**Imaged Places/Imagined Spaces in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Paris:
Deconstructing Early Photographs of the City
Reconstructing Popular Cultures**

Barrie M Ratcliffe

In our society sight is treated as the most reliable of all our senses. That ours is an ocular-centric culture is evidenced in the everyday aphorisms we use: "seeing is believing" and "I'll believe it when I see it." When we understand something we even say "I see" because sight is equated with comprehension and knowledge and those who have them possess 'insight' and 'vision' while the unfortunates who do not are 'shortsighted' and even 'blind'.[1] It may well be fitting, then, that images are our dominant form of communication. Their omnipresence in electronic and print media, in our lives, means that they do not merely 'mirror' our world (if that, indeed, is what they do) but that they contribute to its very making.

Many of these images are photographic. The camera, by virtue of its optical mechanism that appears to replicate what the human eye does and sees, is generally treated as a simple truth-revealing system. The camera's operator points, focuses and presses a button and thereby produces an apparently authorless text. As a consequence, photo-graphs enjoy the reputation of being unmediated copies of the real world:[2] "a picture, we say, is worth a thousand words." The standing they have and their ease of use mean they are omnipresent as testimony: in mug shots, as proof in courts of law, in social rituals.

---

[1]For a clear discussion of how and why we favour sight over other senses, see Anthony Synnott, *The Body Social. Symbolism, Self and Society* (London: Routledge, 1993), especially the chapter "Site: The Eye and I," 206-27.

[2]In a speech made in 1848 at a critical juncture in the emergence of photography in France, Alphonse de Lamartine put this viewpoint succinctly: "Is a reflection of a glass on paper an art? No, it is a sunbeam caught in the instant by a manoeuver." Cited 109 John Tagg, *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photography and Histories* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988).

Photographs also appear to preserve fragments from the past and bring them intact to the present; ever since the process was invented and quickly perfected in the mid-nineteenth century historians have been able to call upon an ever-richer corpus of images. They have usually paid them scant attention. And when they have used them, it has generally been in an ancillary role, subordinate to the written word, as images that illustrate, support or merely break up a text. This is as true of historians of the city as it is of their fellows. From the beginning, though, photographers attempted to capture the burgeoning city and its meaning.

If there were photographs of public spaces in mid-nineteenth-century Paris, which is the subject of this paper, and, above all, those where popular classes dominated, historians would be unusually grateful. And they would be because specialists of the French capital at this time have to confront a severe penury of documentation that is especially acute for the popular classes who made up seven in ten inhabitants. On the one hand, fires set at the end of the Paris Commune of 1871 consumed most of the documents held in different municipal archives and those words the usually voiceless uttered in the street and which were recorded in policemen's notebooks or stammered in court testimony and written down by clerks that scholars have overheard for other periods in this and other cities are not available.[3] On the other, in the absence of life stories or letters home from immigrants to the city, what has come down to us on popular classes is mainly the witness of elite observers who dared to speak about and down to them. The truth is that historians can be grateful because a contemporary photographer, Charles Marville, has bequeathed them a rich legacy of images of the French capital that he took during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. His corpus has singular advantages. The first is the extent of his legacy: he left over eight hundred photographs. The second is that he used the recently perfected wet collodion process on glass-plate negatives that yielded especially sharp images and which could be reproduced.[4] The third is that his

---

[3]As have Arlette Farge, L*a Vie fragile. Violence, pouvoirs et solidarités à Paris   au   XVIIIe   siècle* (Paris:Hachette,1986)   and   David   Garrioch, *Neighbourhood and Community in Paris 1740-1790* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

[4]In the space of just over a decade at the mid-century, photography underwent two technical revolutions. First the daguerreotype that had produced clear images but had disadvantages—long exposure times and images on silver plates that could not be reproduced—was supplanted by the callotype, a paper negative, less precise (though more atmospheric) but reproducible. Second, the callotype was successfully challenged in the early 1850s by the wet collodion method that Marville was to choose. Adopting a pharmaceutical product used

photographs departed from the dominant visual rhetoric of the time by not depicting picturesque topography and city monuments.   His images are, instead, a vast visual representation of the urban planning of Baron Haussmann and Napoleon III, the most ambitious refashioning of a city centre before the bombs of World War II and the bulldozers of the 1950s and 1960s devastated inner cities as never before.

This representation has three complementary parts, which confer both meaning and value on the whole. To begin with, he took pictures of the excavations for the new thoroughfares. Then Marville systematically photographed the achievements of Second-Empire planning.   He depicted the new street fixtures—street lamps, urinals and water fountains, omnibus shelters and newsstands. He showed the landscaping of the new city parks that urban planners believed would be the lungs of the city.   Above all, he tried to reveal the wide vistas opened up by the new rectilinear boulevards with their smooth road surfaces and the beginnings of those uniform facades that would elegantly line them.   He was unable to do so with complete success for all he could show was the preliminary stage-setting for what would be the spectacle of bourgeois Paris. The full emergence of this 'phantasmagoria' depended on mature trees, completed grand buildings and the installation of luxury cafés and shops.[5]

---

on bandages to help wounds heal, the new process had shorter exposure times and used chemicals that were relatively easy to mix. It still had drawbacks: the equipment, even with the introduction of the folding bellows-type camera in the 1860s, was bulky; the plates were fragile and, of course, it produced sun pictures. Not until the 1880s with the perfection of flexible film, simple cameras and the magnesium flash was photography again revolutionized.

[5]The phantasmagoria of the "looking-glass city" (Walter Benjamin), this first example of "theme-parking" in any great city, would soon be depicted with more success by other apologists. Many Impressionist paintings celebrated what Guy Deborde would call the society of spectacle, which T J Clarke (himself influenced by Deborde's concept) calls exercises in 'boulevard pastoral'. *The Painting of Modern Life.   Paris in the Art of Manet and his Followers* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1985) 75. Not all Impressionist works, though, were unambiguous paeans of ostentatious bourgeois parade. For example, Gustave Caillebotte's 1877 streetscape, "Paris Street; Rainy Day," depicts monotonous facades of buildings on a dreary rainy winter day where elegant self-absorbed figures under umbrellas pass each other without communicating or even making eye contact. Anne Distel et al., *Gustave Caillebottte: Urban Impressionist* (Paris: Musée d'Orsay, 1995).   I take the idea of Haussmannization as theme-parking from Trevor Boddy, "Underground and Overhead: Building the Analogous City," 123-53 in Michael Sorkin ed *Variations on a Theme Park. The New American City and the End of Public Space* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982).

These two elements of his work, however, are not what Marville is best remembered for: he also took photographs of all the streets that would disappear to make way for the new thoroughfares. These freeze-frames between what was and what would no longer be have forever fixed an image in our consciousness for he pointed his camera as a finger of accusation at streets that seemed the antithesis of what replaced them. Where boulevards were light, they were darkness. Where the ones offered wide panoramas, the others were visual culs-de-sac. Where the ones were smooth and wide, the others were uneven and tortuous. Where boulevards were the major solutions to supposed urban ills, old streets were their cause. It is these dark images of so-called old Paris streets—streets one contemporary observer likened to "the tortuous paths of insects in the heart of a piece of fruit"[6]—that have been most used by scholars. We should know, though, that they have usually[7] been uncritical, the assumption being that they simply reflect reality.

---

[6]Charles Merruau, *Souvenirs de l'Hôtel de Ville de Paris* (Paris: Plon, 1875) 350.

[7] The work of Marie de Thézy is the exception. See, above all, the introduction 9-39 to her *Marville Paris* (Paris: Hazan, 1994).

I argue that it is time to adopt a more critical approach to Marville's images and particularly to those of pre- Haussmann Paris. Scholars in other disciplines—in anthropology and in post-colonial theory, for example—have recently begun to adopt a literally iconoclastic approach to the use of photographs as evidence.[8] It is curious that historians have so far failed to apply a similarly critical apparatus to images to that they have to written texts.[9] In doing just that, I shall suggest, first of all, that his images do not mirror reality. I shall attempt, secondly, to go further. Much as I may have been influenced by critical approaches to cultural texts, I nevertheless remain sufficiently essentialist to believe there are realities behind our representations. I shall therefore peer beyond Marville's glass negatives and try to glimpse lived space in what at first seem the darkest and most impoverished of those streets destined for demolition. The area I have selected to scrutinize contains six contiguous streets on the densely populated and impoverished north side of the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève in the fifth arrondissement on the Left Bank—an area that in elite discourse and in Marville's images was emblematic of dilapidated, insanitary housing that gave mean asylum to the dangerous Other. See pages 100 to 105.

Examination of the photographs may produce three results. The first is a heightened awareness of both the importance and the danger of representations of the city and urban space, for they are everywhere, they are contested, they are deceptive.[10] The second is the realization that photographs of the city, photographs in general, are constructions and not the reflecting mirrors of reality we want them to be. The third and final benefit is that we learn that it is possible to lift just a corner of the veil of silence that hides the lived reality of those who have no first-person voice, whose identity was expropriated along with their streets and whose memory was erased when the buildings where they lived were demolished.

---

[8]Elizabeth Edwards, ed, *Anthropology and Photographs 1860-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994) and Jon Wagner ed, *Images of Information. Still Photography in the Social Sciences* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979).

[9]There are some exceptions to this. For two examples, see the thematic 1989 number of the *Journal of Urban History* and Peter B Hales, *Silver Cities: The Photography of American Urbanization, 1839-1915*

[10]There are those who have gone even further and claimed—for polemic purposes, I believe—that the city is *only* representation. See, for instance, James Donald, "Metropolis: The City as Text," in Robert Bocock and Kenneth Thompson eds, *Social and Cultural Forms of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992) 422.

Demolishing Streets; Deconstructing Images

The testimonial and factual authority that Marville's photographs of pre-Haussmann streets enjoy status not available for any written text derives from their apparent empirical link to reality. To show that his images are not innocent and to suggest that our reactions to them colour how we view them, I shall develop two arguments. The one is that, though in common parlance we say photographs are taken, they are actually made. I shall try to show, then, that his images are artful constructions, that Marville does not merely transcribe but inscribes, that he does not only record but writes. The other is that, if our eyes do not deceive us when we look at his images, our mind's eye may well do so. I shall attempt to indicate that we view images through schemas we have learned and which influence what we think we see.   There   are,   I believe, three viewing strategies that will allow us to discover how and why his images are coded. The first is to look critically at his photographs. We can look at the most obvious surface level and see the narrow irregular streets, the uneven facades of the buildings that line them. We can go further to look for what they reveal without meaning to: Marville intended to show stasis and decrepitude but there are still traces of life in the handcarts in the street and the flowerpots and curtains at windows.[11] We can go still further by asking ourselves what they erase. As in any text, of course, what is absent may well be as revealing as what is present. His images necessarily leave out what photographs cannot capture, the forces that underlay the uses to which streets and buildings were put: the dynamics of urban change, the housing market, landlords.[12] More obviously and hauntingly absent, though, are the popular classes who inhabited them.   Marville only photographed nature-morte, urban space without city life.[13]   There are two feasible explanations for this erasure.   One is that it was not in his commission—as we'll note, he worked for the City—to represent life but

---

[11]Walter Benjamin rightly pointed out that film focuses our attention on the hidden details of familiar objects and allows us to notice things that we would not do otherwise. See the discussion of this in Michael J Dear, *The Postmodern Urban Condition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000) 178.

[12]This is why Manuel Castells long ago rejected ecologism, the emphasis on spatial form, as an ideological red herring: the real problems in the capitalist system lay elsewhere. *The Urban Question* (London: Arnold, 1977) 73.

[13]Marie de Thézy, *Marville Paris* 33 insists that people are more present in his images than we believe. I do not accept that they are: instead of pullulating streets he merely included the odd figure that served only to indicate scale.

only the streets condemned to disappear. The second is that the insensitivity of the wet collodion chemicals he used meant exposure times were too long to fix movement and some of this photographs show moving people only as vaporous trails across parts of the image. We cannot determine whether either or any of these reasons fully explain the eerie emptiness of his images, but it should be noted that others at the time used shorter exposures and photographed street life.[14]   It should also be noted that, with the exception of images of street trades in a long picturesque tradition, elites at this time did not represent popular classes in lithographs[15] or photographs[16] and that this absence was symptomatic

[14]I am not referring to Charles Nègre's famous callotype of little chimney sweeps "Ramoneurs en marche," 1851, which seems to depict motion, because they were posed and the photographs touched up with pencil to enhance the illusion. James Borcoman, *Charles Nègre, 1820-1880* (Ottawa: National Gallery of Canada, 1976)   25-7.   Rather, I am thinking of Adolphe Braun's images of Paris streets in the early 1860s that caught movement by using shorter exposure times. Thomas Annan's 1868 photographs of condemned alleys and closes in Glasgow also included residents: only two of his twenty-eight pictures do not have either people posing or lines of washing. Thomas Annan, *Photographs of the Old Closes and Streets of Glasgow 1868-1877 with a Supplement of 15 Related Views with a New Introduction by Anita Ventura Mozley* (New York: Dover Publications, 1977) 1st edition (with 40 photos, 1877-1879; second edition 1900).

[15] Those who gained a living on the streets of Paris by selling and performing, cleaning and gleaning, had frequently been depicted. Vincent Milliot, "Le travail sans le geste.   Les représentations iconographiques des petits métiers parisiens. (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles)." *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 41(1994): 5-28.   Even Jules Vallès, who invented the term "rualism" for the realism he sought to achieve in his written depictions of Paris streets during and after the Second Empire, still only noticed the street performers and traders.   Roger Bellet, "Rue de Paris et Tableau de Paris, vieux Paris et Paris révolutionnaire chez Jules Vellès," 138-9 in Roger Bellet ed, *Paris au XIXe siècle: aspects d'un mythe littéraire* (Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon, 1984).   Even when on rare occasions Impressionists depicted popular classes in urban spaces, they continued this picturesque tradition. Thus Manet painted his street singer and rag picker.   Robert L Herbert, *Impressionism.   Art, Leisure, and Parisian Society* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988) 62-5.

[16]André Rouillé has shown that photographers during the Second Empire paid scant attention to popular classes.   "Les images photographiques du monde du travail sous le Second Empire," *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 54(1984): 31-44. It may be, as Peter B Hales has argued (*Silver Cities* 213) that the breakthrough in photographic representations of popular classes and the urban poor took place in the 1880s when Jacob Riis took his camera and the new-fangled magnesium flash inside New York tenements and published his *How the Other Half Lives.   Studies among the Tenements of New*

of indifference to the fate of those who were expelled from the old streets when they were demolished and for whom, of course, no provision for relocation was either made or contemplated.

York (New York: Dover, 1971, original edition 1890). His title is significant: it signals his readers were with him on his side of the camera while the poor were the objectified other.

It is when we adopt a second viewing stance and actually go behind Marville's camera, however, that we can best determine the meaning[17] of his images: they are not meant as nostalgic reminders of what once had been. They are supports for urban planning.[18] Two kinds of evidence can be adduced to support this contention.   External evidence suggests that his task was to justify demolitions. He seems to have had several commissions from the city from 1858 onwards and this was one of them.[19]   Marville's pictures, indeed, were intended to be records to show that nothing of value was lost.   Internal evidence is even more conclusive. The frame and viewpoint adopted for each photograph was always the same: the nameplate of the street is always shown. He made his photographs very early in the morning before the streets came to life and was thus the better able to depict the urban space that deserved to be razed. He also appears to have taken his pictures immediately before the streets were expropriated and torn down.   Most of all, though, his images are artful.[20]   His choice of time of day meant the sun's rays were

---

[17] This does not mean that such representations of the old were inconceivable at the time. Baron Isidore Taylor and Charles Nodier's attempt to show the value of medieval buildings, many of which were in disrepair led to the publication of three thousand lithographs in their multi-volume *Voyages pittoresques et romantiques dans l'ancienne France* (Paris: Didot, 1820-78, 23 vols.).   Similarly, there was a well-established tradition of picturesque images of Parisian buildings, of which Adolphe-Martial Potémon's *Ancien Paris*, three folio volumes of lithographs issued 1843-1866, is perhaps the most representative and memorable.   It may also be that Henri Le Secq's photographs of demolitions for the rue de Rivoli in the early 1850s were nostalgic images of buildings about to disappear. Such is the argument of Eugenia Parry Janis, "Demolition picturesque: Photographs of Paris in 1852 and 1853 by Henri Le Secq," 33-66 in Peter Walch and Thomas F Barrow eds, *Perspectives on Photography* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986).

[18] Other photographers were also hired at this time to provide visual propaganda for modernism. For examples, see Philippe Néagu and François Heilbrun, "Etude: Baldus, paysages, architectures," *Photographies* 1 (1983): 53-77 and Elizabeth Anne McCauley, *Industrial Madness. Commercial Photography in Paris, 1848-1871* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994) chapter V, "Collard, the Machine, and the Modern," 195-232.

[19]Marie de Thézy has found that in 1858 he had been given a contract to photograph the Bois de Boulogne and suggests that in 1865 he was probably asked to make a photographic record of streets slated to disappear.

[20]It is not surprising that his are artful photographs. It has recently been discovered that from the 1830s down to 1851, when he took up callotype photography, Marville had been an illustrator for books and journals and that he produced atmospheric callotypes in the early 1850s. Constance Hungerford, "Charles Marville, Popular Illustrator: The Origins of a Photographic Sensibility,"

low and struck buildings at an angle, thereby bringing out the unevenness of their facades. The lack of light emphasized a threatening darkness. His adoption of a low camera angle accentuated the height of the houses, the narrowness of the street and the irregularity of cobblestones with their insalubrious rivulets of surface water. His adoption of an off-centre viewpoint, finally, allowed him to suggest that these streets led nowhere and constituted a hindrance to circulation. His images, then, were the visual expropriation that preceded, and helped justify, the destruction of old streets.

History of Photography (1985): 227-46. Rather viciously but not inaccurately, Baudelaire, who lamented his contemporaries' fascination with photography, pointed out that photography was "le refuge de tous les peintres manqués, trop mal doués et trop paresseux pour achever leurs études." "Salon de 1859: le public moderne et la photographie" (September 1860), *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976-1980 2 vols) II   614-19.

As with any cultural artifact, however, his images of pre-Haussmann streets only acquire full meaning when they are viewed—and this is the third strategy—as they were intended to be: in the context of wider beliefs and knowledge systems at the time. In the decades before Marville pointed his camera at streets doomed to disappear, elite discussion of the high-density city centre and its inhabitants intensified and in two ways.

  Firstly, expressions of concern about the habitat and habits of the poorest strata of the popular classes became more frequent. Emerging disciplines—hygienics, statistics, criminol-ogy—conferred greater credibility on arguments that densely populated low-quality housing had a dangerously deleterious impact not only on the health but also on the comportment of those who lived there. These arguments, indeed, were taken up by journalists and novelists who self-consciously went exploring the alien distant lands that crowded city centres were now believed to be.[21] Second, the dominant medical theory on the propagation of disease put even greater emphasis on environmental factors than before, while the gathering and publication of social statistics revealed differential mortality[22] and seemed to show that those who were forced to live in areas of dilapidated housing were indeed the improvident and intemperate, those whom Haussmann termed 'nomads,' who were then further demoralized by conditions in the dark and dank tenements.[23] In

---

[21]The mid-century witnessed the flowering of the mysteries novel: Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris* had its counterpart across the Channel in GWM Reynolds' *the Mysteries of London*. Anne Humphreys' "Generic Strands and Urban Twists: The Victorian Mysteries Novel," *Victorian Studies* 34 (1991): 455-72. The most sustained use of the trope of exploration of foreign lands in journalist descriptions of urban poverty, of course, was Henry Mayhew's descriptions of London street trades, *London Labour and the London Poor* (London: Griffin, Bohn and Company, 3 vols, 1861 edition): in his preface he referred to himself as a "traveler in the undiscovered country of the poor." Others in Paris, London and elsewhere used the same metaphor. Deborah Epstein Nord, "The Social Explorer as Anthropologist: Victorian Travellers among the Urban Poor," 122-34 in William Sharpe and Leonard Wallock eds, *Visions of the Modern City* (Baltimore:Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

[22]Each of the first three cholera epidemics to strike Paris, those of 1832, 1849 and 1865, yielded statistical publications as part of a determined, if unsuccessful, effort by medical practitioners to understand the etiology of the disease.

[23]The British physician, Hector Gavin, put contemporary views well when he described the inhabitants of tenements in Bethnal Green in London's East End as people who "always supply our courts with criminals, our gaols with convicts, our charities with paupers, and hospitals with the sick and diseased; and [who] impoverish the honest, labouring poor by the heavy poor-rates to which they give rise." *Sanitary Ramblings, being Sketches and Illustrations of Bethnal Green, a*

this discursive rebuilding of old streets as dangerous for the health and behaviour of their impoverished inhabitants and just as importantly, for the future of the city, Marville's images acted as visual evidence.

Type of the Condition of the Metropolis and other Large Towns (London: Cass, 1971 edition), 43. LF Benoiston de Chateauneuf put it just as cogently in his 1834 report on the cholera epidemic that had struck Paris two years earlier: "Placée dans l'échelle sociale au degree le plus bas, cette classe incessamment créée dans nos villes populeuses et manufacturières par les revers de l'industrie, les fautes de l'imprévoyance, les désordres de l'inconduite, cette classe n'est nulle part plus nombreuse qu'à Paris, où elle s'augmente encore de la foule de gens sans aveu qu'y attire sans cesse l'appât d'un gain quelconque. Sans domicile fixe, sans travail assuré, cette classe, qui n'a rien en propre que sa misère et ses vices, après avoir erré le jour sur la voie publique, se retire pendant la nuit dans les maisons garnies des différents quartiers de la capitale..." *Rapport sur la marche et les effets du choléra morbus dans Paris* (Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1834), 191-2.

If we are fully to realize that these are more constructions than mirrors of reality, we also need to bear in mind not only that these are views from the outside but two further points. The one is that, try as they might, elites were unable to prove the validity of their claims either in the case of the link between the environment and disease or in that of the impact of living conditions on comportment. The dominant medical theory at the time that attributed the origin of disease to miasmas—tiny particles that emanated from putrefying matter and stagnant water and entered the body through the respiratory system—could not be proved with the tools they had available and was, in any case, erroneous.[24] The same was true of their arguments on behaviour. Then, as at other times, available data on deviance and welfare dependence, which they took to be indices of disarray, were not full enough and their analytical methods not sufficiently sophisticated to allow them to produce unambiguous results.

---

[24] Anyone who has read the medical topographies, the reports on epidemics, or leading hospital physicians' case notebooks, can only admire the unrelenting effort to understand. They failed to do so. Historians, however, have only done marginally better. As a consequence, the reality of excessive urban mortality is still not clear (and Jacques Dupâquier, "La surmortalité urbaine" *Annales de démographie historique* (1990): 7-11 has queried its extent). Nor are the causes of differential mortality: was it the result of the environment or of a combination of factors that also include exhaustion from work and malnutrition? We do not even know whether immigrants were more vulnerable to ambient diseases in the city or whether they arrived young and healthy and with resilience. What is clear, though, is that when major declines in death rates did take place in Paris in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, falls in infant mortality were chiefly responsible. The weight of opinion is that this fall resulted more from recourse to maternal breast-feeding and the sterilization of milk and bottles than from sanitary improvements. For a brief discussion, see Alain Faure, "Migrations intérieures et villes dans la France du XIXe siècle," *Historiens et géographes* 338(1992): 151-60. For an analysis of factors behind infant mortality declines, see R I Woods, P A Waterson and J H Woodward, "The Causes of Rapid Infant Mortality Decline in England and Wales, 1861-1921," *Population Studies* 42(1988): 343-66 and 43(1989) 113-32.

The other point is   perhaps even more important: elite discourse on the Other reflected less changes in areas of high-density, low-cost housing and their inhabitants-although the population of Paris doubled between 1831 and 1861—than changing attitudes amongst elites themselves.[25]   Those who stigmatize the Other are invisible behind their words and camera and they claim their views are both commonsensical and universal. We have learned, however, that in discussing the Other those who speak cannot help but reveal as much—maybe more—about themselves as about the ostensible objects of their discourse.[26]   Thus, the dark shadow they believed was cast by overcrowded tenements on old streets was, in part, a metaphor for the Revolution, insurrections and barricades they had endured and feared might well recur, especially if the residual residents of these buildings were further demoralized and went on to contaminate other groups above them in the popular classes. Similarly, worries about disease were partly concerns that epidemics would spill over into more prosperous parts of the city: recent cholera epidemics had revealed not just the impossibility of preventing them, but the difficulty of containing them within the areas of highest mortality. Most of all, however, discussions of the Other reflected the growing cultural distance between elites and the rest of the population, a gap opened up by elites rather than popular classes. Elites reinforced their own identity and feelings of self-worth through recourse to the technique of symbolic inversion: those who lived in areas of high-density, low-cost housing were their antithesis: where elites had high moral standards, self-discipline and rational behaviour, the Other was hedonistic, undisciplined and irresponsible.[27]   At the same time, their own identities and attitudes were

---

[25]There is *prima facie* support for this in parallel developments in London. Donald Olsen has argued that there occurred a 'crisis of conscience' there in the second quarter of the nineteenth century when elite observers came to view the city as 'dirty and deadly' and that this perception was not justified by changes in the urban environment itself. See his "Introduction: Victorian London" in David Owen, *The Government of Victorian London, 1855-1889* (Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1982) 10-12.

[26]Referring to mutual glances between individuals, but his comments can be applied to the gaze of elites, Georg Simmel wrote in 1921: "By the glance which reveals the other, one discloses oneself. By the same act in which the observer seeks to know the observed, one surrenders oneself to be understood by the observed. The eye cannot take unless at the same time it gives." Cited in Anthony Synnott, *The Body Social 2.*

[27] Peter Stallybrass and Allun White *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London: Methuen, 1986) 128) have pointed out, though, that attitudes to the Other were ambiguous: elite observers were at once repelled and yet fascinated by the Other. Charles Dickens, whose imagination was

also changing.   What has recently been called privatism[28]—the emphasis on the home as a refuge from a dangerous public world, including city streets,[29] and its corollary, the concern for disciplined public presentation of self— also had an impact on elite attitudes to old streets.   As did the greater concern they now felt about personal hygiene[30] and smells.[31]

Marville's photographs are not innocent but artful, then, and are a constituent element in the elite imposition of identities on old streets and those who frequent them.   One further deconstruction needs to be carried out before we put these images aside and we can look afresh at our corner of the French capital: we need to be aware of the grids of meaning we ourselves have learned and might well apply when we view his images.   We should remember that we constitute a different viewing community out of Marville's time frame. Why is this obvious point important enough for me to make it? For two reasons. One is that a

---

stimulated by regular visits to areas of poverty in London, liked to talk about "the attraction of repulsion."

[28]Lyn H Lofland, *The Public Realm: Exploring the City's Quintessential Social Territory* (Hawthorne, N Y: Aldine de Gruyter, 1998) 143-4.

[29]For a stimulating discussion of this thinking about streets as being both utopian and problematic, see Anthony Vidler, "The Scenes of the Street: Transformation in Ideal and Reality, 1750-1871," 29-111 in Stanford Anderson ed, *On Streets* (Cambridge MA: M I T Press, 1986 edition).

[30]Elite attitudes to hygiene have recently fascinated scholars almost as much as cleanliness did nineteenth-century elites themselves.   See, *inter alia*, Jean-Pierre Goubert, *La Conquête de l'eau. L'avènement de la santé à l'âge industriel* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1986) and Georges Vigarello, *Le Propre et le sale. L'hygiène du corps depuis le Moyen-Age* (Paris: Le Seuil, 1984).

[31]It has been argued that, because of fears of popular insurrection and burgeoning cities, there was a transitory lowering of thresholds of the elite's olfactory sensibility from the later eighteenth until around the mid-nineteenth century.   David Howes and Marc Lalonde, "The History of Sensibilities: Of the Standard of Taste in Mid-eighteenth-Century England and the Circulation of Smells in Post-Revolutionary France," *Dialectical Anthropology* 16(1992): 125-135 and David Howes, "Olfaction and Transition: An Essay on the Ritual Use of Smell," *Revue canadienne de sociologie et d'anthropologie* 24 (1987): 398-416. See also Alain Corbin, "Histoire et anthropologie sensorielle," *Anthropologie et societés* 14 (1990): 13-24 and idem, *Le Miasme et la jonquille. L'odorat et l'imaginaire social, XVIIIe-XIXe siècles* (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1982).   Smell still acts as a powerful symbolic weapon for creating and enforcing ethnic and class boundaries. In a well-known phrase, the middle-class George Orwell wrote that "the real secret of class distinction ... is summed up in four frightful words ... The lower classes smell." *The Road to Wigan Pier* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1937) 159-60.

photograph is a still but reactions to it are mobile. With its limited narrative power, it invites us to use our imaginations and no photographer can control reactions to his work.[32] This being so there may well be multiple readings of the same image, readings that vary according to a viewer's gender, age, or ideology.[33] Thus, for example, at a time when many contemporaries feel a sense of loss of community, of buildings, from city-centre demolitions, the very stillness of Marville's images of deserted streets may well stimulate feelings of nostalgia, where longing is all that remains of belonging. Or we might see those streets as old and quaint, invitations for gentrification, redevelopment and recolonization by the well-off, where longing becomes only the desire for belongings.

---

[32]Discussing nineteenth-century travel Joan M Schwartz has appositely put the point: "photographs were an agent of sight but they were also a site of agency in that they promoted the imagining and conceptualization of space and landscape." "The Geography Lesson: Photographs and the Construction of Imaginative Geographies," *Journal of Historical Geography* 22 (1996): 16-45.

[33]This is true for pictures in general and, of course, for images of cities. "The image of the city does not float above the oppositional nature of society nor exist alone in the minds of some elite few, it belongs at the level of group interaction and as a banner in the fight between contending social interests, as some visions of what society might be rather than what it has become." Mark Gottdiener, "Culture, Ideology, and the Sign of the City," 202-18 in Mark Gottdiener and Alexandros Logopoulos eds, *The City and the Sign: An Introduction to Urban Semiotics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

This leads to the second, perhaps more weighty, consideration. Our imaginations do not have entirely free reign because we view photographs through learned schemas. As one scholar long ago reminded us: "we only see what we know or at least what we can integrate into a coherent system." [34]   It may well be, then, that the aphorism "seeing is believing" should read "believing is seeing". We therefore need to be aware of these taken-for-granted schemas. [35]   Let me give just two examples of how the schemas we live with might influence how we react to Marville's photographs. One is how we view streets today, which we usually do, of course, from the relative comfort and safety of an automobile. We are encouraged to see them as thoroughfares to move along [36] rather than as spaces to linger in because they are a locus for sociability. We are likely to regard them as potentially dangerous, more jungles than theatres, a promiscuous mix of the pure and impure, respectable and disrespectful, bourgeois and bums. We are likely to do so not just because of the long tradition of opposition to public space in Western discourse on the city but also because recent cultural and technological changes have transformed many activities that used to be public into private ones. A second example is the words we have inherited to describe city-centre areas of high-density, low-cost housing and those who dwell there. These are frequently terms that come down to us loaded with accumulated meaning and which help construct rather than merely define reality. [37]   They need little rehearsing

---

[34]On ne voit que ce que l'on connaît on du moins ce que l'on peut intégrer à un système cohérent." Pierre Francastel, *Etudes de sociologie d'art* (Paris: Denoël,1970) 60. Marx's famous comment on how we make history may be applied to how we interpret images. We do not do so "under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all dead generations weighs like an Alp on the brains of the living." *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon,* 1850,
chapter I.

[35]Questioning what appears to us to be obviously true has been a major thrust of some of the most interesting recent work in the social sciences. Raul Rabinow's challenge to us "to anthropologize the Westto show how exotic [its] constitution of reality has been " has been heeded. "Representations are Social Facts. Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology," 234-61 in James Clifford and George Marcus eds, *Writing Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

[36]"The Street Level," Richard Sennett noted a quarter of a century ago," is a dead space ... It is only a means of passage to the interior." *Fall of Public Man* (New York: Knopf, 1977) 12-15.

[37]Knowledge is language.   Derrida has even argued that language uses its

for us to realize that they are much more than merely descriptive: slums[38] and ghettoes,[39] tenements and flophouses, lumpenproletariat and urban underclass.   A crucial step in reviewing Marville's images, then, may well be, as Paul Valéry said of looking at Degas, "to forget the names of the things we see."[40]

---

speakers rather than the other way round—as we like to suppose—and that we are the servants rather than the masters of our metaphors.   As the editors point out on 50 in their introduction to William Sharpe and Leonard Wallock eds, *Visions of the Modern City* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

[38] A recent instance of a loaded definition is that given by the British geographer R J Johnston, who, after describing a 'slum' as low-cost, dilapidated housing, adds: "The term usually implies both a poverty-ridden population, an unhealthy environment, and a district rife with crime and vice" *Dictionary of Human Geography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[39] Philippe Genestier, "Eloge du ghetto, stéréotypes et termes repoussoirs de la pensée urbanistique," *Villes en parallèle* 15-16 (1990):   313-29, has made a first deconstruction of the term   'ghetto' while Yankel Fijalkow has shown how the term 'îlot insalubre' was constructed by elite observers in his aptly titled *La Construction des îlots insalubres.   Paris 1850-1945* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1998).

[40] Cited François Laplantine, *La Description ethnographique* (Paris: Nathan, 1996) 28.

The trouble is, of course, that loaded terms do not stand alone: they are the bricks and mortar of long-standing constructions of life in poor urban areas.   If we are to search for the lived reality of the north side of the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève, our compass will better lead us to the true north—which I'll argue, of course, is strong and free—if we realize that in recent decades research on the city in the past and in the present has successfully challenged long-standing paradigms on crowded city centres and those who live there. This does not mean —for such is not the nature of academic disciplines—that some grand new consensus has emerged. It does signify, though, that we have come out from under the shadow of the miserabilist discourse that long dominated thinking.[41] It invites us to reexamine all three facets of inner-city living: the nature of high-density, low-cost areas; living conditions in unsanitary tenements and shanties; the people there.   As for so-called slums and shantytowns, we have come to realize three things. One is that the ecological thesis, that habitations shape the habits of those who inhabit them, that urban form forms and sometimes deforms us, is too simplistic, for even the severely disadvantaged have a greater capacity to mold their own lives than once was supposed. Second, research on present-day shantytowns and on so-called slums in the past has suggested that rather than being symptoms of failure, they may well be signs of success, evidence of dynamic urban growth, and be robust economies and communities in themselves. It has further shown, thirdly, that such areas offer advantages to those who live there: intelligence on employment, re-tailing adapted to their budgets and needs and the inexpensive housing that temporary migrants, for instance, want because their strategy is not to settle in the city but to use it to accumulate savings albeit usually modest ones. Many of those who live in these areas, then, choose to be there rather than being constrained to do so.

---

[41]Just as early anthropologists working during the colonial period attempted to show that so-called primitive societies were complex and their inhabitants orderly and sensible, so some urban anthropologists have attempted to defend those who live in shantytowns and dilapidated city centres in a similarly missionary manner.   Whatever the legitimacy of such endeavours, there is a danger in them that we forget the wider processes that the disadvantaged cannot control and that some of them do not survive. For reminders of this see Lisa Redfield Peattie and Edward Robbins, "Anthropological Approaches to the City,"   83-95 in Lloyd Rodwin and Robert M Hollister eds, *Cities of the Mind: Images and Themes of the City in the Social Sciences* (New York: Plenum, 1984) and J Squires, "Ordering the City: Public Spaces and Political Participation,"   89 in John Weeks ed, *The Lesser Evil and the Greater Good: The Theory and Politics of Social Diversity* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1994).

We might also rethink overcrowding,[42] dirt and odours, not to deny these existed but to indicate that most of the criticisms of conditions have come from outsiders, handkerchiefs resolutely pressed to noses, anxiously peering in rather than from those actually living inside. We might further bear in mind that nothing is more difficult than to divest ourselves of our ethnocentrism, our belief that our attitudes to smells and dirt are universal. They are, in fact, cultural rather than natural.[43]   There is no reason to believe, for example, that the habitus or olfactory regimes of popular classes in Paris in the mid-nineteenth century had changed and every reason to suspect that immigrants to the city came from living conditions that had prepared them to regard cramped living, odours and vermin as an inevitable part of daily life.[44] Indeed, elite observers, who confused popular-class sleeping space with living space, when the latter also embraced stairwells and courtyards, taverns and streets, were constantly astonished to discover that those living in confined and insalubrious quarters were not actually unhappy to do so.[45]

---

[42]It should be said that research on the effect of high density on morbidity, mortality and crime rates questions whether these alone have an impact. S Kirmeyer, "Urban Density and Pathology: A Review of Research," *Environment and Behavior* 10(1978): 247-69.

[43]For an illustration of just how difficult it is to divest ourselves of our taboos about dirt and smells, see the testimony of a stone-cutter's daughter and conditions on a small island off the coast of Sweden at the turn of the twentieth century and the researchers' reaction to her account in Jonas Frykman and Orvar Löfgren, eds *Force of Habit: Exploring Everyday Culture* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1996)   158-63.

[44]Alain Corbin has given us a chilling description of living conditions in the Limousin—which sent so many temporary migrants to Paris—in his *Archaïsme et modernité au Limousin au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Rivière, 1975).

[45]In an 1851 report on the sanitary condition of the twelfth arrondissement (ancien), the author, after claiming that residents seemed to take pleasure in making insalubrious conditions worse (because, he said, of their ignorance of the true principles of hygiene) added: "Et, ce qui est triste de constater, c'est l'espèce d'orgueil que ces malheureux mettent dans leur abjection; ils semblent heureux de la vie qu'ils se sont faite en dehors de toutes les lois de la société; on les mettrait dans un palais qu'ils en feraient bientôt un repaire aussi affreux, aussi pestilentiel, que celui où ils sont nés et où ils veulent mourir; aucun raisonnement ne peut les convaincre, aucun conseil ne peut les toucher. Le temps et de bonnes institutions pourront seuls corriger ces natures viciées dès le berceau" Commission des logements insalubres, *Rapport général des travaux de la Commission pendant l'année 1851* (Paris: 1852) *Archives de la Préfecture de police*. The attitude that is reported may be more important than the interpretation of it. As so often, any upward contempt residents might well have felt for their visitors is not reported. For the possible importance of this, see

William Ian Miller, *The Anatomy of Disgust* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997) Chapter IX,   206-34.

Scholars have also been reconsidering—and this is the third and final aspect of recent work on the high-density, low-cost housing areas—their supposedly dysfunctional denizens, those whom John Bright, the English Radical, called in a redolent term "the residuum." We have come to realize that many—though not all—of those who lived and live there are immigrants, usually temporary ones.   Recent experience[46] and research invites us, then, to look again at those for whom we have inherited significantly denigrating terms: a 'floating' population, doing 'casual' labour often in the 'informal' sector of urban economies. They do so by reminding us that, though too often they elude the bureaucrats' statistical nets and we underestimate their numerical importance, temporary migrants have played and continue to play an important role in urban economies.[47] Research also does so by indicating that much of the history of migration flows to cities has been written from the urban perspective which takes for granted that those who move to cities do so because they want to relocate there, to 'assimilate' as the word has it, and that those who obstinately keep their cultures and eventually leave the city, who have 'low persistency rates' in the parlance of migration studies, are necessarily failed immigrants.[48]   If, however, we reverse the

---

[46]The recent decline of city-centre economies in some US cities and the poor—usually Afro-Americans—marooned there suggests *a contrario* that the dynamism of city centres in the past acted as a magnet.

[47]We know how important unskilled immigrants have been in Western economies since World War II, for example. Stephen Castles and Godula Kusack, *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985 edition). In mid-nineteenth-century Marseille, 10% of the population was made up of foreigners and especially Italians, most of whom were unskilled labourers so needed by the city's port and expanding economy. Renée Lopez and Emile Termine, *Histoire des migrations à Marseille* (Aix-en-Provence: Edisud, 1990) II, 10-35 and 181-86. For a general discussion on the role of the unskilled migrants, see the editors' introduction 9-38 in Jan and Leo Lucassen eds, *Migration, Migration History: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997). Evidence from urban economies in the so-called third World suggests the importance there of the informal sector. (It is estimated that at least half the workforce in Jakarta, for instance, is in the informal sector. Alison J Murray, *No Money, No Honey: A Study of Street Traders and Prostitutes in Jakarta* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1991) 20-1. It is likely that such occupations played a more important role in nineteenth-century urban economies. Alejandro Portes, "The Informal Economy and its Paradoxes," 426-49 in Neil J Smelser and Richard Swedberg eds, *The Handbook of Economic Sociology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) discusses the difficulties of defining and measuring the informal economy.

[48]The long tradition of temporary migration from the Massif central to Paris,

viewpoint to adopt that of temporary migrants, we understand better that much movement to and from cities—and across frontiers and oceans[49]—has been about resisting rather than embracing modernism, about profiting from economic opportunities and returning home, about putting up with jobs others might shun because their feelings of self-worth are not affected,[50] tolerating crowded conditions because saving is the critical migration strategy.[51] The corollary of this, of course, is that we are now more willing than we used to be to accord more inner-city and shantytown residents a greater capacity to cope, though not to believe that they therefore had the possibility of upward social mobility or even of always successfully combating cyclical fluctuations or shifts in the demand for labour. This capacity resulted in part because much migration is a network-creating and network-dependent process, generating webs of contacts that provide job information—and even employment niches for immigrant groups—lodging and the support of collective identity. It also came from the coping strategies we know many adopt to deal with quotidian problems and temporary difficulties.[52]

---

however, has been examined by several scholars. These migrants long resisted the call to settle permanently in the capital and were proud to do so. In January 1883 the editor of their journal in Paris, *L'Auvergnat*, trumpeted: "Oui, mes amis parisiens nous sommes des Auvergnats et soyez persuadés que nous ne voulons jamais être autre chose que des Auvergnats … vous ne serez jamais que des Parisiens; c'est à l'hôpital que vous irez mourir tandis que nous autres nous finirons tranquillement nos jours à l'ombre du vieil arbre qui abrita nos jours d'enfance … " Reproduced in Roger Girard, *Journal d'un Auvergnat à Paris (1882-1982).   Les fondations (1882-1907)* (Paris: Fayard, 1982)   26-7.

[49]Witness how many Italians went to the United States at the turn of the twentieth century and returned home again: they had not intended to stay. Mark Wyman, *Round-Trip America: The Immigrants Return to Europe, 1880-1930* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).   Similarly, it has been found that only one-third of Mexican immigrants who had been in Los Angeles in 1917-18 were still there ten years later.   Ricardo Romo, *East Los Angeles: History of a Barrio* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983) 124-8.

[50]This point is forcefully made by Michael J Piore, *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labour and Industrial Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)   54.

[51]I am aware that my brief comments necessarily elide a series of controversial and important issues in migration history: push-and-pull factors, sensitivity of migration flows to economic opportunity, the self-selectivity of flows, the impact on salary levels, crowding-out of native-born in lower paid employments. These questions, though, do not alter the point being made here.

[52]Enzo Mingione, "Urban Survival Strategies, Family Structure and Informal Practices,"   297-322 in Michael Peter Smith ed, *The Capitalist City.   Global*

Rebuilding Demolished Streets

So far I have tried only to indicate that Marville's images, elite dis-course at the time, were a trompe-l'oeil, imagination inscribed on streetscapes. In so doing, though, I have in large part merely followed in the methodological footsteps of a number of scholars who have recently claimed visual acuity, seeing through the rhetoric and disciplinary strategies in the gaze that elites and the West in general turn on the Other. I need to go further[53] and, as just noted, recent work on the very poor in cities invites me to do so.

Before proceeding, however, I should say how I chose my six streets. I did not select them because I believed that any indicators I might devise might turn out to be vindicators of what I wanted to argue about life in disadvantaged areas of mid-nineteenth-century Paris. On the contrary, I chose them precisely because contemporary observers treated the north side of the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève, where they were situated, as emblematic of dark and dangerous quarters, areas for which the only solution was destruction.

Restructuring and Community Politics (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987) has attempted to schematize what resources are available to the very poor. Brian Roberts, "Household Coping Strategies and Urban Poverty in Comparative Perspective," 135-68 in Mark Gottdiener and C G Pickvance eds, *Urban Life in Transition* (Newbury Park: Sage, 1991) has convincingly argued that the household and its strategies are crucial for an understanding of urban life everywhere.

[53] Nigel Thrift has justly criticized the recent and well-nigh exclusive preoccupation with deconstructing elite discourse as a middle-class obsession with our own middle-class constructions of reality. "Over-wordy Worlds," 144-8 in Chris Philo ed, *New Words; New Worlds: Reconceptualizing Social and Cultural Geography* (Lampeter: St David's University College, 1998). David Blackbourn has expressed his dismay more graphically: it is the sound of one hand clapping. "Economy and Society: A Silent Bourgeois Revolution" in Geoff Eley and David Blackbourn eds, *The Peculiarities of German History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).

We need to ask whether the image presented has validity. About one facet, at least, the picture is accurate. These were certainly narrow and ancient streets that were a barrier to through traffic and the buildings that lined them were dilapidated, dark and damp.[54] The real question to ask, though, is whether the physical condition of buildings meant, as was claimed at the time, that this was a lost corner of the property market, with buildings unchanging, profits low, and owners disinvesting. Of course it does not. And there is good reason why. Owning low-cost housing in Paris at this time was profitable because poor tenants were not as demanding as were wealthier clients and repair costs could be kept to the strict minimum.[55] At the same time, demand for the accommodation offered on my streets was growing because of accelerating immigration, because centripetal forces in a face-to-face economy and pedestrian city anchored economic activities, and job hirings largely—but not exclusively—in the city centre and because from the early 1850s demolitions elsewhere in the inner city put greater

---

[54]I have built up my image of my six streets using three kinds of source. The first is the publications and documentation left by the brothers Lazare *Archives de Paris*, D^{1Z}/130 Fonds Lazare and Félix and Louis Lazare, *Dictionnaire administratif et historique des rues et monuments de Paris* (Paris: bureau de la Revue municipale, 1855). The second is cadastral and expropriation plans. The former show the exact lay-out of every building but have the disadvantage of only indicating the ground-floor plan and, for my streets, being made in 1810 and thus not covering the demolitions, rebuilding and new building that, contrary to what elites claimed at the time, took place in the following half-century. *Archives Nationales,* F^{31}/23 and F^{31}/95 and 96—plans for each building and for blocks (*îlots*); *Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris,* Plan: Expropriation 161 "Modification du quadrilatère limité par l'Ecole Polytechnique, la rue des Carmes, le quai de la Tournelle et la rue de Poissy" (1853). The third and most important source is the fiscal records for houses on the streets kept by the municipality, all of which are housed at the *Archives de Paris*. The *Sommier foncier* (DQ18/ 274, 282, 285, 286, 288, 289, 295, 296 and 298) indicates—though not always as diligently from survey to survey—both rental values for buildings and sales and prices paid. The *Calepins de révisions du cadastre* (D^{1}P^4/44, 141, 780, 840, 1148, 1191) are files for each house, containing a brief description of the building, along with the name of the owner and changes in title and formal leases for rental units. Valuable as these are, some dossiers are fuller than others and entries are more complete for the early 1850s than they are for the revisions made in the early 1860s. For businesses in my streets, I used, above all, the *patente* records: D^{3}P^4/2 "Développement par classe et par nature de profession, des résultats relatifs aux patentes," 1861, 1864, 1865 and D^{2}P^4/18 "Calepins industriels."

[55]As Adeline Daumard has rightly suggested in *Maisons de Paris et propriétaires parisiens au XIXe siècle, 1809-1880* (Paris: Cujas, 1965) 130.

pressure on near-by housing.[56] Evidence of the pressure of demand is found in extraordinarily low vacancy rates for rental units.[57] It is to be seen, too, in rising population densities in my streets, in the colonization of courtyards by workshops and storage, in the subdivision of living spaces, [58] and in some spectacular instances of reconversions of buildings into hundred-unit furnished lodgings or others into a large public washhouse in the 1850s.[59]

---

[56]Migration to the area as a result of demolitions elsewhere had long been taking place. Already in 1839 authorities recognized that some of those on welfare in the arrondissement had been forced there because of demolitions elsewhere. *Archives de l'Assistance publique,* Fosseyeux 96/7, "Procès-verbaux du bureau de bienfaisance du XIIe arrondissement," 9 august 1839 and 22 July 1842. Early in 1851 the mayor of the XIIe arrondissement was writing that demolitions around the Hôtel de Ville forced many ("une population nombreuse") to seek refuge on the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève. *Archives de Paris*, VD[6]/670 letter to the Prefect of the Seine, 3 March 1851. It could also be—but it has not been demonstrated—that imperfections in the housing market, which led investors and speculative builders to concentrate on housing for the better-off, as well as in the building industry itself, and particularly the absence of major productivity gains, were also a factor. For this issue in a wider perspective, see Christian Topalov, *Le Logement en France. Histoire d'une marchandise impossible* (Paris: F N S, 1987).

[57] Manuscript census returns for the twelfth arrondissement for 1856 (*Archives de Paris,* Vbis5F[1]/3) allow me to calculate that for all six of my streets the vacancy rate was 0.22%, lower than for the arrondissement as a whole.

[58]As Daumard has shown for the near-by rue Mouffetard. *Maisons de Paris* 204-05.

[59]For the rapid spread of these, see Chambre de commerce de Paris, *Statistique de l'industrie à Paris résultat de l'enquête faite par la Chambre de commerce pour l'année 1860* (Paris: Chambre de commerce, 1864)   231-2.

None of these changes show that property-owners on my streets was profitable. Other indices do. The property market for my streets was not only active—half the owners changed in only ten years from 1852 to 1861[60]—but sales prices rose markedly[61] and rental values more than tripled from the mid-1840s to the mid-1850s and then increased by a further two-thirds by 1863-1864.[62]   All these measures indicate that property-owners in my streets did better than the average owner in the city.[63]

---

[60]Based on a comparison between owners named in the *matrice foncière* for 1852 and the list from the 1861 manuscript census return. A small proportion of these changes were the result of the death of the owner, nine out of ten were from sales. This is a higher property turnover than that calculated by Daumard for Paris as a whole: she concluded that, on average, property changed hands once every 24 years. *Maisons de Paris* 245-6.

[61]I do not have complete figures (and no indication of renovations that might have been made between sales is given in fiscal records) but a comparison of sales prices for four houses bought between 1853 and 1861 with the expropriation settlements in April 1866 reveals increases ranging from 225% to 350%. *Archives de Paris*, D^4P^2/55 "*matrice foncière*" and *Gazette des Tribunaux* 21 and 22 April 1866.

[62]These increases were similar between properties and across streets. My calculations are based on municipal evaluations in *Archives de Paris*, D^1P^4 and DQ18. It has been estimated that the overall rise in rents in the capital between 1852 and 1862 was 42% and a further 9% between 1862 and 1876. Using the same sources, Adeline Daumard made a similar calculation for the rue Mouffetard: she found lower increases in rental values: 34.8% for 1842/4 to 1854/6 and 51.7% for 1854/6 to 1863/5.

[63]Since global averages hide considerable variations, more research will have to be done to refine the comparisons I have been making.

The profits they made, of course, were a function of demand for the uses to which their property could be put. The argument at the time was that the only purpose a building in my streets could be used for was to house a residual population. Whatever the nature of those who lived in them or of the accommodation offered, lodgings were un-questionably the most important business in my streets. I am able to show this in three ways. First, two-fifths of all businesses early in 1866 were those of lodging-operators or tavern-keepers or combinations of the two. [64] Second, the value of these is indicated in the compensations awarded when the buildings were expropriated: they received sixteen of the twenty-five highest settlements. There is a third manner in which we can establish the viability of tavern-keepers/lodgers-operators: by analyzing bankruptcy records. We know that theirs was always a highly competitive sector which, combined with the low entry thresholds and the poor book-keeping of many who set up on their own, meant that turnover was high. It is not surprising, then, that out of the nearly 8,000 businesses that failed in the five years from 1861 to the end of 1865, one in ten were of tavern-keepers, and that they constituted the largest single group. Out of all these, not one was from my streets, all of which were generously endowed with taverns and lodgings.[65]

---

[64]Out of a total of 109 businesses, 36 were tavern-keepers, of whom 20 were also lodging operators (and many of them also served food to their customers). Calculated from *Archives de Paris*, VD^6/1384 "Tableau des offres" March 1866 and *Gazette des Tribunaux*, 21 and 22 April 1866. The detailed results are not quite as clear-cut as this indicates because several leaseholders were also principal tenants (*principaux locataires*) which means that one or two may have rented out units for other uses.

[65]The only failure in any sector was a mechanic on the rue du Bon-Puits in 1865.   Tavern-keepers (often combining other activities providing lodging, providing food) made up 848 of the 7,692 bankruptcies in 1861-1865. I arrived at the first figure by counting all tavern-keepers in the index-card file of failures at the *Archives de Paris*, which are organized chronologically but do not indicate the name or the address of those whose business failed. The second figure is the total number of bankruptcies recorded in the registers for 1861-1865 *Archives de Paris*, D^{10}U^3/34-38 "Registres d'inscription des faillites du Tribunal de commerce de Paris." Since these give the name, occupation and address of those who failed, I used them to check whether anyone from my streets did so.

This does not mean, however, that these activities were the only businesses that could flourish on my streets. Three-fifths of all enterprises, in fact, were in other sectors: a quarter were artisan and industrial workshops; a third were shops and services.[66] While these businesses are still modest in size and there are few industrial workshops using any machinery,[67] their number confirms that this was no lost corner of the Parisian economy.

---

[66]There were 27 artisan shops and stores, 17 food and service businesses, 17 second-hand dealers (furniture, clothes, rags...) and 3 small industrial enterprises. Calculated from the *Gazette des Tribunaux* and verified against commercial directories for 1860-1865.

[67]An analysis of the register of industrial enterprises operating in the 1860s *Archives de Paris,* D^2P^4/16 "Etablissements industriels, 1er au Xe arrondissements (calepins industriels)" helps put this into perspective. It indicates that on my streets there were only two small weaving firms—one with 39 looms on the rue du Mûrier and another with 4 on the rue du Paon—and a bleach establishment on the rue Traversine, employing 2 workers. It also shows, though, that there were only 13 industrial enterprises in the entire Saint Victor quarter (the largest of which, on the rue des Fosses Saint-Victor, made boarding for the book trade and employed 50 workers). In the fifth arrondissement as a whole there were just 95 firms most of which were small (only 6 employed more than 40 workers). The largest number was, of course, in leather tanning. This situation would not be changed by Haussmannization: in 1876 the only industrial establishments in the Saint-Victor quarter were one making playing cards and two workshops making decorative ironwork (*ferronnerie*) *Archives de Paris*, D^3P^4/2). Jeanne Gaillard *Paris la ville 1852-1870. L'urbanisme parisien à l'heure d'Haussmann* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1977) 86) has calculated that in the 1860s the first four arrondissements on the right bank centre had three times as many industrial and commercial enterprises as did the three arrondissements on the opposing bank (the fifth, sixth and seventh).

What else does this brief analysis tell us about the streets and those who lived there? Two other things. First, the coexistence of commercial and artisanal activities on the ground floors of buildings with living space on the upper, as well as the intensification of the use of space, suggests that building-use responded to the dynamics of the city growth at this time and that patterns there are similar to those found in the inner city as a whole.[68]   Second, and perhaps more importantly, it suggests that the area may well have been well adapted to the needs of the poorer strata of the population who lived there. Streets that were overwhelmingly pedestrian may well have been conducive to transient interaction and gossip between residents.[69]   As were all washhouses in popular-class districts of Paris,[70] that in my area would have been a centre for women's sociabilities. Tavern-keepers and operators of lodgings, then as now, have always been more than mere providers of drink food and accommodation.[71]   In the streets that I have studied also, they acted as intermediaries with civil registration officials for birth and death certificates. More revealing of relationships, however, is that spouses chose them to act at weddings: a quarter of marriage ceremonies at the local parish church had a tavern-keeper as a witness.[72]   They provided

---

[68]As François Loyer, *Paris XIXe siècle* 24-6 has shown for Paris as a whole.

[69]I cannot show that this was the case because such sociabilities and gestures have not left traces in the sources. It might be wondered, however, just how important it was because exchanges were probably limited by long hours, high population turnover, and the heteroglossia of the community. For a lively discussion of heteroglossia in a city that drew in large numbers of immigrants, as Paris always has, see Alan Pred, *Lost Words and Lost Worlds: Modernity and the Language of Everyday Life in Late-Nineteenth-Century Stockholm* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) 9-26.

[70] Michelle Perrot, "Femmes au lavoir," *Sorcières* 19(1979): 27-43;" Marie-Hélène Signoret-Guillon, "Le Lavoir: espace féminin à Paris dans la deuxième moitié du XIXe siècle," unpublished master's dissertation, Université de Paris VII, 1980; Alain Corbin, *Le Temps, le désir et l'horreur* (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1991) chapter "le Grand siècle du linge," 23-52.

[71] For Paris, see, for the eighteenth century, Thomas Brennan, *Public Drinking and Popular Culture in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988) and David Garrioch, *Neighbourhood and Community* 24-27 and 180-190 and, for the nineteenth century and later, W Scott Haine, *The World of the Paris Café: Sociability among the French Working Class* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).

[72] *Archives de Paris*, Archevêché.   Registres de marriage, Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet, 1861-1865. W Scott Haine, *The World of the Paris Café* 45-48 found a similar proportion for popular-class weddings in Paris

intelligence about employment and may well have given credit in times of difficulty.[73] Different lodgings also fostered the clustering of those in related trades and/or from the same place of origin.[74] At the same time, the provision of low-cost accommodation was tailored to the needs of temporary migrants, who made up some of the clients, and who might well not have needed lodgings year round. Such lodging, then, suited their migration strategies, helping them to put money aside to take back home. Local shops, finally, half of which offered food and services, the rest second-hand goods, all of them modest in size, catered to a clientele who needed inexpensive high-starch, but high-calorie, foods as well as second-hand clothes and household items.[75]

Recovering Lost Lives

If buildings and businesses were not residual, those they served could still have been. I need, then, to discover whether this was, as it was

---

as a whole at this time.

[73]When in the economic crisis at the mid-century, the Paris Chamber of Commerce examined *garnis*, it found that one *garni* resident in seven was living on credit from the proprietor (Chambre de commerce Paris, *Statistique 1847 et 1848*,   955). These were only a proportion of lodgings offered to popular classes and it is conceivable—though we should not romanticize relationships—that those lodging operators, renting out just a few units to countrymen or those in a trade they themselves had earlier practised, may also have extended credit.

[74]The importance of such clustering in Paris and elsewhere is well-known. Even some elite contemporaries, recognized that the poor lived together for more reasons than just low-cost housing. In 1836 the physician François Leuret pointed out: "Il y a encore une autre raison pour que les pauvres se réunissent; ils s'aident plus efficacement les uns les autres qu'ils ne seraient aidés par les riches. Les pauvres font vivre les pauvres, c'est un proverbe de la rue Mouffetard." François Leuret, "Notice sur les indigens de la ville de Paris," *Annales d'hygiène publique et de médecine légale* 15(1836): 294-358.

[75]Edwin Eames and Judith Goode point out that such facilities are always crucial for coping strategies among the urban poor. "Strategies for Coping with Inadequate Resources: A Cross-Cultural View of the Behaviour of the Poor," 287-97 in George Gmelch and Walter Zenner eds, *Urban Life* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1980). Though some work has been done on recycled foods and second-hand clothes in Paris, little has yet been done on food provision for the poor. Victor Fournel *Ce qu'on voit dans les rues de Paris* (Paris: Delshay, 1858) 372-373) reproduces the menu from a *traiteur* in the rue des Amandiers, a few hundred metres from my streets. He found it amusing; we might find it instructive. All it offered for fare was: *bouillon* 5c and 10c; plate of cabbage or beans 5c; stew 10c; beef and pork 10c; sausages 5c and 10c. Many of the residents of these streets may well have found even these prices beyond their means.

reputed to be, a *città dolorosa*, a vale of tears, peopled by those who, by dint of age, physical infirmity, family status and gender, marginal or extruded occupation, or lack of social and language skills, found refuge in this dark and damp corner where deviant subcultures mushroomed so that it also became a *città pericolosa*, a vale of fears.

The route I have chosen to discover as much as I am able of this richly varied world consists of adopting three tests. The first of these is to identify the residents, their occupations and their spatial distribution in order to ascertain whether they truly were the 'residuum' they were reputed to be. The second is to establish whether their behaviour was deviant by interrogating essentially serial sources, surviving registers from hospitals, civil and church[76] registration, arrest records, the morgue archives. The third and final test is to refine the analysis by selecting a group of immigrants whose occupations as street-sweepers and-repairers and general labourers, along with other characteristics, should have made them the margin of the margin with a commensurate condition and lifestyle. I shall endeavour to discover whether this was so and, if not, why.

---

[76]I am, of course, painfully aware of the limits to what such sources might reveal. Robert Park, who was one of the pioneers of an urban sociology focused on the streets, believed that statistical data alone were of small value and might just as well be collected by a more or less bright secretary, as he once remarked.   Rolf Lindner, *The Reportage of Urban Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 84. He gave his students sage advice: "You have been told to go grubbing in the library thereby accumulating a mass of notes and a liberal coating of grime. You have been told to choose problems wherever you can find musty stacks of routine records based on trivial schedules prepared by tired bureaucrats and filled out by reluctant applicants for aid or fussy do-gooders or indifferent clerks. But one more thing is needful: first-hand observation. Go and sit in the lounges of the luxury hotels and on the doorsteps of the flophouses; sit on the Gold Coast [a wealthy part of Chicago] settees and on the slum shakedowns; sit in the orchestral hall and in the Star and Garter burlesque. In short, gentlemen, go get the seat of your pants dirty in real research." Cited in John C McKinney, *Constructive Typology and Social Theory* (New York: Appleton, 1966)   71. Though I might not believe in all the open-sesame qualities of ethnographic research, I must lament the absence of direct testimony from those whose lives I seek to understand.

Manuscript censuses allow me to establish that just over five thousand people lived in my streets, one in five of those in the Saint-Victor quarter and one in twenty of those in the fifth arrondissement.[77] They also suggest that, although population densities in some parts of the city centre had already begun to decline even before the clearances carried out by Haussmann, here they were still—if slowly— increasing. Sex ratios at both dates also indicate the growing importance of temporary male migrants. Other indices, though, do not suggest that my streets were exceptional. Children always act as a glue for sociabilities in a popular-class neighbourhood:[78] data on age structures for the quarter—unfortunately not available for my streets— suggest that children under fifteen made up only a fractionally smaller proportion of residents than they did in the arrondissement and city as a whole.[79] They also seem to show that women over sixty did not constitute a larger percentage of the population and that the pro-portions of widows and widowers in my streets was not higher than in the quarter.[80] Perhaps the most striking characteristic of residents, however, was the low percentage of native-born Parisians. Only a quarter of men and a third of women had been born in the capital, lower proportions than in the quarter or the arrondissement and markedly lower than in Paris as a whole[81].

---

[77]The exact figure is 5066.They represented 19.3% of those in the quarter and 5.23% of the population of the arrondissement.

[78]In his study of the rooming-house area of Chicago in the 1920s, Harvey Zorbaugh found it lacked a sense of community because of the high turnover and the absence of children, adding "children are the real neighbors, and it is a childless world." *The Gold Coast and the Slum*, quoted Ulf Hannerz, *Exploring the City: Inquiries Toward an Urban Anthropology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

[79]The difference with Paris as a whole was 3%.

[80]Women over 60 made up just under 10% of women, as against 8.5% for Paris in 1861. In my streets widows made up 9.9% of women in 1856 and 8.6% in 1861. This compares with 12.6% and 7.64% for the same dates in the quarter. Percentages for the arrondissement (11.64% and 11.79%) are influenced by numbers of women in hospices. The percentages of widowers were actually marginally lower in my streets than in the quarter (4.0% and 4.5% in my streets and 4.7% and 4.3% in the quarter).   Unfortunately, my data do not permit me to establish the proportion of female-headed families.

[81] RESIDENTS' PLACES OF BIRTH (in percentages)

Immigrants, long-term and above all short-term, are the dominant element in the population of my streets.

Data from manuscript census returns for the fifth arrondissement and published census for France, 1861. The high proportion of foreigners is explained by the clustering in my streets of Italian and Hessian migrants. The 1856 manuscript census returns did not enumerate provincials and foreigners by street and it is impossible to establish whether their share of the population was—as must be strongly suspected—increasing.

What concerned contemporaries more than where they came from, though, were the trades plied by residents: commentators insisted on the importance of those they believed to be marginal—street traders and performers, rag pickers and practitioners of similar 'dirty' trades. [82] Manuscript census returns give a first quarter-wide indication that so-called casual trades did not dominate the occupational structure. They indicate, on the one hand, that male building workers make up the largest occupational group, while workers in the clothing and related trades—two-thirds of whom were women—constitute the second most numerous group, followed, at a considerable distance, by workers in printing and binding.[83]   They also show, on the other hand, that if all those in street trades and entertainment are taken together,[84] they make up but a tiny proportion of the active population; building workers are six times and clothing workers five times more numerous. It is still possible, though, that my streets have a different occupational structure from the rest of the quarter. This is not what my own database, my second source built up from civil registration and hospital records, indicates. Over one in ten male workers is in some kind of skilled trade, one in five men is a building worker, three in ten are general labourers, one in ten is in street maintenance[85] but only one in twenty is in the trades that observers compulsively talked about.[86] The occupations open to women from the

---

[82]Whether such occupations were peripheral to the urban economy and street culture is, of course, another matter. I have argued elsewhere that rag pickers, for instance, were not marginal. See "Perceptions and Realities of the Urban Margin: The Rag Pickers of Paris in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century," *Canadian Journal of History* 27(1992): 198-233.

[83]There were 2397 building workers (all except 3 of whom were men), 1957 workers in clothing and related trades (women made up 1360 of them).   Printing and binding were represented by 354 workers (of whom 274 were men).

[84]There were 165 men and 57 women in street trades and 181 males and 11 females who were street performers. The gender imbalance in the latter is explained by the presence of the colony of boy street musicians in the rue du Bon-Puits.

[85]13.6% are in a skilled trade (though *tailleur* and *cordonnier*—2.8% and 1.5% respectively—are terms that cover a gamut of conditions) of whom 1.9% are in printing and binding. 21.6% of actively employed men are in the building trade, of whom three in five are stone-masons (*maç*ons), the great majority—80%—from the Creuse. 28.8% of men from my streets described themselves as labourers. Street maintenance workers made up 10.0%, half of them, road sweepers. The reasons for the presence of so many in this sector are discussed later in the text.

[86] Street entertainers made up 2.2% of all occupations; street traders (including *colporteurs, commissionaires* and water-carriers) 2.1% and the'dirty'

popular classes were, as always, more restricted but, once more, patterns of employment show the importance of unskilled work and the clothing and related trades (one in three for each category). Laundresses represent nearly one in ten women workers but domestic servants here, as elsewhere in the quarter and arrondissement, are underrepresented. The street sellers, entertainers and those in 'dirty' trades we expect to find make up only five per cent of their declared occupations.[87] There is a further element in elite condemnation of these streets: the high proportion of residents there who lived in rooming-houses, what the French call *garnis*. Commentators worried about these because of the large numbers of immigrants who frequented them, the gender imbalance (there were many more men than women), the fact that they had no furniture meant that those who lived there had no roots, the danger that these places could be hiding places of the unwanted and breeding-grounds of promiscuity and deviance. This concern has bequeathed us not only discourse but, since police kept a close watch on them and obliged lodging operators to keep registers of comings and goings, some data as well. What information is available, however, serves to de-dramatize rooming-houses rather than to show them to be dangerous marginal spaces. As many as one industrial worker in five lived in *garnis* and building workers who were seasonal immigrants were by far the largest group, which suggests that many garnis were not a last resort for the residual population but a sensible choice for those who neither needed nor wanted long-term furnished accommodation. [88] Conditions in four out of five of them were either good or acceptable. Some of the better ones specialized in catering either to immigrant workers in a particular trade or from the same point of origin (and usually both).[89]

---

trades (rag pickers, rag merchants, second-hand dealers, rabbit-skin pullers) 2.0%.

[87]Labourers make up 31.4%, workers in the clothing and related trades 27.9%, laundresses (*blanchisseuses*) 9.3%. Women road sweepers represent 4.9% of women's trades.

[88]Chambre de commerce de Paris, *Statistique 1847-1848*, 69; *Statistique 1860*, XLI-XLII. In 1860 building workers made up two-fifths of industrial workers living in *garnis*. In normal times, two-thirds of popular-class budgets was spent on food, expenses that could only be compressed with difficulty. Cutting down on the cost of housing, then, has always been a coping strategy, especially for in-migrants.

[89]It is estimated, for instance, that 13% of all *garnis* catered to one trade (*Statistique 1847-1848*, 980). It might be noted—and the Chamber of Commerce itself did—that its investigation did not cover all those who lived in furnished lodgings. This is not just because the police divided *garnis* into 8 categories,

which ranged from furnished apartments for the well-to-do to overnight flophouses and it was difficult to determine where popular-class lodging began, but, more importantly, because an undetermined number of lodgers with only one or a few rental units were not officially registered and because the popular classes themselves took in lodgers.

By 1861 two in five inhabitants of my streets lived in rooming-houses as compared to one in five in the quarter and one in six in the arrondissement. [90]   At the same time, the number of *garnis* had increased and, more significantly perhaps, so had the capacity of larger establishments: in 1861 two-thirds of their clients were in lodgings that accommodated over forty people. If there had been a slight increase in segregation between those in garnis and those in leased unfurnished rental units, these developments did not create separate spaces for two types of resident. Three in five people in my streets did not live in rooming-houses, which were distributed—if unevenly[91]—across all streets.

  Only half of *garnis* occupied an entire building and there were still disparities between the *garnis* themselves, some offering dormitories for a season, others predominantly single units that had a high client turnover.[92]   What is more important, though, is that the distribution of

---

[90]3.9% compared to 37.7% five years earlier. A comparison of 1861 data with figures   for 1834 (available in *Archives de la Préfecture de police*, DA134 "Etat numérique des Français et étrangers présents dans les hôtels et logemens garnis du quartier du Jardin du Roi, au 1er juillet 1834") suggests that the number of people in *garnis* in my streets increased by three times from 1834 to 1861 (from 678 to 1908). The distribution of immigrants across streets parallels that of *garnis*.

[91]The highest proportions of people in *garnis* (74.1% of men and 51.1% of women) were in the rue Traversine; the lowest were on the rue d'Arras (33.8% and 15.5%) and the rue de Versailles (18.1% and 10.2%).

[92]Combining census, fiscal and notarial records allows me to compare the rooming-house buildings which, wholly or in part, would be run by Louis Tron, on the one hand, and those which would be operated by Jean Fresquet, on the other.   These were the largest in my streets. The *garni* at 13 Bon-Puits occupied the whole five-floor building and took only Italian street musicians, housed in rooms that each had an average of three beds but two of which held six each. Rooms were furnished with wooden beds each with two mattresses, a pair of sheets, woolen blanket, quilted bedspread, and a stool, valued together at 20 francs. (One or two rooms had extras: an old commode or a table).   At number 5 on the same street, where Italians were also clustered, the *garni* they monopolized only occupied part of the five-floor building and Italians only made up half the residents. The *garni* was organized and furnished in the same manner as the one at number 13 (there were 12 rooms with 39 beds).   The layout of the rental units in the buildings at 39 and 41 Traversine, which had six floors, and 43 and 45, which had four, indicated two kinds of clientele.   Of the 111 rooms, 78 held only one narrow bed and thus catered to people who were alone (other evidence—statistics on arrest and death cer-tificates—suggests that some of them may well have been older).   However, 9 of the rooms held 3 beds, 16 held 4, 2 had 3 and 1 had 6 beds, suggesting that Fresquet also catered to building and other workers, who, as he did, may well have come the *Massif central.*   The furnishings of these rooms were more Spartan than the two *garnis*

occupations and immigrant groups both in furnished and unfurnished lodgings was not scattered and random but clustered and purposeful, which confirms for my streets what studies have shown for high-density, low-cost housing areas for other cities, in the past as in the present, and for specific groups in Paris itself.[93]   This was the case, for instance, with rag pickers, building workers, those in street maintenance, and immigrants from outside France.   Rooming-houses, then, were not dens of iniquity but instruments for coping and succeeding.

Whatever type of accommodation or however little space was occupied by different people on my streets, however, we should remember that the complexity of the residential fabric was such that they could not avoid social interchange in corridors, stairwells and courtyards.[94]   We should also bear in mind that however dense an individual's primary network, his/her life was criss-crossed by her/his outside contacts, and family and group borders were always vulnerable.

---

on Bon-Puits: each bed, with only mattresses, bolster and woolen blanket, was valued at 4 to 6 francs.

[93]In a rare close historical analysis of how urban space is occupied and lived, Olivier Zunz showed the importance of clustering for long-distant immigrant workers in Detroit *The Changing Face of Inequality: Urbanization, Industrial Development, and Immigrants in Detroit,1880-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).   Similar concentrations, but not ghettos, have been found in Paris.   For a recent overview, see Marie-Claude Blanc-Chaléard, "L'habitat immigré à Paris aux XIXe et XXe siècles: mondes à part?" *Le Mouvement social* 182 (1998): 29-47.

[94]One instance gives an indication of this density and diversity at every address: the building at 12 Paon.   It had had four floors, a dairy shop (*laitier*) and a tavern giving on the street, and, relatively rare in this area, a coach entrance rather than the usual street door opening onto a narrow corridor.   In 1861 the building had 45 rental units, 18 of which were tiny rooms let at the very modest rates of 40, 60, 80 and 100 francs a year. These units were occupied by 106 tenants, three-quarters of whom were not native-born Parisians but, in contrast to *garnis*, there were slightly more women there than men.   At the back of the small courtyard was another building that had been rented to a dairyman (*nourrisseur*) earlier in the century but was now used as a storage area by a carter.   On the half-floor above, added to gain more rental space, a *cabinet* was rented out for 80 francs. On the first floor above there was one room with a fireplace rented for 160 francs, two *cabinets* leased for 60 and 80 francs and another, reached by a ladder, at 80 francs. On the second floor there was a room with a fireplace costing 180 francs, along with a *cabinet* let at 60 francs. On the last floor, was a larger room with a fireplace that was leased for 200 francs. As were other buildings, this was a mosaic whose diverse accommodations meant that, poor as most were, residents were in varying situations.

It was not merely how and where they lived and what trades residents of high-density low-cost inner-city areas practised that worried elites. It was also, perhaps more than anything, how they behaved: they were a burden on welfare rolls; they were promiscuous; they were disproportionately represented among suicides and those arrested for having no visible means of support, for repeated mendicancy, for crimes.[95]   In order to test whether people in my streets acted in this way I have interrogated serial sources: civil and church registration and hospital records. I have not done so just as a *pis aller* —because I didn't have anything better—but because they offered a double advantage. The registers were not made by policemen or welfare workers but for administrative reasons and, more importantly, for purposes other than those for which I shall use them. They can be read for the personal details they contain and used to build up a composite picture from individual entries, as practitioners of microstoria have shown us we should proceed—that is from the bottom up rather than from already aggregated data.   I do not believe that the image that emerges from this exercise confirms elite views.

---

[95] They were also reputed to be politically dangerous in insurrections. Marx, who termed the urban poor "the reserve army of labour," called into service during boom periods and dismissed back into poverty during downturns, also called them the 'lumpenproletariat,' the paid counterrevolutionary foot soldiers of the Second Republic. At the other end of the ideological spectrum, the historian Hippolyte Taine believed they had been a rent-a-mob during the Terror made up of "les ouvriers instables, les vagabonds de la ville et de la compagne, les habitués d'hôpital, les souillons de mauvais lieu, la populace dégradée et dangereuse, les déclassés, les pervertis, les dévergondés, les détraqués de tout espèce." *Les Origines de la France contemporaine. La Révolution* (Paris: Hachette, 1896 edition) III,   471-2.

Whether or not it does so, none of the serial sources indicates that I should "gild the ghetto" as the expression has it, and underestimate the difficulties of urban life in the mid-nineteenth century. Some, indeed, bear witness to the hardships faced by more vulnerable groups —such as older people and, above all, women alone—some of whom were shipwrecked, ending their days alone in hospices or hospitals or in the river and then on a cold slab at the morgue. Registers of patients admitted to the *Salpétrière* women's hospital for the 1860-1865 period show that sixteen unfortunate women, who had been residing in my streets, were judged mentally unfit and in need of institutionalization, only four of whom ever saw freedom again.[96] They also included those five women who, along with so many others suffering from uterine cancer, were sent there to die because medical science at the time could do nothing to save them.[97] Ten elderly indigent widows[98] were also sent to another part of the same institution, the hospice for the elderly. The suffering these women endured should not be minimized but we should note that at thirty-one the numbers sent there were smaller than their share of the population as a whole.[99] Also underrepresented were the thirty men from my streets sent to Bicêtre, the equivalent institution for men,[100] twenty-one of whom for mental illness but thirteen of these were later deemed cured and released.[101]

---

[96]*Archives de l'Assistance publique*, Hôpital de la Salpétrière 1Q2/169-171. Registres des entrées, 1859-1865. Those not released were either transferred to asylums in their place of origin or died at the *Salpétrière.*

[97]The labourer, Catherine Reiter, a 43-year-old widow born in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, living at 12 Bon-Puits, was sent there in the terminal stages of uterine cancer in March 1863 and died six weeks later.

[98]One of whom was Marie Laisné, a 70-year-old widow from Dricourt in the Ardennes, who had been living at 10 du Mûrier and had worked as a basket-maker.

[99]9533 women were admitted to this hospital in this period. The institution had a capacity of 4,901 beds (1440 for the mentally ill; 3,461 for the aged or infirm).

[100]*Archives de l'Assistance publique*, Hôpital de Bicêtre 1Q2/116-118 Registres des entrées 1860-1865.   Total admissions for the period were 8,312.

[101]As was Andrew Scott, aged 38, an unmarried street musician from Britain living at 25 Traversine, who was admitted in May 1864 and released six months later. There is more work to be done on this differential treatment of men and women in psychiatric care.

Similarly saddening but also instructive are the registers of the *Dépôt de Préfecture*, daily records of those picked up in the street, usually for being found to have no visible means of support, often not for the first time, and sent overnight to the holding cells, and the *Dépôts de mendicité*, institutions of correction to which inveterate beggars were sent. Out of the twenty thousand entries in these, a hundred and eighty-nine were from my streets, a slightly higher proportion than the share of the Parisian population in my streets.[102] The registers, too, reveal something about those in my area who fell by the wayside. Half the men were over fifty and one in eight was handicapped.[103] The addresses they gave also indicate that those who had no networks and were older lived in the same *garnis*: half the men and women lived at just two large rooming-houses. At one in six of occupations given, street trades were overrepresented, perhaps because their part of the informal economy was a last resort for those who could not do other tasks or was a disguised form of begging.

These registers may suggest that there was inevitably a small proportion of those residing in these streets who ended their lives in misery but others clearly reveal the importance of networks and normalcy. In 1840 the author of a well-known study of poverty in France and England used the proportion of deaths that took place in hospitals, as opposed to those that occurred at home as a criterion for measuring poverty because they were an institution only for the poor which the better-off successfully avoided, even in death. He found that one in three Parisians died in hospitals.[104] When I examined death certificates for those from my streets who died from 1861 to 1865, I found that only one in five deaths occurred in hospital. The others preferred to do so at home, however cramped and difficult we might believe conditions there to have been. Proof that this indicates the importance of networks is to be found in the civil status of those who did die in hospital: four in five were

---

[102]Not all registers are available at the *Archives de la Préfecture de police.* The total number of entries for both is 18,637. 131 men and 58 women from my streets were sent to one or the other. I have avoided double-counting of those picked up more than once. In a limited number of entries the address where individuals lived is not indicated because they are '*sans asile*',   homeless.

[103]As was Jean Michel Gazengel, 63, living at 3 Bon-Puits, who was a blind street singer from Saint-Martin de Laudrelle (Manche), picked up for the seventh time for vagrancy in December 1865.

[104]Eugène Buret, *De la Misère des classes laborieuses en Angleterre et en France* (Paris: Paulin, 1840, 2 vols) Cited 263 Philippe Vigier, *Paris pendant la Monarchie de Juillet* (Paris: Hachette, 1991). Buret's figures were from 1836 and his percentage was 37.6%.

either unmarried or widowed.[105]

---

[105]Out of 736 deaths 134 occurred in hospital. It may well appear that death certificates for the fifth arrondissement have built-in biases that invalidate my conclusions. In principle, this is true because all hospital admissions were supposed to be made at the *Bureau central*, which sent patients to different hospitals across the city rather than just to the *Pitié,* which is the one where hospital deaths in the fifth are recorded. In principle, too, non-residents in the capital were not admissible and a high proportion of immigrants in my streets could thus have been refused admission. In reality, these rules were not applied.
 The central office only admitted a declining proportion of patients because decisions were made at hospitals on the basis of need by the medical personnel rather than by administrators as they lamented   (Armand Husson, *Etude sur les hôpitaux, de la distribution de leurs bâtiments, de l'ameublement considérés sous le rapport de leur construction* (Paris: Dupont, 1862) 142; *Archives de l'Assistance publique, Mémoire du Préfet de la Seine présenté à la Commission départementale sur l'admission dans les hospices des maladies des communes rurales* (Paris: Vinchon, 1851.) I estimate that the *Bureau central* admitted two in five patients but only one in five in 1860 *Archives de l'Assistance publique*, 3M/11 "Administration générale de l'Assistance publique de Paris. Compte moral 1860."   What might have had some impact, however, is the effort by the welfare administration to increase home visits, home childbirths and medical consultations at the welfare offices (*bureaux de bienfaisance*), effort made above all from 1853 (see Administration générale de l'Assistance publique de Paris, *Exposé des progrès et des améliorations réalisés dans les services dépendant de l'Administration de l'Assistance publique du premier janvier 1852 au 31 décembre 1867* (Paris: Dupont, 1872) 44-5).

A similar test can be applied to childbirths. We know that at mid-century about one-third of these took place in hospital and that this proportion was higher for out-of-wedlock births and higher in the generally poor arrondissement in which my streets were situated.[106]   We might expect, then, that women in my streets would give birth in hospitals. They did not. Only six percent of births took place in hospitals,[107] the rest took place either in those spaces where they lived, which we might regard as confined and unhealthful, or in smaller numbers at birthing facilities at welfare offices.[108] Of the twenty women who did give birth in hospital, fifteen were single women who did not name the father of their child on the birth certificate, suggesting, of course, that they were alone and lacked the support network that other women enjoyed.[109]   We might further expect that a significant number of

[106]Data published in the *Recherches statistiques sur la ville de Paris* (VI, 558-559) indicate that in the 1852-56 quinquennium an average of 19.8% of births in the capital took place in hospitals but 51.1% in the then twelfth arrondissement.   They also suggest that, while 31.8% of births were out-of-wedlock in the city as a whole, the proportion in the twelfth was 51.7%.

[107]That is 20 out of 345 births in a three-year period (1863-1865).

[108]While these figures tell us something, they may exaggerate the degree of choice mothers had. There were two developments at this time that led to some decline in hospital and lying-in hospital births. One was the attempt to relieve pressure on hospital beds—and lower costs—by encouraging home childbirths. The other was that, because of outbreaks of puerperal fever, which, of course, physicians did not understand and could not control, the lying-in hospital was periodically closed, thus reducing childbirths there and opening more maternity beds in general hospitals. It is unlikely, though, that closing the lying-in hospital had a major impact: despite the attention some male commentators lavished on it, it was responsible for only 5% of births in the capital.

[109]I confirmed these results by an analysis of entries at the lying-in hospital itself.   The clientele at the *Maternité* were all from the popular classes and those who went there were overwhelmingly women alone or impoverished married women. Scarlett Beauvalet-Boutourye, *Naître à l'hôpital au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Belin, 1999) 143 has calculated that in the 1860-1880 period 71.8% of women in childbirth there were single, 22.6% married and 5.6% widows. She also shows that 8 out of 10 were not born in the Seine—though this may be because of the importance of domestic servants, nine out of ten of whom were immigrants, among the clientele. Given the shame attached to giving birth there, and the high mortality (the death rates for parturient mothers rising in the 1860s probably because of puerperal fever outbreaks), the number of women there from my streets might well be another index of the number of single women giving birth without support. Out of 9,058 patients at the *Maternité* in the 1861-1865 period, only 17 were women from my streets. Of these 16 said they

poor mothers in my streets might abandon infants, who would put pressure on family finances in the case of couples and prevent employment in that of single women. I therefore examined the dense registers of the large numbers of children taken to the municipal orphanage. I found that only a handful of parents gave up their children.[110]

were unmarried. One in three was a domestic servant. Average age was 23.8 years, though 3 were under 20. *Archives de l'Assistance publique*, Port-Royal 1Q2/57-60 registres des entrées.

[110]I tested 8,000 entries in the registers to find that only thirty-one children from my streets were sent to the *Enfants trouvés*. Of these, though, a third were sent there only temporarily usually because the mother was ill or giving birth to another child (between a quarter and a third of all children sent there were reclaimed by parents after a few days or weeks). Of the children who were really abandoned only 10% were legitimate. Such proportions and such abandonments do not reveal the existence of promiscuous groups taking refuge in the anonymity of high-density low-cost areas. *Archives de Paris*, Enfants abandonnés: registres des enfants laissés en depot 401-6, 1864-1865. I applied a final test for sexual behaviour, an ambiguous one: admissions to hospitals that treated patients for sexually transmitted diseases. It is ambiguous for several reasons. One is that sexual contact is not the only way such diseases may be transmitted and a small number of those sent to the venereal hospitals only had symptoms that appeared to be venereal. However, venereal disease was important: an annual average of 1230 women and 3202 men was admitted to the two specialist hospitals in the 1860-1865 period and stays were longer than for general hospitals. Of the 7381 women, only 24 came from my streets and of the 19,214 men (I analyzed six years, 1860-1865) 119. This represents 5 women and 20 men a year. *Archives de l'Assistance publique*, Hôpital Broca-Lourcine (femmes) Registres des entrées 1Q2/134-36, 1860-1865, Hôpital du Midi 8/80-85, 1860-1865.

There is one final test[111] that I have been able to apply: to determine, if only indirectly, the religious sentiments of those living in my streets. Surely, if elite lamentations about popular classes lost to organized religion were true, those in this area would also have lost their way? There is a way to find out. The teaching of the Catholic Church, constantly repeated to the faithful at this time, insists on the importance of baptizing newborns within three days of their birth. How faithfully Catholic parents in my streets adhered to this directive may be taken as an index of religious feeling. In the city as a whole in 1855-1858 half of baptisms took place within three days of birth and three in five in the first week.[112] Delays for newborns with parents living in my streets were three in five within three days and three in four within a week,[113] indicating both greater fidelity than in the city as a whole and markedly greater than in other popular-class parishes.[114] Part of the explanation for

---

[111]There are other serial sources I might have used to examine those who lived in my streets. One is the electoral lists drawn up in a political system that had universal—but only manhood—suffrage. At this time, though, the lists, were not fully representative for they only contained the names of half those eligible to vote. None of these, though, has survived for the fifth arrondissement. There is a second source I actually tried to use to gauge normalcy: the military recruitment registers. Jeanne Gaillard (*Paris, la ville* 222-4) adopted the criterion of the proportion of recruits with both parents together as a measure of what she termed "une famille normale". She found that in the more bourgeois areas from seven to eight out of ten twenty-year-olds had both parents alive, while the proportion falls to four out of ten of those in areas with higher proportions of the popular classes. Applying this criterion to the registers for 1859 to 1863 (those for 1864 and 1865 have not come down to us), I found that 40.4% of young men living in my streets had both parents alive and were living with them, a further 31.7% were living with one parent, 6.7% had one or both parents living near-by, and 12.5% had lost both parents. If this is truly a test of normal family life, which is questionable, it suggests again that this area was more normal than might have been supposed. The numbers involved, however, are small (104) and only reflect the more sedentary of those who lived in my streets. *Archives de Paris*, D^1R^1/105,103,153,175.Tableaux de recensement des jeunes gens [recrutement militaire] XIIe ancien/Ve arrondissement nouveau, 1859-1863.

[112]Average delays in Paris were 55.2% within three days and 60.1% in the first week. Barrie M Ratcliffe, "Workers and Religion in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Paris: The Evidence from the Timing of Weddings and Baptisms," *Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques* 24(1998): 283-327.

[113]Of 664 baptisms of infants from my streets (out of a total of 3716 at the Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet church for the six years 1860-1865) 61.3% were within three days, while 72.9% took place within a week of the child's birth. *Archives de Paris*, Archevêché Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet. Registres des Baptêmes 3028-3033 (1860-1865.)

[114] Evidence   from   the   near-by   churches   of   Saint-Médard   and

this is that immigrants were prompter than native-born Parisians to bring their infants to the font. This, though, does not change the value of this test of the conformism of those who lived in my area.

Saint-Etienne-du-Mont suggests that the promptness with which children from my streets were baptized is exceptionally high for a popular-class area: there the averages were 40.3% and 59.6% for the former and 34.8% and 55.9% for the latter. Ratcliffe, "Workers and Religion".

The tests for marginal behaviour I have applied imprison me in debate with elite views and only permit me to view inhabitants from a distance. I need to escape, change viewpoint and look more closely at lived reality. In an effort to do so I have opted to put one group under close scrutiny: migrants in my streets from the Grand Duchy of Hesse. My choice may appear Quixotic because they are but shadows, barely mentioned in elite discussions, ignored in historians' texts. The choice, though, is apposite and for three principal reasons. The first is their numerical importance in the French capital and in my streets: there were two to three hundred of them in my streets at any one time and three thousand in the city.[115] The

---

[115]I established these figures with difficulty and in four ways. First of all, I used published and manuscript census returns. These are badly flawed. One problem is that, though the census service began to enumerate foreigners in France in 1851, not until 1861 were different nationalities indicated, which means that I cannot make comparisons between 1861 and earlier. Another is that the breakdown by national group puts into one umbrella category of 'Germans' not only those from states that would be integrated into the Second Reich but Austro-Hungarians and Luxembourgers. Hessians, then, were not enumerated apart. A third is that not only did quinquennial censuses fail to capture the flux of temporary migrations but, as the statistical service only admitted at the beginning of the following century, enumerations of foreign groups had always been less accurate than other statistics *Résultats statistiques du recensement général de la population effectué le 24 mars 1901* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1906) IV, 82. These defects are grave enough that, despite the appearance of precision, census results have to be taken as only first indications. The 1861 returns suggest there were 29,025 'Germans' in Paris, one third of the category in France as a whole and 3 out of10 foreigners in the capital. By 1866 there were over 5,000 more. In my streets there were 447 'German' men and 293 women, making them one in six of all residents and the most numerous foreign group (3 out of 4 of those born outside France). These returns do not indicate how many 'Germans' were Hessians but since Hessians were Lutherans, national group and religious affiliation can be taken together to bring us closer to their numbers in my streets. From this it appears there were some 250 Hessians in my streets, that they are clustered at a half-dozen addresses and that the sex ratio (at 104) reveals a balance between genders that is unusual among immigrant groups (this includes all ages and not just adults, for there is no breakdown by age-group). Not all those who were Lutheran and German, of course, were Hessians, though the clustering we know about from other sources suggests that this was likely to be the case. It may also be that the religious affiliation numbers are not as accurate as they might have been because some of those questioned objected to being asked and some prudent census-takers used other and less reliable ways to presume religious denomination (as indicated in the report on the census by A Rataud, mayor of the fifth arrondissement (14 May 1861), *Archives de Paris,* Vbis5F[1]/4 and as did the Secretary-General of the Prefecture of the Seine in a letter to the Lutheran Consistory, *Archives de l'Église Evangélique Luthérienne,* Correspondence du Consistoire central. The third approach was to use the Lutheran Church archives to gauge the number of Hessians. These suggest,

second is that they not only come from a poor rural background[116] but their occupations as labourers and street-sweepers [117] make them

first, that unskilled Hessians only began arriving in the mid-1840s. An examination of wedding registers at les Billettes church, which is the one Hessians in Paris would have frequented, showed that from May 1842 to May 1852 there were only 97 marriages involving one or more Hessians (1 in 5 of the total) and that only 19% of Hessian spouses were unskilled, none of whom gave one of my streets as an address.　Other evidence in the Church archives also indicates that immigration of poor Hessians only began in the mid-1840s.　First mentions of their presence are when the Consistory expressed concern about growing numbers (Procès-verbaux Consistoire, 27 December 1844). It was then that German missionary groups began funding proselytizing and services for German-speakers.　(The German mission in La Villette was set up in 1841 and in 1845 the *Evangelischer Verein der Gustav-Adolf-Stiftung* in Leipzig began funding the salary of an assistant pastor (Procès-verbaux, Consistoire, 25 July and 31 October 1845).　At the same time, mainly German-speaking immigration led to a rapid increase in Lutherans in the Seine department:　estimated at 10,000 in 1808, Lutherans were believed to number 40,000 by 1870.　By 1872 numbers had fallen by a half because Germans had left the city. *Archives de l'Eglise Evangélique Luthérienne*, "Note à l'appui d'une demande de deux nouveaux pasteurs pour l'Eglise de la Confession d'Augsbourg à Paris," (27 July 1870); *Notes statistiques pour les différents groupes de l'Eglise de la Confession d'Augsbourg à Paris* (Paris: Charles Marechal, 1872). Equally useful are estimates of the numbers of Hessians in Paris made by German-speaking pastors who evangelized and ministered to them.　These put numbers in the fifth and La Villette in the nineteenth arrondissement at between 2,000 and 3,000 *Archives de l'Eglise Evanélique Luthérienne* Pastoral reports, 6 March 1861, 10 September 1863, 24 April 1866 and 23 June 1868.　While not allowing me to calculate total numbers, the fourth source—marriage certificates and *actes de notoriété* (proofs of identity of individuals lacking proper documentation signed by seven witnesses)—allowed me to establish the backgrounds of Hessians marrying, the occupations and addresses of spouses and witnesses.

[116]They came from the northern highlands of Hesse. Their parents had unskilled occupations: 46.8% of fathers were labourers, 30.5% peasant proprietors (total sample: 141); the occupations of mothers were indicated less frequently but, out of 124 whose trade was identified, 70% were labourers and 27.4% peasant proprietors.

[117]I have identified 747 individuals (312 spouses and 435 witnesses) from marriage certificates.　There is an unfortunate male bias in these because witnesses under French law had to be men.The character of women's occupations is nevertheless clear:　80.0% were unskilled labourers and 16.8% were street-sweepers.　Evidence on men's occupations is similarly unequivocal:　71.5% are labourers and 23.8% are street-sweepers and street-repairers. Because not all Hessians in the fifth arrondissement lived in my streets, I verified those elsewhere to discover that 71.9% of the 239 men for whom I could establish occupations were labourers, while 17.6% were street-sweepers and repairers.　Of 55 brides 41 were labourers, while 5 were street-sweepers.　More

appear both marginal in the labour force [118] and yet perhaps representative of many of those who lived in my area. The third reason is that they do not integrate into Parisian life. None of them speaks French. [119]   When they marry they choose spouses who are also Hessians: nine of ten of their marriages are homogamous.[120]   Nearly all weddings, indeed, involve couples who already share the same address at the time of the ceremony[121] which, for contemporary observers at least, was a regrettable sign of cohabit-ation and a failure to observe decent social conventions.

---

significantly (because greater numbers were involved), I looked at all marriage certificates involving Hessians in the nineteenth arrondissement—which became the home of the most numerous Hessian community in the 1860s—and out of 368 spouses, 309 (84.0%) were labourers and a further 31 (8.4%) were in street-repairing or sweeping.

[118]When the famous illustrator Henri Monnier asked a street-sweeper to pose for him and explained that he wanted him to be a model, the street-sweeper responded sadly, "Modèle de misère." Cited in Emile de la Bédollière, *Les Industriels* 146.

[119]Out of 151 weddings involving Hessians in my streets, 140 (92.7%) required the services of an interpreter (as the *Code Napoléon* specified when neither spouse spoke French). Hessian weddings in the rest of the arrondissement (a total of 49) confirm this was representative: 39 of them (79.6%) needed an interpreter.

[120]Both spouses came from the same area and background. 91.4% of weddings were homogamous and, of the 13 which were not, 7 were still unions with German-speakers. Similarly high degrees of homogamy were found in the nineteenth arrondissement: out of 199 weddings involving Hessians there between 1860 and the end of 1869, 160 (83.4%) were between Hessians. If those between a Hessian and another German-speaker are added to them the percentage rises to 98.0%

[121]92.7% of spouses in my streets were at the same address, 96.0% of those in the rest of the arrondissement.

Were these characteristics truly symptoms of marginality and an inability to cope in the city and were the consequences of this to be found in patterns of behaviour, we would expect to find Hessians falling into poverty and into the hands of policemen, falling back on hospitals and welfare, and perhaps even falling into the Seine, thus escaping the city as suicides. To all intents and purposes, however, they are nowhere to be found in the registers of hospitals and hos-pices,[122] holding cells,[123] published data on arrests in the Seine department,[124] or even in the

---

[122]Applying the same tests to Hessians as those I have already used as a whole yields negative results. No Hessian died in hospital and there was just one hospital childbirth (an unmarried street-sweeper living at 14 rue du Paon in 1862). No Hessian man or woman from my streets was sent to a venereal hospital. One Hessian child was abandoned at the *Enfants trouvés* and this was because the mother had died in childbirth. Among those sent either as psychiatric patients or as elderly indigents to the Salpétrière or Bicêtre, there was only one from my streets: Louis Schomberg, a 20-year-old sweeper from the rue du Paon, sent there in September 1864 and sent back to Hesse a year later.

[123]No Hessian was sent to either of the *Dépôts de mendicité.* No Hessian man or woman from my streets was sent to the *Dépôt de Préfecture*, although a Hessian labourer living at the Place Maubert in the fifth arrondissement and a street-sweeper also from the Place Maubert were.

[124]The Justice Ministry published annual statistics indicating occupations and nationalities of people arrested in the Seine department. Although these aggregated statistics identify Hessians they do not, of course, indicate where those arrested lived. If the figures are compared with census figures for 'Germans' and with my estimate that there were 3,000 Hessians in Paris at any one time, the results can give a very rough estimate of whether Hessian arrests were disproportionately high or low. To make my estimate I analyzed data for the 1860 to 1869 period and calculated the ten-year average. We should be aware, though, that arrests are perhaps less indicators of levels of crime than of the vulnerability of some groups to being picked up: 42.2% of all those arrested were picked up for having no visible means of support (some, of course, more than once); only half of those arrested had a criminal record and one in ten was released immediately without being charged. At the same time, some were more likely than others to be arrested: males made up 17 of the total 20; labourers were one in four, and foreigners were 8.00% of arrests (but only 4.8% of the population of the Seine department in 1861 and 5.5% in 1866). This, however, was not the case with 'Germans', who made up 17.4% of foreigners arrested (when the censuses for 1861 and 1866 suggest—but probably underestimate—the proportion of foreigners in the department at 30.7% and 28.9%). It is even less the case with Hessians, who make up only 2.8% of 'Germans' arrested when they likely were 10% of 'Germans.' *Compte général de l'Administration de la justice criminelle en France pendant l'année* (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1861-1870.

registers of the morgue[125] that identified and recorded the cadavers brought there daily, most fished out of the river.

What we have to explain, then, is how so many of these migrants in the lowest-paid employments, many of them in jobs subject to seasonal and cyclical lay-offs, seem to have been successful and why none of them fell back on city welfare or fell foul of the law. A first step towards doing so is to establish why they came to Paris. They came as temporary rather than permanent migrants. Their purpose was two-fold. First, they intended to return to Hesse and Paris was instrumental in a migration strategy of improving old lives rather than making new ones, one of maintenance rather than rupture.[126]   Second, as their sex ratios and the disproportionate number of weddings in their community both suggest, many came as couples intending to marry. Neo-Malthusian policies in force in the Grand Duchy until 1868 prevented the very poor from legalizing their unions since authorities feared that the families that might be founded would become a burden on welfare resources.[127] Hessians' aims, then, were specific and limited. There are two principal explanations why, in normal cir-cumstances, these strategies stood a chance of succeeding and why, even in moments of distress, they did not fail. One is that, despite appearances, Hessians came with advantages. The other is that, because they came as links in a chain migration, they were sustained by networks on arrival and during their stay in the French capital.

---

[125]None of the 2,799 bodies identified in the Morgue registers for the period 1860-1865 was a Hessian. Taken to the morgue were the cadavers of those who had died in public spaces (streets but above all the river) usually as a result of suicide but also because of accident or sudden death.

[126]These felicitous terms were first suggested by Paul-André Rosental, "Maintien/Rupture: un nouveau couple pour l'analyse des migrations," *Annales E S C* 6 (1990): 1-31.

[127]For a discussion of these policies in Hesse and neighbouring South German states, see Klaus-Jürgen Matz, *Pauperismus und Bevölkerung: Die gesetzlichen Ehebeschrönkungen in den Suddentschen staaten während des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 1980).

Push factors had long determined temporary and permanent migration from Oberhessen. Partible inheritance, the relative poverty of upland agriculture, population pressure, and perhaps declines in cottage industry, all combined at mid-century to swell migration flows so that perhaps 140,000 migrants—and an increasing proportion of labourers— left Hesse in the 1850s.[128] Even the poor migrants who came to Paris, however, did not come unprepared for the city. Though we cannot know how old they were on arrival, there is every reason to believe that they were young and healthy. One reason is that migrant streams everywhere are usually highly self-selective and dominated by young adults. Another is the large number of Hessian weddings in Paris that suggests that young adults formed a major proportion of immigrants. More direct evidence can also be adduced: the age of witnesses for the documentation that Hessians without papers needed to be able to marry. Nearly three in five were thirty or less and four out of five were aged forty or younger.[129] Migrants came prepared in a second manner: the long

---

[128]Peter Winkel, "Emigration from Hesse-Darmstadt in the Mid-Nineteenth Century" *Yearbook of German-American Studies* 26 (1991): 81-92. In a recent thesis on Hesse-Cassel, Simone Wegge found that 55,000 people permanently emigrated from this neighbouring state between 1832 and 1857("Migration Decisions in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Germany," unpublished PhD Thesis, Northwestern University, 1997, 130-31 and table 4.4.1, 314). See also Inge Auerbach ed, *Hessische Auswanderer* (Marburg: Veroffentichungen der Archivschule Marburg, 1987-1989, 4 vols) that contains a wealth of information on Hessian migration. For the wider migration context in Germany at this time, see Steve Hochstadt, "Migration in Pre-Industrial Germany," *Central European History* 16 (1983): 195-224. For the undeveloped state of the Hessian economy, see Ingomar Bog, "Die Industrialisierung hessens," in Uwe Schultz ed. *Die Geschichte Hessens* (Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss, 1983).

[129] *Archives de Paris*, $D^{12}U^1$/38-47 Fonds des justices de paix (Ve arrondissement). The total number of witnesses is 348. 56.9% were 30 and under; 68.1% 36 and younger; 78.74% 40 and less; 92.0% fifty and younger. I selected witnesses because there were seven for each document, and because the age of spouses—which I might have used—might have been more biased. Witnesses had to be 21 and could be relations.

It is possible that for others in the occupation street-sweeping was only a last resort for the old and those incapable of doing other work. This is certainly what Henry Mayhew suggested was the case with those in street maintenance in mid-nineteenth-century London (*London Labour and the London Poor*, (first published in 1851) London: Frank Cass, 1967, 4 vols). This does not seem to be the case in Paris. Hessians had come to dominate street-sweeping. Not until the 1891 census, though, am I able to determine age structures in the service. Of the men over half (56.0%) were aged 40 and under and a further 31.3% were between 41 and 59 years old. Women were slightly older: 20.0% were 40 and under and 61.2% aged from 41 to 59. Proportions calculated from

Hessian tradition of seasonal migration had included, among other tasks, labouring, construction work and street maintenance in German cities. The kind of work they did in Paris, then, involved only a change in the direction of flows rather than in the nature of employment.[130]   They came prepared in a third way: they came with the ability to read and write.[131]

---

manuscript census data in *Archives de Paris*, D^{1}M^8/6 "Recensement du 12 avril 1891. Relevé spécial des professions à Paris."

[130] Steve Hochstadt, *Mobility and Modernization: Migration in Germany, 1820-1989* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999)   202-3.

[131] Out of 278 Hessian marriages in the fifth arrondissement and 1668 individuals who were asked to sign the wedding certificates, only 5 (0.3%) were unable to do so. This is only an approximate measure but it confirms what we know about schooling in Hesse.   How important this ability was in terms of coping (as opposed to bible-reading) is another matter. One in four building workers in Paris was still illiterate in 1860 (Chambre de commerce de Paris *Statistique 1860*, XLI), but many migrant workers from the Massif Central were able nonetheless to use the city successfully for their ends.

More importantly, they came to the French capital because of pull factors: the Parisian economy drew them there. It did so in large part because the massive urban planning projects, the prosperity of the economy and manufacturing [132] all increased demand for labour, including unskilled workers. It also seems—and the point is a major one—that the immigrants so attracted did not swamp the labour market because the general level of nominal wages rose slightly faster than, or at least kept pace with, the cost of living.[133] It also appears that this was true even of labourers and street-sweepers. The validity of this assertion, though, is easier to demonstrate for the latter than for the much more diverse group of unskilled workers. Information on increasing numbers and wages of street-sweepers suggests that, provided they had no mishaps, Hessians could make ends meet and make savings even in this low-status employment. Numbers of street-maintenance workers in the city were growing. At a time when one in four male industrial workers in the city earned three francs and less a day and one female in six earned as little as one franc twenty-five cents and under,[134] male sweepers earned from two francs fifty to three francs fifty and females one franc to one franc twenty a day.[135] Could such modest remuneration allow Hessians to meet their migration goals? We know that some other migrants earning low wages were able to do so. It may well be, then, that Hessian labourers and road-sweepers could also make a profit in the city, provided that, as did some other migrants, they had the networks and the coping strategies to succeed.

It is evident that they needed the migration networks in Paris to help them overcome the disadvantages they suffered: the French capital was a recent venue for poor migrants from Oberhessen; they did not speak the language; they were unskilled. Their chain migration, then, had to serve them in three ways. Migrants already in Paris had to send for more to come, by either sending remittances for travel or intelligence about employment or both. Migrants already there also needed to provide help to newcomers, who arrived with limited financial means and had to

---

[132]Barrie M Ratcliffe, "Manufacturing in the Metropolis: The Dynamism and Dynamics of Parisian Industry at the Mid-Nineteenth Century," *Journal of European Economic History* 23 (1994): 263-328.

[133] As suggested by Jacques Rougerie, "Remarques sur l'histoire des salaires à Paris au XIXe siècle," *Le Mouvement social* 63 (1968): 71-108. Given the wide disparities in wage scales, more work needs to be done on the question before we have an unequivocal demonstration of this.

[134]Chambre de commerce de Paris, *Statistique 1860*, xxxv-xxxvi and   994.

[135] Luigi Cerruti, "Cenni statistici sull'industria e sul commercio nel distretto di Parigi", *Bolletino consolare* I (1861-1862) 561-600.

find work and low-cost accommodation quickly.   Migrants together, finally, had to provide each other moral and limited financial support at certain phases of the life cycle or in the moments of crisis some would face at one time or another during their sojourn in Paris.

This, in fact, is what they did. The nature and importance of solidarities can be indicated in a number of ways. Hessians in my streets came from the same areas, had similar social backgrounds and were in the same occupations.[136]   Many of them did not come as single migrants but in couples.[137] When they made their unions legal their marriage certificates give some indication of how many couples had family with them in Paris. One spouse in five had either one or both parents living with them and nearly two in five had other family members.[138] Given the stage in the life cycle that spouses had reached, when young children would put pressure on family finances and perhaps prevent mothers from having gainful employment, the availability of kinship resources, and

[136]Street-sweeping was an immigrant niche, dominated by Hessians, a domination facilitated by the fact that sweepers worked in groups of five or six, supervised by someone who had risen from the ranks. See Louis Bamberger, "La colonie allemande," *Paris-Guide par les principaux écrivains et artistes de la France* (Paris: Librairie internationale, 1867) pp.1017-1042; Street-paving was also dominated by immigrants. Of the 350 nominations to the post of *cantonnier* in the municipal service from 1856 to 1870, only two had been born in Paris (*Archives de Paris*, VO NC/168 "Nominations de cantonniers, 1856-1870).

[137]This is suggested in three indices. One is that sex ratios (which include children because no age breakdowns are available) for Hessians in my streets are more balanced than for other immigrant groups in Paris. Published census data suggest (but can do no more because we do not know how many women were in domestic service) that 'Germans' had sex ratios of 117 in 1861, lower than any other national group except the British (who did have a high proportion of governesses, teachers, and female domestic servants). Hessians in my streets, according to my estimates from manuscript census data, had a sex ratio of 120. A second is the number of Hessian weddings that was disproportionate to their total population. A third is that some weddings involved legitimizing children born out of wedlock who had come to Paris with their parents. (French law allowed couples who married to indicate children they already had, whose names were then entered on the marriage certificate; these marriages were termed *marriages réparateurs*.)

[138] Out of 299 spouses from my streets, 22.4% had both parents or one parent living with them, while 37.1% had siblings, cousins or uncles in Paris. Since witnesses had to be male and aged twenty-one these proportions must underestimate the true situation.

especially grandparents, who could look after infants, may well have been critical.   Residential clustering further enhanced solidarities. As is often the case with immigrant groups,[139] Hessians formed extremely close-knit communities. Just how close can be established by analyzing the addresses given by spouses and witnesses at weddings and by witnesses who vouchsafed for an individual's identity and civil status before a justice of the peace.   Two-thirds of spouses and their witnesses in all Hessian marriages in the fifth arrondissement lived in my streets and of these four in five lived at just six addresses.[140] Witnesses in justice of the peace documents in the fifth arrondissement are similarly clustered:[141]   two-thirds of them lived in my streets and one-third had the same address as the individual whose identity they were guaranteeing.[142]

  Residential clustering also encouraged some Hessians to establish businesses to serve the needs of fellow countrymen. At three of the six addresses where Hessians were concentrated in my streets there were Hessian tavern-keepers and lodging operators[143] who provided places of

---

[139] As did other German groups in Paris. Furniture workers (*ébénistes*) and shoe-makers (*cordonniers*) often had their own *garnis* or were grouped together in *deutsche hoefe*. Chambre de commerce de Paris, *Statistique 1847-8*, 159 and 230; Louis Bamberger, "La colonie allemande…"

[140] I have 1143 names from weddings from 1860 to 1865. Of these 734 lived in my streets. Four in five of them at six addresses. These are in declining order of importance: 14 Paon (19.6% of Hessians in my streets); 27 Traversine (14.0%); 13 Mûrier (13.8%); 19 Arras (12.5%); 22 Traversine (11.0%); 31 Traversine (9.3%). This suggests that half of all Hessians in the arrondissement lived in just six buildings.

[141] *Archives de Paris*, D^{12}U^1/38-65.   The total number of witnesses is 491. Of these, 85.3% lived in the arrondissement, 65.4% in my streets, 33.2% at the same address as the individual without papers they identify.

[142] To verify that such clustering in my streets was a matter of choice rather than imposed on an extruded group, I analyzed the addresses given by the 1164 spouses and witnesses in all 199 weddings involving Hessians that took place in the XIXe arrondissement between 1860 and 1869. The Hessian community there in the 1860s was the most numerous in Paris. Over half of them (55.2%) were to be found in just two streets: the rue de Meaux and the Passage Saint-Nicolas, both of which were to the south of the canal basin at La Villette and to the north of the Butttes-Chaumont. Buildings there were makeshift and without facilities.

[143] Nicolas Fox was at 14 Paon (where he rented ground-floor space and a small *garni*); Louis Fuchs at 27 Traversine (where he owned the building bought for 10,426 francs in 1843); while Johann Gaspard Fischer was a tavern-keeper at 22 Traversine (his marriage certificate in the Lutheran Church archives indicates that, when he married in June 1851, he was a shoe-maker; his *acte de*

sociability and intelligence and acted as anchors for their local community. More important perhaps was the role played by religion. Hessians arrived as pious Lutherans [144] and once in Paris were proselytized by their Church, which set up institutions to meet their spiritual and other needs. In the 1860s four hundred German-speakers took communion during the Sunday service in German at the chapel in the fifth arrondissement. [145] The Lutheran Church played four specific roles in reinforcing community and helping Hessians cope. The first was that religion reinforced identity and a rigorous moral ethic that emphasized the values of hard work, thrift and abstinence. The second was that it facilitated their marriages through the creation of a charitable organization that helped them find the documents they needed. [146] The

notoriété (14 September 1863) reveals that both his parents, who were labourers, lived at the same address as he did and so did his wife's, who were also labourers). It is possible that the principal tenant at a fourth address where Hessians were clustered—Mutterer at 31 Traversine—was also a countryman but I have not been able to verify this. It is certain, however, that Jacob Reh, who rented a tavern business from Jean Fresquet at 41 Traversine was a Hessian. All of them frequently acted as witnesses for Hessians for weddings, births and deaths.

[144] Pastors Reichard and Bodelschwingh (the latter destined for an exceptional evangelical career) wrote in 1863: "Les Allemands, surtout les Hessois et quelquefois aussi les Alsaciens emportent de leur pays des usages pieux. Il est rare de trouver des familles qui n'aient emporté de leur pays soit leur Bible, soit un livre de priéres, soit un recueil de cantiques." *Archives de l'Eglise Evangélique Luthérienne*, Pastor's report on La Villette-Belleville for 1862 (23 September 1863).

[145] *Archives de l'Eglise Evangélique Luthérienne*, Pastor Albert Matter's Report for 1860 (6 March 1861). He also commented on Hessians' religious observance: "Si les sentiments religieux ne sont pas très développés, ils sont du moins exacte[s] dans l'accomplissement de leurs devoirs religieux, les enfants sont apportés au baptême dans les quatre jours qui suivent la naissance, les indifférents même croient convenable de se présenter une fois par an à la Sainte Cène. Mais ces formalités une fois accomplies, un grand nombre d'entr'eux se flattent d'avoir payé leur dette à Dieu et à l'Evangile." His successor as Pastor was more generous: "Les Hessois ont l'habitude de fréquenter les cultes, tiennent aux sacrements, aiment les visites du Pasteur dans les cas de maladie surtout, demandent l'assistance du Pasteur aux enterrements." Report by Pastor Mast for 1863 (2 may 1864). Whichever of the two is nearer the truth, these religious sentiments were more developed than was the case with many in the popular classes in Paris at the time.

[146] The Lutheran and Reform Churches established the *Oeuvre évangélique des mariages* in 1857 in imitation of the Société Saint-François Régis founded earlier by Catholics. By the end of 1865 it had facilitated the weddings of over

third was that the Church established free primary schools teaching children in German and following exactly the curriculum used in the Grand Duchy.[147] The fourth and final role was to offer very modest financial aid but stronger moral support by visits through pastors when Hessians fell ill.[148]

The example of Hessians is instructive for it shows that those with a strong migratory tradition and support networks could get by and even succeed in their migration strategies and this despite low status and poor remuneration. Their experience, however, should not induce us into believing that all migrants, and still less all residents, in my streets benefited from having such strong family or group solidarities. Theirs, indeed, was a case of encapsulation: they had an exceptionally dense migration network to sustain them. There is a second drawback to the Hessian example: it does not help us see the overlaps and connections between individuals and groups in my streets and thus to understand how they all lived together. Regrettably, and as is so often the case in studies of urban cultures, surviving sources cannot be coaxed into showing them.

1,000 couples, only a small proportion between French nationals, but a large number involving Hessians. For an examination of the work of these charities, see my "Popular Classes and Cohabitation in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Paris," *Journal of Family History* 21(1996): 316-50.

[147] The Lutheran chapel in Saint-Marcel operated Sunday schools and kindergarten (*asiles*) but no statistics on the numbers of children involved are given in annual parish reports. Primary schools for children aged seven and over offered separate classes in French and German for a nominal monthly charge of 10c per child. Parish reports indicate that in the 1860-1865 period an average of 144 children were attending the classes in German. These classes were funded by the Consistory and German evangelical missions. See also Wilfried Pabst, "Ecoles allemandes à Paris. Notices sur l'évolution de la colonie allemande à Paris (1858-1914)," *Francia* 8(1980): 667-79.

[148] Financial aid was minimal because the Lutheran Church in Paris had a chronic shortage of funds, made all the more serious by the poverty of the rapidly increasing numbers of newcomers in the 1850s and 1860s. This meant that in times of illness or unemployment Hessians had to rely on the informal help of their community. I examined the lists of mutual aid societies set up in Paris from 1849 onwards (*Archives de Paris*, 1315 W/112-115) but, though many other immigrant groups set up *sociétés de secours mutuels*, Hessians did not. It is possible, but I have no evidence for it, that the charity set up by the Prussian embassy in Paris in 1844 (the *Hilfsverein für notleidende Deutsche*) gave some succour. For this and other charitable organizations for Germans in France, see Frantz Menges, "Die Deutschen Hilfsvereine in Frankreich vor dem ersten Weltkrieg," *Francia* 5(1975): 359-77.

Looking Through Darkened Windows

This paper has been concerned with representations of high-density, low-cost housing areas in the inner city. We have come to realize in recent years that the images—be they figurative as in Marville's photographs or textual as in this paper—that we use to try to make comprehensible a complex and elusive urban reality are necessarily simplifications and therefore misrepresentations. We are also more aware that the city is perceived from different standpoints and that this means we have to compose with competing images. In this text, indeed, I have presented two contrasting representations of the same reality.

I have argued that we should not accept the claims to truth of one of these: Charles Marville's images of condemned streets in central Paris inhabited by the most disadvantaged of the city's population. I have done so by arguing that his photographs were made rather than taken and by suggesting that to see through his images we need to put ourselves behind his camera lens rather than just viewing what it recorded. When we do we are able to understand how and why he made his images and how they fitted into contemporary elite discourse on the Other. This discourse, I have further claimed, tells us more about elites as subjects than about the ostensible objects they discussed. I have done so, too, by suggesting that we also need to look at ourselves when we view his pictures of the dark side of the Montagne Sainte-Geneviève in order to realize that we, too, are conditioned to see rather than being entirely free to imagine the lived reality behind those dark decrepit walls. I have pointed out, finally, that recent research on the experience of the disadvantaged in cities, then and now, also invites us to (re)view both Marville's and our own images of inner cities.

Marville is the pretext for my own text on those six streets that has elaborated a different representation of lived reality there. To develop this composite image, I have first recreated the streets and the buildings and businesses on them to show that, far from being a lost corner of the metropolis, this area was dynamic, responsive to market forces, and adapted to the needs of its inhabitants. Second, I have tested point by point the validity of contemporary condemnation of those who lived there and concluded that their identity, occupations, and what behaviour I was able to glimpse, all indicate they were ordinary and respectable people struggling and usually managing to make ends meet and even doing more than that. Thirdly, I have looked closely at one group, many of whose characteristics make them appear to be on the very edge of the margin, and have argued that not even they conform to the patterns of failure outside observers believed they detected.

While I believe that my own representation better captures lived reality than do Marville's images, I am still painfully aware of the blurred and

incomplete nature of the picture I have constructed. As do all scholars nowadays, I realize that research is only exploration, its results more readings than findings, this text as much a construction as any cultural artifact. I know, too, that historians and anthropologists can no longer speak as confidently as they once did on behalf of those who have no voice of their own. I even know that much of urban life—spoken words, gestures, body language, and social inter-action—does not leave traces and must remain lost to me. As must the symbolic resistance, the secret weapons of irony, sarcasm, and ridicule, which subordinate groups, in my streets as elsewhere, have always used behind the backs and out of the sight of the dominant.   James C Scott, whose study[149] has done much to enlighten us about what he terms "sniggering guerilla warfare" in our world quotes an Ethiopian proverb that sums up recourse to these weapons of the weak: "When the great lord rides by the peasant bows deeply and quietly passes wind." When the not-so-great historian passes through the archives the mute inhabitants of my streets may well silently do the same. I console myself, however, with my belief that, by climbing my rickety homemade ladders and peering through my clumsy binoculars into darkened windows, I have glimpsed at least the shadows of once-lived reality. And I find further consolation for all the physical and imaginative effort required for only tentative results in a passage by Charles Baudelaire, that inveterate wanderer of Paris streets at night, (though he certainly did not frequent mine):

> "He who looks outside through a window open never sees as much as he who looks at a window closed. No deeper, more mysterious, more fertile, more obscure, more dazzling object exists than a window lit by a candle. What you can see in sunlight is always less interesting than what transpires behind a window pane."
>
> Charles Baudelaire, Le Spleen de Paris

---

[149] *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

Figure 1

rue d'Arras

Figure 2

rue du Bon-Puits

Figure 3

rue du Mûrier

Figure 4

rue du Paon

Figure 5

rue de Versailles

Figure 6

rue Traversine