

SUZANNE NASH

---

## Introduction

---

Twentieth-century theorists of modernity have frequently chosen metaphors of homelessness to describe the aesthetic repercussions of cultural change. Ruins, debris, rooflessness, *bricolage*, nomadism, and *habitus* are all highly charged figures in a critical idiom which looks for significant connections between art and the structures of everyday life. As the essays in this collection aim to show, these metaphors have a rich cultural history. They are the haunting reminders of several generations of thinking about the relationship between changes in artistic form and the reality of social restructuring that was taking place at an unprecedented pace throughout the nineteenth century. In France the story of that relationship is marked, for a variety of reasons, by several distinct events: the Revolution, the June Days of 1848, and the rebuilding of Paris under the Second Empire. The essays in part 2 describing "aesthetic forms of homelessness" reflect the intense creativity and inventiveness under the July Monarchy and the Second Empire that was in part generated to accommodate the changes brought about by those events. A separate section has been created in part 3 for the "place of women," whose status as citizen of the new postrevolutionary order was conceived differently from that of men. In the dialectic of family and state which constituted the republican discourse of citizenship, women were consigned to the domain of the private, the concrete, and the individual, whereas men were seen as the public representatives of universal goals and ideals. The repression of women in the name of "community" and the increasingly radical separation of personal and professional spheres of responsibility

exacerbated distinctions between public and private forms of writing. It is not surprising that nineteenth-century literature, which investigates the pathologies of that separation, provides such a rich source for reflection on the many forms of displacement we have come to associate with modernism.

In *The Theory of the Novel*, Georg Lukács begins an analysis of the modern novel by using the metaphor of "home" to emphasize the important connection of outside to inside in the way cultural experience determines artistic expression and, by extension, makes the interdependency of form and content a necessary feature of interpretation. Lukács evokes the lost cultural past of the epic—a time when "the world is wide and yet is like a home . . ." and "all that is necessary is to find the *locus* that has been predestined for each individual."<sup>1</sup> He opposes this once homogeneous world, in which "being and destiny . . . are . . . identical concepts" (p. 30), to the world of the novel, in which there are "irreparable cracks" (p. 37) and "the ultimate basis of artistic creation has become homeless" (p. 41). For Lukács, the greatest art, while unsparingly confronting man's alienated condition, can reconstruct a sense of the lost homogeneity of human life out of the fragments that now constitute our condition. More recently, and very much in keeping with the later Lukács (who will identify this metaphysical alienation with the material conditions of life under capitalism), Franco Moretti has compared the classical Bildungsroman of Jane Austen or Goethe, where "time is used to find a homeland," with the novels of Balzac, Stendhal, and Flaubert, in which the heroes have an "incredibly weak sense of social contract," the continuity between inner and outer world is broken, and "plot becomes a sequence of arbitrary acts."<sup>2</sup>

Like Balzac, for whom the "fall" into materialism began with the July Revolution,<sup>3</sup> Walter Benjamin connects the psychological importance attached to home as a place of refuge, where the individual can protect and nurture his illusions, to the bourgeois monarchy of Louis-Philippe. Then for the first time the private space of living was perceived as "antithetical to the place of work."<sup>4</sup> No wonder that Balzac's narrator can imagine the reader of novels as a bourgeois *rentier* or as a bored woman with soft hands (" . . . you who hold this book with a white hand, you who settle deeper into your soft armchair as you say to yourself: perhaps this will amuse me," *Le Père Goriot*). The hero of the postrevolutionary French Bildungsroman, as Moretti points out, conceals the best part of himself from the world in which he must succeed, until finally, by the end of the nineteenth century, in the novels of Huysmans or Proust, he never leaves his house or bedroom at all. Artist and woman, writing and home, begin

to exchange features, granting new aesthetic significance to Flaubert's equivocal remark: "Madame Bovary, c'est moi."<sup>5</sup>

Retreat to a private space is never wholly successful, however. Nor was it meant to be in the nineteenth century. Walter Benjamin is particularly alert to the seemingly paradoxical intrusions (or, as Baudelaire puts it, "sallies") of privacy into the public sphere. This may be because, unlike Lukács, Benjamin does not seek an ironic reconstruction of a lost wholeness in modern art, but rather the heroic testimony of a condition of permanent disconnectedness. He analyzes the ambiguous social and political implications of aesthetic phantasmagorias of the interior in a variety of genres: the emergent fiction of "detection," in which traces of the individual on furniture are studied for microscopic clues of unimaginable crimes; the ornamental vegetable forms of art nouveau as they move from their Parisian apartments into the street to confront "a technically armed environment"; and the glass-covered, marble-floored shopping arcades which draw the individual, imagined as a dandified or feminized male, into the city while giving him the impression he has never left his apartment. An ironical tourist, *chez lui* in his own city, the Baudelairean poet-flâneur can "go to market"<sup>6</sup> by strolling indolently past an array of fetishized objects, as if he were a discriminating buyer instead of a peddler of outdated words. Within these passageways, he can feel sheltered from the anonymous urban crowd, which appears to him there as so much dream imagery. The utopian architecture of the arcades, which serve as a model for Baudelaire's perverse representation of modernity, are seen by Benjamin to devolve, later in the century, into the huge commercial emporiums, described by Zola in *Au bonheur des dames* as palaces of prostitution. The entire city is transformed into a commercial interior, whose labyrinthine, street-like aisles shut the now distinctly female consumer off from any distractions and make her an eager accomplice to her own political dispossession.

If Lukács and Benjamin believe that "all the fissures and rents inherent in the historical situation must be drawn into the form-giving process"<sup>7</sup> for the artist to maintain a critical relationship to his or her time, Paul de Man understands those fissures and rents as fundamental to language itself, an inescapable feature of all texts. The rhetorical arsenal of deconstruction—with its stress on "deferral," "dispossession," "lapse," and "relapse"—is meant to attack the consoling notion of origin, especially as it appears in Romantic texts, and the idea that one can rediscover in art a lost experience of wholeness. Instead of being a decisive mark of identity—"native speaker," "mother tongue," etc.—language itself becomes here a region of exile

and alienation, a "*demeure empruntée*," as the rhetorician Du Marsais says of metaphor. Self and world, text and life, are seen as mystifying distinctions, out of which decisive concepts of culture, morality, and individual thought have been invented. "Modernity" is thus redefined, not as an historical condition, but as a metaphysical insight into the power of language to mean more than it says and its failure to signify anything beyond itself.

Although deconstructionist criticism represents both a demystification of the aesthetic as a privileged category (a last residence of completeness) and a rejection of historically grounded criticism, its view of the world as a self-deluding text has afforded important insight into the treachery of language as a reliable tool for analysis. It has opened the way for an appreciation of alienated modes of writing by marginal groups who challenge, when they do not outright reject, the "discourse" of the dominant culture in clearly political terms. This collection, which focuses on the nineteenth century's preoccupation with figures of homelessness, reveals both the temptation and the anxiety implicit in such a pessimistic view of human expression. In fact, the direction of modern criticism toward increasingly hermetic, text-centered, anti-referential theories of reading follows a path similar to that traced by nineteenth-century narratives as they turn from the world of social exchange to more and more detached forms of self-analysis.

Recently, from the perspective of sociology, there has been a renewed interest in community and culture as linguistic phenomena. In the writings of Pierre Bourdieu, *habitus* represents the internalization of social distinctions, such as property and class, that condition our psychological predispositions. The word implies both "habit" and "habitation," and pessimistically suggests that what we call "values" or "free choice" are myths. The task of the analyst, in this case the sociolinguist, is to uncover the processes by which society institutionalizes these so-called "values," so that we can understand and alter the means by which one *habitus* controls and exploits another.

A critique of the subject is the inevitable result of the shift from a form of industrial capitalism which still depended for its success upon individual initiative to its later technological phase in which faceless corporations or completely abstract systems of negotiation like the modern bank have replaced the old barons of industry and empire.<sup>8</sup> Most postmodernist thinkers agree, however, that some concept of accountability to a collective social life must replace the isolationism fostered by the bourgeois ideal of home if human beings are not to passively accede to their own demise as individuals.

Although the self-fashioning individual of great expectations epitomized by Rastignac's challenge to Paris, "*À nous deux, maintenant*,"

became a commonplace of nineteenth-century self-representation, no such totalizing image seemed available for the social theatre within which that individual was expected to play out his role. Paris is characteristically depicted as having a monstrous appetite for seduction and betrayal in nineteenth-century fiction, where the search for the reinvention of a notion of community which does not stifle individual thought is already well under way. The new postrevolutionary society is represented more in terms of what it has lost—as debris or ruins, quagmire or sewer—than in terms of the solidity of its foundations. How did this happen? A general overview of some of the conditions which led to the dissolution of prerevolutionary concepts of community may be helpful for understanding how the breakdown between individual and polis represented in the texts analyzed in this collection might have occurred.



The French Revolution was at once the culmination of the social and economic disorders of the *ancien régime*, and the beginning of an era and a mentality we now recognize as modern. Although significant alterations in the way individuals conceived of their relationship to the state were occurring throughout the industrializing world, France stood out as the largest and most populous country in Europe, and her Revolution, which sent waves of émigrés to England, Germany, Russia, and Italy, struck the imagination of a post-feudal world as no other event ever has. The radical break with the old monarchical forms of government produced a crisis in national identity that manifested itself in a pervasive sense of the precariousness of individual destiny. In sealing off any possible return to what, after 1793, was referred to as the *ancien régime*, the Revolution could seem to replace one form of tyranny by another: time-honored but repressive absolutist values by the unpredictable relativism of political expediency. As John Dunn has remarked, Burke, in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, already saw “a political space . . . opened up to the entrepreneurial ravages of those with no stake whatever in the ancient order of things and little direct stake in the continuing safety or prosperity of the population they aspired to lead.”<sup>9</sup> Even the most progressivist contemporary voices understood that modern times had begun, in a sense, with the Terror, when the democratic ideals of 1789 appeared to die along with inherited legitimacy, and the reshaping of society fell to those most capable of manipulating the symbols of revolutionary idealism. Victor Hugo, whose last novel, published in 1874, was entitled *Ninety-Three* (*Quatrevingt-treize*), had already perceived the importance of this change during the early years of

Romanticism, when he wrote that from now on the pen would replace the sword, and the new dictionary, the old revolutionary *co-carde*. During the decade following 1789, rhetoric had proved more powerful than tradition or the law in harnessing the energy of vast numbers of people, and that lesson would not be forgotten, especially under the repressive political regimes of Napoleon and the Restoration monarchy. The series of revolutions in 1830, 1848, and 1870, which followed 1789, brought with them a sense of social and psychological dislocation for people in every class. As the century advanced, theories of culture and sophisticated new disciplines—sociology, psychology, demography, anthropology, urban planning—grew out of the need to understand the growing displacement of individual interests by the collective body now more and more frequently referred to as the “masses.”

The Revolution seemed to inaugurate a new age because it precipitated social changes whose effects would influence the way people thought of their relationship to the state throughout the nineteenth century. But a demographic shift that would have a profound effect on the way individuals conceived of home had already begun to take place in France before the Revolution. In the mid-eighteenth century 80 percent of the population of France lived and worked in the country and 100 percent of the cultivatable land was in use. By the early twentieth century, the urban population was almost equal to that of the countryside, and Paris, the capital, had nearly tripled in population. This process of urbanization was not caused by the natural growth of cities; urban mortality rates were too high for that. Nor, as was popularly believed by the end of the century, was it due to a drastic emptying out of the countryside in favor of the city. Rather the shift occurred owing to the immigration of an excess rural population that could not be absorbed by the land. Indeed statistics show that, unlike England, where enclosure had driven the peasantry to the cities earlier,<sup>10</sup> the rural population of France remained approximately the same in 1831, 1846, and 1866, whereas urban population increased from 5.1 million in 1806 to 18.5 million in 1911.<sup>11</sup> The fact that the myth of an *exode rural* became a commonplace of late nineteenth-century thought and a powerful literary theme, suggests that traditional rural and village life was still a compelling reality, and that the fear of its loss was related to a deeper anxiety that can be connected to a loss of national identity (HPF, 181).

Before the onslaught of the industrial revolution, there were annual migrations (*la montée vers Paris*) of people seeking work—masons, carpenters, coppersmiths, peddlers, nursemaids, cooks, etc.—who returned after a few months of seasonal work to their pro-

vincial dwellings. In comparison with a constantly changing urban population, rural life was sedentary and traditionalist. The distinctive regional differences determined by these differing local economies were to be preserved throughout most of the nineteenth century. Home was conceived of as one's *pays d'origine* with its very concrete—linguistic, culinary, artisanal—expressions of daily life. Seasonal workers returning from Paris were coming back to a place in which their parents and grandparents had been born, a region that to a large extent was inseparable from their social identity.

In pre-industrial France agriculture represented three-fourths of the national revenue, and most of its activities were organically connected to the provincial town. Aside from capitals such as Lyons or Paris, city and country were not very distinct realms. Nine out of ten provincial towns produced at least half of their consumption of grain, and manufacturing activities, involving local rural labor, were scattered throughout the countryside. The distinction between village, *bourg*, and *ville* was mainly one of size and administrative function. Cities had walls, denser population, regular market days, an annual fair, a parish, but they were centers from which less autonomous neighboring inhabitants came and went and around which people of all classes oriented their daily lives (HPF, 2: 83). Lionel Gossman has pointed out the common moral scale on which business was conducted: the production of goods being in proportion to need, with emphasis placed on the quality and the value of the product for the existing social structure. Commerce was thought of as a function of social "virtue" by eighteenth-century economists such as Colbert or social philosophers such as Montesquieu and even Rousseau.<sup>12</sup> This close connection between worker and product was reflected in institutions like the guild or *métier juré*, a hierarchized community with the master craftsman as the supreme authority. Products were subject to strict inspection and the master was held legally accountable to the consumers for the work of his less skilled *compagnons* and unpaid *apprentices*.<sup>13</sup>

People drew their physical and spiritual sustenance from the region in which they were born. This was true for most of France, with no dramatic difference between a commercial north and a land-owning south, as in England; or between a worldly north and a backward and native south, as in Italy. Apart from its regional distinctions, all of France seemed coherent in more or less the same way. The memory of home as a fully integrated social and spiritual world—Nerval's Senlis or Proust's Combray—would remain central to the individual's self-image well into the twentieth century, even in the terms by which its loss might be stated. In fact, the French

language does not really have a word for home or homelessness in the English sense. In 1988 the demographer Jean-Pierre Poussou can still write with pride:

Can one explain this general sedentariness? It certainly corresponds to our ancestors' strong attachment to their country of origin, understood in the narrowest sense of the word possible. . . . For the majority of these rural people, all of whom owned at least a small plot of ground, life is inconceivable outside of the framework of one's birthplace, or far from there, outside of the family and village structures, then, to which one is so attached.<sup>14</sup>

But as the overall population of France grew, there developed a disjunction between rural/provincial and urban experience. A steady stream of unqualified, mostly male laborers, *brasseurs*, migrated to the capital and swelled the ranks of the urban poor. More importantly, an economic upswing which took place between 1750 and 1775, coupled with the royal government's willingness to make reforms that removed the economy from the control of the state to place it in the hands of an entrepreneurial middle class, produced a widening gap between the haves and the have-nots which helped prepare the way for the Revolution of 1789. Because of a sharp downward turn in the economy after 1775, followed by the poor harvest of 1788, the lower and middle classes, who bore the brunt of taxation, were only temporarily brought together in their hatred of privilege. The laboring people, who continued to pay taxes on nearly everything and did not have enough surplus to benefit from the new prosperity, became a source of cheap labor for an increasingly powerful middle class. With the deregulation of salary rates, working conditions, price, and quality of products, the guild system gave way to a capitalist economy that emphasized production for the new, increasingly mass market and challenged the traditional structure of society at its very core.<sup>15</sup>

As large urban centers became hubs for the distribution of goods, new wealth and a new class emerged whose base was the city. In some sections of pre-industrial Paris the streets of the *quartier* actually had a kind of social and economic integrity. As T. J. Clark puts it, ". . . the context of industry was the *quartier*," with its forges, its brickyards, and its money lenders. "Business and sociability were bound together. . . . Each *quartier* had its own shopkeepers and *négociants*, who gave it the access it needed to Paris and the world beyond. . . . They knew how to talk to the bank and how best to strike a bargain . . . they were the bourgeois of the neighbourhood, and



recognized as such."<sup>16</sup> One might say that Balzac models the entrepreneurial con man, Vautrin, along the lines of the *bourgeois du quartier*. He knows who needs what, exactly where to go to get a "job" done, and how to make a profit for the benefit of his underground Parisian community. On the other hand, the ease with which Vautrin can transform his talents as criminal into those of policeman, the mixture in his character of sentimentality and unfeeling cynicism, suggest the pathology Balzac saw emerging out of this new, urbanized capitalism.

By the 1840s the same causes would produce the same effects in the social reorganization of both Paris and inland cities. Under the July Monarchy the *quartier* economy with its complex social interactions begins to give way to larger, impersonal, citywide negotiations. Technology and capitalism—the train, the steamboat, a banking system to handle the rapid circulation of massive amounts of money—altered the time-honored rituals of rural economics.<sup>17</sup> The narrator of Nerval's *Sylvie* must go to the theatre every night to resurrect his memories of the Valois through the artificial glitter of stage magic. When he returns to Senlis after studying in Paris, he finds his childhood sweetheart, who used to make lace according to her grandmother's model, with *une mécanique* making gloves for Dammartin, because, as she says, "it pays a lot right now."<sup>18</sup> The largest of the urban centers became crossroads or spokes in a wheel with Paris at its center. "The provincial town with its fairs, its religious, military, and administrative functions, its system of influence on surrounding countryside, patiently woven by its artisans, its merchants, its notaries . . . must submit or inexorably perish."<sup>19</sup>

For the nineteenth-century city dweller the possibility of return to the country of one's ancestors became increasingly a practical impossibility. As the population of Paris grew from 547,756 in 1801 to 1,053,897 in 1846, to 2,536,834 in 1896, physical homelessness accompanied spiritual loneliness. Building, which increased by 10 percent under the Restoration, did not keep up with the growth in population. As Louis Chevalier points out, "from the last years of the Restoration to the early years of the Second Empire descriptions all stress either the monumentality and splendour of the capital, or the filth, stench, darkness, and ugliness of the streets."<sup>20</sup> Victor Considérant, a philosopher and economist who was born in a small village in the Jura and who became a disciple of Fourier's when he first came to Paris, describes the city in 1848 as a dying pauper: "Look at Paris: all these windows, doors and apertures are mouths which need to breathe" (LC, 154). City planning took place with little attention to the basic needs of the masses. Rather than sponsoring new sewers or

waterworks, the government supported the building of churches, mansions, or even elegant glass-covered arcades to protect pedestrians from the mud of the streets. In the poorest sections, where most of the demolitions took place, lodging houses began replacing small residences, and these anonymous, tenement-like dwellings continued to multiply under the July Monarchy. Inhabited by itinerant male workers or destitute families, they became a symbol of the hearthless home, often more threatening than the streets from which they were meant to provide shelter (LC, 230).

In 1848 Henri Lecouturier, in a publication significantly entitled *Paris incompatible avec la République, plan d'un nouveau Paris où les révolutions seront impossibles*, would identify Paris, loss of identity, and subversion of the values of republicanism with the misery of homelessness: "There is no such thing as a Parisian society, there are no such persons as Parisians. Paris is nothing but a nomad's camp" (LC 364). Adolphe Thiers, the official representative of republicanism under the Second Empire, describes Paris as ". . . this heterogeneous mob, this mob of vagabonds with no avowed family and no known domicile, a mob of persons so mobile that they can nowhere be pinned down and have not succeeded in establishing any regular home for their family." He would add with the full weight of his official position: "This is the mob which the law proposes to expel" (365). Poverty, criminality, and anarchism were seen as dangerous fissures in the unsteady edifice of postrevolutionary France. The vagabond, or *mauvais pauvre* posed a serious threat to an industrializing civilization's utopian myth of the "new man." His homelessness was interpreted as a sign of mental wandering, a deviant anti-culture against which the citizenry needed to be protected.<sup>21</sup>

Under Louis-Napoleon, in the 1850s and '60s, Haussmann would undertake the sealing over of these fissures by restructuring Paris in accordance with a counterrevolutionary rhetoric, displacing some 350,000 people, most of them poor and working class, from the center of the city to the periphery by cutting hundreds of kilometers of broad new streets with spectacular vistas through the narrow slums and building some seventy thousand structures for the commercial, private, and leisured life of a newly wealthy middle class. Napoleon III's Paris was a fitting stage for the fortunes of the great merchant-bankers and financiers, referred to as "Maisons"—Laffitte, Rothschild, Péreire, etc.—who, like the father of Proust's Swann, now inhabited the townhouses and apartments of the old aristocracy. The imposing new bourgeois *immeubles* with their impersonal exteriors reflected the separation of public and private spheres that Haussmann's reorganization of Paris encouraged. A family's fluency with the expanding course of empire was reflected in the arrangement

of their “fabric swaddled” interiors, and, as Katherine Grier puts it in her study of parlor decor: “Their success could be measured by the degree to which the ‘messages’ of parlor furnishings were legible to outsiders.”<sup>22</sup>

Paradoxically, women, whose job it became to translate those messages of republican idealism into the domain of the private, have a history of their own in the postrevolutionary story of an industrializing France, one that places their role as the caretakers of domestic virtue into a highly ironic light. During each revolution—1789, 1830, 1848, 1870—radical women joined forces with revolutionary men to seek the rights of citizenship, and after each revolution they were silenced or suppressed. If in 1789 working-class women lead the bread riots, form political clubs, even have a spokeswoman in Olympe de Gouges, who publishes the *Declaration of the Rights of Women and of the Female Citizen* in 1791, by 1793 the new constitution calls for universal male suffrage only, women’s right to assemble is denied, and Olympe de Gouges is guillotined. In 1795 the National Assembly excludes women from all public life:

Be it decreed that all women should retire as formerly it was ordained, into their respective homes; those who, one hour after this decree is promulgated, are found in the streets, gathered in groups of more than five, will be dispersed by armed forces and arrested until public calm is restored in Paris.<sup>23</sup>

The Civil Code drawn up under Napoleon which places a woman’s property and children under the legal authority of her husband authorizes her political and economic subjugation for the rest of the century. Even a privileged aristocratic woman and a firm supporter of the Revolution, such as Germaine de Staël, who typically saw the world from a universalizing enlightenment perspective, would feel compelled to tell the story of the repression and retirement of female genius in *Corinne*, written while she was in exile from Napoleon.

Radical women writers proposed new structures for living during the early phase of industrialization, particularly during the revolutionary periods of 1830 and 1848. After 1830, for example, two hundred women followers of Enfantin, the high priest of Saint-Simonianism, were delivering lectures on spiritual revolution in the working-class quarters of Paris. They believed in a church with a male and female deity, the collective ownership of property, marriage by consent, communal living arrangements called *maisons de famille*, and women’s full participation in the governance of the community. In February of 1848 radical feminist groups of all kinds rallied to debate women’s rights with the leaders of the revolution. But the

provisional government did not respect the women's petitions for representation in the National Assembly, and after the April elections, women's political clubs were again shut down by the Republican police. In 1850 Pauline Roland, a Saint-Simonian who had joined forces with other feminists to create workers' associations, was arrested for conspiracy to overthrow the government. Her arrest decree contained this telling characterization: ". . . an unmarried mother, who is the enemy of marriage, maintaining that subjecting the woman to the control of the husband sanctifies inequality" (FF, 148). After the coup d'état of 1851, Roland was deported to a penal colony in Algeria, and other feminist leaders fled their so-called motherland: Jeanne Deroin to London, Suzanne Voilquin to the United States, Désirée Gay to Belgium.

Radical French feminism virtually disappears for the next twenty years under the Second Empire, to be replaced by the cult of bourgeois domesticity. During this period working-class women suffered the worst possible abuses. Yet reformist or visionary social theorists such as Auguste Comte or Pierre Joseph Proudhon remain profoundly, often appallingly misogynist, insisting on women's mental and moral inferiority, their essentially reproductive function, in short on the absolute centrality of the patriarchal family for the founding of a just society. Republicans and socialists alike agree that woman's place is in the home and that moral virtue is directly related to domestic stability.

The social pathology, so dramatically reflected by the separation of private from public domains in women's history, finds imaginative expression everywhere in the literature of nineteenth-century France. Indeed, the social historian Louis Chevalier maintains the superiority of literary texts over accounts by contemporary social reformers for analyses of the data gleaned by official statisticians:

In many cases . . . the literary description provided the social description with its first experience of the developments which were its principal subject matter. . . . Despite appearances, the Fourierists had less influence on Eugène Sue than Sue had on them. . . . To many social reformers, a reading of the *Mystères de Paris* was a revelation of facts about which . . . they had believed that they themselves were the specialists. (LC, 127)

The purpose of this collection is to show the extent to which imaginative works are a primary part of this social record and not merely reflections, somehow subordinate to the "harder" evidence of sociology. The essays included here analyze the malaise present

around the relationship of "home" to individual identity in a variety of texts representing differing class and gender perspectives as nineteenth-century France emerges from its revolutionary break with the old order to enter the industrial age of empire and liberal bourgeois republicanism.



The introductory essays of part 1 will argue that homesickness was a national malady and the Parisian artist its most eloquent analyst. Michael Roth shows how the medical discourse on the "disease" of nostalgia follows the same trajectory we see elsewhere in the connection between the individual's concept of home and a sense of national identity. During the 1820s and 1830s the malady is described as an excessive attachment to the specific dwelling place and country of one's earliest infancy. After 1850, however, as the disease seems to disappear, there is profound disagreement about its social and psychological significance. Most doctors applaud the disappearance of the illness as a sign of the technological "progress" of civilization which allows people to reach their loved ones more easily; others, a minority, express uneasiness about the loss of nostalgia, which for them suggests the possibility of a generalized historical amnesia or desensitization of humanity brought about by that same technology. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, Roth concludes, hysteria as a woman's disease replaces nostalgia as the focus of medical attention.

Priscilla Ferguson sees the figure of the *flâneur*, from Balzac's artist-*flâneur* in the July Monarchy to Flaubert's *flâneur* under the Second Empire, as both a product and a critique of urban civilization. Reading the 1869 *L'Éducation sentimentale* through the lenses of Émile Durkheim's analyses of suicide, Marx's concept of fetishism, and Benjamin's notion of phantasmagoria, she argues that the *flâneur* projects the writer's growing sense of displacement in bourgeois society.

The essays in part 2 analyse a rich variety of artistic forms which, under the July Monarchy and the Second Empire, urban artists invented to express their experience of social and psychological dislocation. Pastoral nostalgia permeates the literature of mid-nineteenth-century France. Writers such as Nerval and Balzac, who still remember the time when a return to one's *pays d'origine* was possible, document, with the precision of rescue workers sifting through debris, the details of the breaking up of the old order, of the transformation of the concept of home from that of one's hereditary past into that of newly acquired property. In the years leading up to 1848,

familiar literary motifs change in significant ways: the street replaces the road; the wanderer replaces the figure of exile, and home becomes an increasingly elusive dream, to be sought in other countries and other times.

Mary Harper reads Nerval's "Le Temple d'Isis" of 1845 as an allegory which addresses the "homelessness" of a generation estranged from itself. The genre of the *voyage en Italie*, used at the turn of the century by Goethe and Madame de Staël to propose new models for creative engagement with their times, allows Nerval to articulate a critical distance from the France of Louis-Philippe and its dominant conventions for restructuring the past and revisioning the future. According to Harper, Nerval's essay "offers neither a synthesis nor a utopian vision" but rather a disjunctive way of thinking about the paradoxes of his "disinherited" age. William Paulson, who focuses on the periods before and after 1848, charts the kind of ontological limbo into which the would-be artist figure moves from Flaubert's first *Éducation sentimentale*, written between 1843 and 1845, to its final version in 1869. Whereas the early version offers an aesthetically promising experience of homelessness and marginality, the final version, which itself adopts the form of narrative homelessness, presents a hero, Frédéric Moreau, who never attains even a hint of the artistic potential of his earlier avatars. Julia Ballerini looks from an art historical perspective at the way photography seemed to offer Maxime Du Camp a technical means for capturing loss and for rendering it both impersonal and permanent in his trip to Egypt undertaken with Flaubert one year after the 1848 Revolution, a time of intense national anxiety concerning the survival of French civilization. Why, she asks, did Du Camp use the same enigmatic native subject, Hadji-Ishmael, in nearly every photograph of his unique album, sometimes conspicuously to give a sense of scale to his monuments, but more often invisibly, like a repressed alter ego, an unknowing human stone amidst the ruins of its own culture?

When the middle class turned its guns against the working classes in 1848, they were saying that the Republic belonged to them and would survive, through them, under any régime. In his last published work, the eleven-volume *Mystères du peuple: Histoire d'une famille prolétarienne*, begun in 1849 and published the year of his death in 1857, Eugène Sue tries one last time to imagine some form of society which would not require expulsion of the "mob," as Adolphe Thiers advocated—a way of conceiving of national self-definition which would include the working classes. Two incompatible concepts of community—one pre-industrial and family centered, the other nationalistic—actually structure this narrative written at mid-century

on the threshold of France's full-fledged entry into the industrial age. Robert Morrissey analyzes Sue's novel, which still advocates revolutionary insurrection through a bonding of the proletariat and the middle class, in the context of the age-old historical tradition of racial struggle between the Gauls and the Franks. The Third Estate must consider itself as a race—the Gauls—rather than a class, if it is to regain its legitimate homeland from the Franks, identified with the French aristocracy. But like earlier utopian socialist thinkers, such as the Saint-Simonians or the followers of Fourier, who theorized ways of bringing domestic, religious and political life into some kind of consonance, Sue, in the end, is forced to send his proletarian Gauls out of France into permanent exile to refound their nation.

The Haussmannization of Paris under Napoleon III aimed in part to transform the political realignments brought about by the June days into concrete structures for the ordering of public and private life. Patrizia Lombardo reveals the irreconcilable rifts underlying politics and aesthetic ideology in Second Empire France. The *cit  antique* imagined by Haussmann's religious contemporary Fustel de Coulanges as hearth and sanctuary of common worship, has nothing in common with *la cit  neutre des peuples civilis s*<sup>24</sup> of the Baron Haussmann's clean new theatre for public display. Yet both men—the modernist, Haussmann, and the conservative, Fustel—enjoyed special privileges under the Empire. As the architect was demolishing the old Paris, the Empress Eug nie and her circle liked to listen to their positivist historian of antiquity lecture on the origins of French civilization. The true modern, according to Lombardo, was Baudelaire, who, rather than retreat into the past or dream of the future, allowed the language of his poetry to be marked by the disharmonies of the present, as it was being lived during the demolition and reconstruction of the old capital. Like Benjamin, she sees Baudelaire's greatness in his renunciation of nature, in his invention of a new allegorical style of realism by which the metropolis becomes the site of a psychological condition of homelessness. Richard Terdiman examines the linguistic and cultural structure of exile in Baudelaire's "Le Cygne." He stresses the relationship between this poem and developments in urban history during the period around 1860, when "Le Cygne" was composed and published. For Terdiman exile is an intense experience of *memory*, arising in an acute confrontation between loss and the recollection of presence. He argues that this mnemonic structure is homologous in Baudelaire's poem with what contemporary cultural experience had manifested as the form of signs themselves: the exile's memory and the semiotic signifier both evoke an irretrievable absence.

Baudelaire's muse is anarchic; she does not comply, like a good bourgeois woman, with republican notions of private virtue as Philip Nord describes them at the end of the Second Empire and under the Third Republic. Nord argues that debates between partisans of the free market and traditionalists who defended an eternal order of things were not confined to political and philosophical issues alone, but included the "right constitution of the private realm." As a nationalistic rhetoric made France every citizen's *pays d'origine*, home and the definition of civic virtue shared a complex, often contradictory rhetoric. During the 1860s and '70s republicans in particular fixed their attention on the bourgeois family: women's comportment and dress, proper child-rearing methods for future citizens, home furnishing design to reflect the democratization of luxury.

Paradoxically, however, homelessness, rather than comfortable domesticity, can be said to characterize the condition of many nineteenth-century women, regardless of class or political context. The industrial revolution brought more and more young, single women to the city to seek work as domestics or in factories. By 1866 30 percent of the industrial force was female, 45 percent in the textile industry. Salaries, working conditions, penalties were consistently worse for women than for men. Sexual exploitation, pregnancy, loss of job, prostitution, early death was a common experience, not just a sentimentalized story by popular novelists. Deborah Nord looks at the fate of these women through the uncommon perspective of Flora Tristan's *Promenades dans Londres* of 1840. An aristocrat by birth, Tristan lost the inheritance of her Peruvian father and was obliged at eighteen years of age to work for her living in a lithography shop. Nord shows how Tristan's role of foreigner and political outsider, combined with her deep sense of deracination among working-class women, enabled her to mount a critique which was meant to be the foundation for a new conception of "home" for the strife-ridden, benighted family of workers into which she had been cast.

Tristan pursued her goals independently of the working-class Saint-Simonian women, who were also seeking alternate economies for living under the July Monarchy. After 1830, when they realized that the men within their ranks were paying only lip service to the political equality of the sexes which they were preaching, a dissident group of Saint-Simonian women founded their own newspaper, the *Tribune des femmes*, run by a non-hierarchical governing board, which advocated the bonding of women across class lines. Kari Weil studies the ironies surrounding the conflicting roles the Saint-Simonian men and women assigned "woman" in their plans for the architectural restructuring of Paris as a new Jerusalem, showing that even within a



doctrine specifically founded as a critique of bourgeois ideology, the male leaders monumentalize the rhetoric of patriarchal domination. Utopia as a dream of phallic motherhood is shown in Weil's essay paradoxically to deny the place of female subjectivity.

Although radical French feminism gives way to the cult of domesticity under the Second Empire, the republican project, as Philip Nord has suggested, had its dubiously emancipatory moments for middle-class women. One of the ironies of the displacement of radical working-class feminism by bourgeois redefinitions of femininity is that female domestic servants provide both the outward signs of middle-class success and the caste over which the patriarch's wife learns to exercise her managerial skills. As factory conditions worsen, increasing numbers of single girls enter domestic service, where, although underpaid, overworked, and sexually exploited, they can count on room and board and cleaner working conditions. Martine Gantrel traces the evolution of this caste, inseparable from the economics of bourgeois homemaking, by analyzing the character of the maid in three works spanning roughly the second half of the nineteenth century: *Geneviève: histoire d'une servante*, published in 1850 by Lamartine; *Germinie Lacerteux*, published in 1864 by the Goncourt brothers; and *Le Journal d'une femme de chambre*, by Octave Mirbeau in 1900. She shows that in these three novels the figure of the maid functions less to document a social type and a social ill than to question and to destabilize the relationship assumed by the patriarchy between woman's nature and woman's place in society.

Focusing on scientific theorizing about women's mental illnesses, Janet Beizer, whose study complements that of Michael Roth on the malady of nostalgia, looks at the way *Madame Bovary* reflects nineteenth-century theories of female hysteria, constructed, as they were, around the pathology of social displacement. Flaubert's correspondence with Louise Colet and his fictional transformation of himself into a restless, petit-bourgeois female, incapable of taking proper care of her home and indifferent to her maternal duties, dreaming of leaving her provincial town to go to Paris, contain revealing echoes of the 1818 definition of hysteria in the *Dictionnaire des sciences médicales* as the neurosis of the "wandering womb" hidden deep within the deviant female body. Punishment for such deviance will fall on Emma's orphaned female child, Berthe. Forced out of the middle-class existence which kills her mother, she will not return to her grandparents' peasant origins, but will end up as child labor in a textile factory.

If nineteenth-century French literature contains a fascinating array of ambivalent new forms of national self-expression, France itself

became, for many who lived outside of her boundaries, a model of advanced social planning, cultural achievement, and *savoir-faire*. Our collection concludes with two texts by English writers, Wordsworth and Charlotte Brontë, that brilliantly register the ironies of that perception, texts that look at France as the homeless place par excellence. In the early part of the century, before spiritual dispossession was felt by most Europeans to be a permanent feature of modern life, return to the place of one's origins after travel abroad still seemed at least imaginatively possible. There was consolation in this, especially for those "moderns" who had seen in the French Revolution the promise of spiritual redemption and discovered instead the violence and carnage of the Terror:

Such ghastly visions had I of despair  
 And tyranny, and implements of death;  
 And innocent victims sinking under fear,  
 And momentary hope, and worn-out prayer, . . .

(*The Prelude*, book 10)

David Bromwich reads Wordsworth's "Tintern Abbey," composed in 1798, six years after the poet's visit to France during the Terror, as a transitional poem proposing just such a retreat. Bromwich sees Wordsworth moving away from a youthful idea of himself as a "patriot of the world," who believed

That, if France prospered, good men would not long  
 Pay fruitless worship to humanity,

to that of a detached mind, who could discover personal sympathies in the monastic peacefulness of the abbey going slowly to natural ruin deep within his native land. Here the poet discovers a "vagrancy of the mind" that enables him to be more at home in the world, a grounding more truly responsive to the "life of all things" than the progressive rhetoric of social planning could ever be. But Wordsworth's poem carries traces of a sense of guilt for having left England in the first place and then for having fled his youthful sympathy for the revolutionary spirit. Dorothy, his sister, becomes the permanent figure of his own childhood, there to protect and pardon the forms of his betrayals, his wanderings from home.

One can almost imagine Charlotte Brontë, who lived "portionless" in the retreat of a Yorkshire parsonage, as Dorothy's spiritual daughter, finding her voice, alone, with no brother to sustain her, some fifty years later in the "heretical" narrative of *Villette*. A foreign name, which when translated signifies emptily the place of a place, has supplanted the profoundly resonant topology of Wordsworth's

texts: "Tintern Abbey," "Grasmere," "Dover," "Calais." Maria DiBattista probes the potential for creativity and the power of feeling in the account of Lucy Snowe, a solitary, fortuneless woman who knows that she will have no role to play in the "phantasy" of "distributive justice" that "underwrite[s] the moral order" of the nineteenth-century world. Villette, the French-speaking place isolated from any real country where Lucy's story unfolds, deceptively suggesting the cosiness of an old provincial town, provides no protection, no hope of change, and no values to substitute for those she had to leave behind "in the clean and ancient town of Bretton." It seems fitting to end a collection that charts the path toward modern metaphors of homelessness with this most estranged voice of detached self-analysis, where the only home left anywhere is the one in the mind.

Displacement of communitarian values into the rhetoric of nationalism can, of course, undermine the very values it means to preserve. In the late nineteenth century concepts of national heritage and domestic stability too easily degenerated into rationalizations for racial, sexual, and class superiority. If rootlessness and unfamiliarity create an alienated society, one may well understand that they may also provide the only conditions out of which the world of empire-building can responsibly be challenged. Yet, one may still ask, with Antoine Compagnon, how it is that English-speaking readers, such as ourselves, can discover their own homesickness from a creation as French as Proust's Combray? If "homelessness" is a key word in so much contemporary theorizing of the aesthetic, this may be because both radical and conservative critiques of modernism are justly aware that the structures we build to represent our condition are not necessarily ones in which we can expect to find any lasting forms of security. But if rootlessness and unfamiliarity have become our common condition, we may still ask what constitutes the experience of recognition that makes those representations so unflinchingly poignant?

#### NOTES

1. Trans. Anna Bostock (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1978), 29–32.
2. *The Way of the World: The Bildungsroman in European Culture* (London: Verso, 1987), 16, 19, 117, 105.
3. See Fredric Jameson's analysis of Balzac in *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 164.
4. "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century," in *Reflections*, ed. Peter Demetz and trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), 154.
5. In *Search for a Method* (trans. Hazel Barnes [Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1963], 140, ff.), Jean-Paul Sartre will ask what such an "artistic transformation

of male into female means in the nineteenth century." He identifies the "strange monster which is *Madame Bovary*" with "the project by which Flaubert, in order to escape from the petite bourgeoisie, will launch himself . . . toward the alienated objectification of himself and will constitute himself inevitably and indissolubly . . . as that petit bourgeois which he refused to be."

6. Charles Baudelaire: *un poète lyrique à l'apogée du capitalisme*, trans. Jean Lacoste (Paris: Payot, 1982). See especially "Le Flâneur," 55.

7. Lukács, *Theory of the Novel*, 60.

8. See Theodor Adorno's "Proprietary Rights": "It is the signature of our age that no-one, without exception, can now determine his own life within even a moderately comprehensible framework, as was possible earlier in the assessment of market relationships" (*Minima Moralia: Reflections on Damaged Life*, trans. E. Jephcott [London: New Left Books, 1974], 37).

9. "Against Vanity," *TLS*, June 29–July 5, 1990, 692.

10. See Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), for a compelling account of this shift as it is reflected by English writers.

11. *Histoire de la population française*, vol. 3 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1988), 130. Subsequent citations in the text will be indicated by HPF.

12. *French Society and Culture: Background for 18th Century Literature* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), 29.

13. *Ibid.*, 33.

14. *Histoire de la population française*, 2: 103, my translation. The last phrase, which renders the observation a contemporary one for the demographer, is difficult to capture in English: ". . . à l'écart donc des solidarités familiales et villageoises auxquelles on est tant attachés."

15. See chapters 1 and 2 of Gossman, *French Society and Culture*, 14–15; 53–56.

16. *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 52.

17. See Jean-Pierre Rioux, *La Révolution industrielle 1780–1880* (Paris: Seuil, 1971), 147.

18. Gérard de Nerval, *Les Filles du feu* (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1965), 130.

19. Rioux, *La Révolution industrielle*, 151. T. J. Clark has shown how the imagery of the great paintings of Courbet, executed between 1848 and 1850, after the bohemian artist's return to his home at Ornans—*The Stonebreakers*, *Burial at Ornans*, *Peasants of Flagey*—reflects, as in a shattered mirror, the transformations taking place in the French countryside. Clark speculates that such transformations as the depiction of a rural bourgeoisie or the disassociation of ritual and religious ceremony were deeply disturbing for a wide range of middle-class Parisian viewers who needed to believe in the integrity of rural life for their own construction of an identity: "The Right and Center wanted a preservation of the rural myth. . . . The countryside must know its place: its place in a mythical schema" (*Image of the People: Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982], 142–43).

20. *Laboring Classes and Dangerous Classes: In Paris During the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Frank Jelinek (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 148. Subsequent citations in the text will be indicated by LC.

21. See Jean-Claude Beaune, "Images du mauvais pauvre. Anti-travail et anti-éducation: La Figure du vagabond au XIXe siècle," *Les Sauvages dans*

*la cité: Auto-émancipation du peuple et instruction des prolétaires au XIXe siècle* (Seysse: Editions du Champ Vallon, 1985).

22. *Culture and Comfort: People, Parlors, and Upholstery 1850–1930* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 81.

23. Quoted by Claire Moses in *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 14. Subsequent citations in text will be indicated by FF.

24. See Clark, *The Painting*, 43.