Paris, 1914), pp. 35–36; Louise Vallory, *A l'aventure en Algerie* (Paris, 1863), p. 15 (Vallory's real name was Louise Mesnier).

[117] On the role of spatial distinctions in asserting French colonial authority, see Zeynep Çelik, *Urban Forms and Colonial Confrontations: Algiers under French Rule* (Berkeley, 1997); Wright (n. 15 above).

were thus built into the actual cityscape by the middle classes, a move that served to reinforce these assumptions while at the same time justifying inequalities in the distribution of power. These inequalities translated into unequal access to urban amenities and a diminished presence of groups defined as spatially deviant in the neighborhoods of the wealthy and powerful. With this change, the occasional appearance of a worker in middle-class Paris or an Algerian in the European city of Algiers became cause for suspicion and surveillance. While this situation no doubt created a sense of discomfort in the identified interloper, it reinforced, among members of the middle class in Paris or in the French population in Algiers, a sense of belonging that was rooted in the urban space they occupied. Perceptions regarding the use and organization of space thus became constituent categories of identity in the nineteenth century.

To borrow the words of Walter Benjamin, himself a great teller of stories about urban space, texts such as those examined in this article "insert in the real Paris, Paris, the city of dreams."[118] I have sought to demonstrate in this article that the complex relationship between these two versions of Paris—one real, one imagined—is a worthwhile area of investigation. The telling of "spatial stories" has serious implications for the formation of identity and the distribution of power. Space is more than a backdrop against which the narrative of history is played out; it is itself implicated in that narrative as a perceptual and ideological category.

[118] Walter Benjamin, *Paris, capitale du XIXe siècle: Le Livre des passages,* trans. Jean Lacoste, 3d ed. (Paris, 1997), p. 428.