



When and why did the *flâneur* die ? A modern detective story

Elizabeth Rechniewski

THE verb *flâner* and the noun *flâneur* are first recorded in French in 1806¹. As there already existed a plethora of terms: *badaud*, *musard*, *promeneur*, *rôdeur* to describe the strollers of the city streets, creating a new term suggests that it was needed to describe a new social figure. And the term soon acquired an extended family: an adjectif: *flâneur* (1829), substantives to describe the activity: *flânerie*, (1826) and *flâne* (1846); and later still there sprang up generations of diminutive offspring: *flânocher* (1877), *flânochage*, *flânocherie*, *flânoter* (1879). The invention of this extended family of terms suggests the importance, indeed the prominence of the activities they describe in nineteenth century France: a characteristic stance, a particular attitude towards the experience of city-life incarnated in the figure of the *flâneur*, who would soon find his historians and his portraitists. It is necessary at this stage, however prematurely, to try to define the particular connotations of *flânerie* in its nineteenth century incarnations. Otherwise it will be hard to know in what guises and disguises the *flâneur* (always a he) might be lurking in the literary undergrowth.

An etymological approach reveals that the origins of the word are uncertain; perhaps it comes via the old Norman 'flanner' (recorded in 1638), from the Scandinavian 'flana' meaning 'to run carelessly hither and thither'². Uncertainty over its origins allows us to speculate on the appeal and associations of the term. *Flâneur* conveniently rhymes in French with 'glaneur' - the person who gleanes, who gathers up the bits and pieces of material apparently useless to others; like the collector or



the *connaisseur*, he may not know what he is looking for, but he knows when he has found it, how to value it. Or perhaps we could imagine that *flâner* is a combination of *glaner* and *flairer*, the latter term meaning to sniff out, to follow trails of which no-one else is aware. All these possible associations suggest something of the meanings which have come to be bound up in the figure of the *flâneur*.

In true Saussurean mode we might try to define the *flâneur* in relation to what he is not: what distinguishes him from all the other types of urban inhabitant that emerge in the nineteenth century: the dandy, the tourist, the reporter and the detective, figures which are sometimes confused with that of the *flâneur*? The dandy flaunts his difference to attract the eyes of the other, but remains trapped therefore in the other's gaze. The tourist visits the city, seeks out its history, but does not penetrate beyond its conventional sights whose meaning has been dictated for him in advance, by his guidebooks. The detective tries to make sense of the patterns of the city; he seeks to dominate its mysteries (its crimes) in order to reveal patterns that are rational, that are susceptible to argument and evidence. The reporter affirms the objectivity of his accounts of city-life, in which the citizens can recognise the events that touch them. What of the *flâneur*? His gaze is turned on and against the other, he does not seek, like the dandy, to be the object of the other's gaze. Like the detective, he searches for signs that no-one else can see. But the *flâneur* is not seeking to make sense of the city nor to explain events rationally in a way that all can understand; he brings a uniquely personal perspective to the interpretation of the clues, the traces and the actions of others, for his own purposes of re-creation. Against logical explanation he affirms the rights of mystery.

There is of course no essentialist definition of the *flâneur* to be arrived at: the *flâneur* is what we make of him for the purposes of analysis. Let me suggest three qualities that might constitute an 'ideal-type' of the nineteenth century *flâneur*, that mark him out from the fellow inhabitants of the city: disponibility, solitude, transcendence.

Disponibility: because he must be free to follow the dictates of his internal promptings; he must not be constrained by the need to meet deadlines or to attend a workplace.





Solitude: because the *flâneur*'s wanderings must not be guided, impeded or distracted by others, he is not engaged in a social situation but in a dialogue with the city.

Transcendence: because his wanderings are a failure if they do not lead him beyond the reach of ordinary men, wrapped up in their routines. He seeks a way of being in the city but not subordinated to it.

For Priscilla Ferguson: 'The *flâneur* is in society as he is in the city, suspended from social obligation, disengaged, disinterested, dispassionate'. The sense of apartness is crucial - he is in the crowd but not of it: they are subject to the the routine existence and rhythms of daily life, ruled by clocks, transport timetables, work and family responsibilities; he maintains his freedom, as Edmund White, a modern *flâneur* writes: 'In covert search of adventure, aesthetic or exotic'. Adventure yes, but we must recognise the intense seriousness of the *flâneur*'s activity: the very existence of the *flâneur* is at stake, for he lives only in and through his problematic relationship to the city. He wanders through the city in search of the traces, signs and meanings that make up the map of his own consciousness. Can we imagine him away from the city and he starts to die.

Why pose the question of the death of the *flâneur* or suppose him indeed to have died? Walter Benjamin, writing in the *Arcades Project* in the 1930s, describes the *flâneur* as a creature of commercial capitalism: 'in the person of the *flâneur*, the intelligentsia becomes acquainted with the marketplace. It surrenders itself to the market, thinking merely to look around; in fact it is already seeking a buyer'. For Benjamin the existence of the *flâneur* can be fairly precisely dated: he is born with the building of the great Parisian shopping and commercial arcades in the first half of the nineteenth century: many were built in the fifteen years following 1822, during, therefore, the reign of Charles X and the period of aggressive entrepreneurship encouraged by the July monarchy. The *flâneur* is fascinated by the proliferation of sights and sounds, the wealth of sensations and excess of objects brought together by the development of the marketplace, writes Benjamin, but he wants to keep it at a distance, he believes he alone can escape the tyranny of commodification. He searches for 'newness' (22), for novel sensations, to escape surrender to the endless





repetition of the mass articles of the commodity form. But his search is in vain - his quest through the city, his scrutiny of the crowd, finds only types, and the eternal return of the same.

Thus Benjamin argues that by the 1870s the *flâneur's* zone of freedom, his vague desires of rebellion had been symbolically and literally swallowed up in the expansion of those mega-institutions of consumption, the department stores, which replaced the arcades. Unable to maintain the unstable equilibrium between fascination and dependence required to keep commercialisation at bay, the *flâneur* becomes a mere 'scout in the marketplace' (21), and ultimately conforms to the model required by the system, like the mannequins in the department stores. For Benjamin, therefore, the *flâneur* is a transitory figure.

This is not perhaps, however, the end of his story: it can be argued that the *flâneur* has a much longer existence than Benjamin allows and that multiform and ambiguous figures of the *flâneur* can be found in the literature of the last several centuries, perennial reincarnations of the ambivalent stance of the artist towards the modern world. A stance results not from the direct unmediated impact of capitalism, exchange value and the market-place on the artist, but on the particular configuration of the artistic field through which these pressures are transmitted from the late eighteenth century.

To understand the structural changes that have created this figure we need in Pierre Bourdieu's terms to look at the evolution of the field of artistic production from the late eighteenth century: the development of an increasingly autonomous field of cultural production, acquiring gradually its own institutions, paid career paths, publishing outlets, and, in the nineteenth century, dividing under the pressure of commercialisation into the fields of mass and restricted production, entraining an increasingly antagonistic relationship between low and high art, between the 'banal tastes' of the general public and the 'refined appreciation' of the artistic elites⁶. This particular configuration of the artistic field placed the artist in a problematic relation to the general public of his time, to the 'masses' and to society in general, a position that could and often did translate as one of mutual suspicion and alienation, of incomprehension and disdain



between the practitioners of what became known as 'avant-garde' art, and the public that just wanted to be entertained.

It is certain that, as Benjamin highlights, the penetration of exchange values into the field of art and the take-off of mass production, pose a particular challenge to the artist: when every object and even every relationship and feeling can be reproduced or traduced, and offered for sale, what values, what forms of expression can the artist defend? Against both exchange and use value, the avant-garde artist claims to uphold aesthetic value, one that owes nothing to the tyranny of the market (exchange value) nor even to the fulfilment of material need (use value), but seeks to transform and transcend the given of immediate experience through the re-creation offered by art. The *flâneur* is the incarnation of this stance in relation to the city. In his discussion of the role of the private dwelling during the reign of Louis-Philippe, Benjamin refers to the interior as 'the asylum where art takes refuge' and as the true home of the collector, who bestows on objects a 'connoisseur value' by which 'things are freed from the drudgery of being useful'. This comment might be extended to the relation of the *flâneur* to the city: the *flâneur* interiorises the city, appropriates and re-creates it, divests it of its utilitarian ends, as the means to create a unique collection of sights and sounds that function as a personal allegory.

These theoretical considerations suggest that the figure of the *flâneur* is probably not confined to one brief period of modernity but may emerge in various guises from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries and perhaps beyond. So the search for the *flâneur* might take us back in time, before the nineteenth century and before the first uses of the term. How far back might it be possible to trace him, even before he had been named? Let me suggest one early incarnation: the narrator of Diderot's *Neveu de Rameau* (1762-1773) who seems to adopt precisely the stance of detached engagement with his society that is characteristic of the *flâneur*:

No matter what the weather, rain or shine, it's my habit every evening at about five o'clock to take a walk around the Palais Royal. I'm the one you see dreaming on the bench in Argenson's Alley, always alone. I talk to myself about politics, love, taste, or philosophy. I let my spirit roam at will,



Elizabeth Rechniewski: *When and why did the flâneur die ? A modern detective story*

allowing it to follow the first idea, wise or foolish, which presents itself, just as we see our dissolute young men on Foy's Walk following in the footsteps of a prostitute with a smiling face, an inviting air, and a turned-up nose, then leaving her for another, going after all of them and sticking to none.

For me, my thoughts are my prostitutes.⁸

These opening lines find the narrator, unconstrained by the sociability of others, allowing his spirit to wander at will, opening itself up to passing ideas, sights and sensations. It is true that the observer is seated but his undirected pursuit of his thoughts recalls the *flâneur's* aleatory wanderings. The precise reference to a real place: the park around the Palais-Royal, and the attempt to evoke something of its atmosphere are rather unusual in eighteenth-century literature of this type (the philosophical dialogue)⁹ and presage the nineteenth century *flâneur's* close relationship to his surroundings. The Palais-Royal - the meeting-place of 'le Tout-Paris'¹⁰ - is moreover just the kind of urban public space where the *flâneur* is in his element, where he can observe others without calling undue attention to himself. Later such places are found in the Arcades of Paris according to Benjamin; later still, on the boulevards constructed by Haussmann. The narrator is clearly a familiar of the place and its habitués; he knows well the social types that haunt the pathways of the Palais-Royal. And if the weather is inclement he resorts to another public space - the café - where once again he can observe others absorbed in their own pursuits, deliberately keeping them at a distance, observing but not listening: 'looking on a great deal but not saying much, listening as little as possible'. And what does he observe there but the social types of Paris, in the form of the chess players: 'Legal the Profound, Philidor the Subtle, Mayot the Solid. One sees the most surprising moves and hears the stupidest remarks. For one can be an intelligent man and a great chess player, like Legal, but one can also be a great chess player and a fool, like Foubert and Mayot.' These implacable judgements indicate disengagement and distance as well as intellectual superiority. And in the café he meets of course Rameau's nephew, indubitably a type rooted in the city where cynicism and hypocrisy can prosper because of the anonymity which protects the scoundrel from detection.

Literature & Aesthetics 17(2) December 2007, page 95





If his ancestors can be detected in the eighteenth century, the *flâneur* comes to self-awareness in the nineteenth. The use of the term multiplies in both social and literary texts from its first recorded use in 1806 (in a 32 page pamphlet '*Le flâneur au salon ou M Bonhomme: examen joyeux des tableaux, mêlé de vaudevilles*'¹¹), reaching a peak in the 1840s. In 1841 A. Lacroix published a portrait of '*Le flâneur*' in *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes*¹². The same year saw the most complete treatment of the physical, moral and intellectual traits of the *flâneur* in *Physiologie du flâneur* by Louis Huart.¹³ Balzac offered many portraits of *flâneurs* in his novels: Priscilla Ferguson writes: 'Balzac's celebration of the 'artist-*flâneur*' sets a model that will be developed over the next quarter century by Balzac himself and by others who identify the *flâneur* as a distinctive feature of modern Paris and of the artist in the making.'¹⁴ There are in Balzac's literary world, she writes, false *flâneurs* and true *flâneurs*: the incompetent *flâneur* lacks knowledge, he neither knows the city nor knows how to use the city; because he feels compelled to act on what he sees, he loses his detachment and the possibility of turning *flânerie* to creativity - ultimately the only aim of *flânerie* which is otherwise mere idling¹⁵. Indeed Balzac's novels are themselves the illustration of *flanerie* transformed into art, for the narrative stance of Balzac's novels, argues Pierre Loubier, is narration as *flânerie* through the society of his time. His narrative stance is not the distant, omniscient perspective of the panopticon, writes Loubier, but one that adopts the perspective of the street and the discontinuous physical rhythms of the city¹⁶.

If Balzac practises *flânerie* transformed into narrative, we do not usually associate the rather rotund figure of Balzac himself with that of the *flâneur*. The opposite is true of Baudelaire who became for Benjamin and others the very incarnation of the *flâneur*, in his writings and in his life. Baudelaire creates in poems such as the '*Tableaux parisiens*' in *Les Fleurs du mal*, an intensely personal portrait of the poet as *flâneur* in the streets of Paris:

*Je vais m'exercer seul à ma fantasque escrime,
Flairant dans tous les coins les hasards de la rime,
Trébuchant sur les mots comme sur les pavés
Heurtant parfois des vers depuis longtemps rêvés
(Le Soleil)*





Elizabeth Rechniewski: *When and why did the flâneur die ? A modern detective story*

Richard Howard offers this translation of these lines:
*I venture out alone to drill myself
in what must seem an eerie fencing-match,
duelling in dark corners for a rhyme
and stumbling over words like cobblestones
where now and then realities collide
with lines I dreamed of writing long ago*¹⁷

In 'The Painter of Modern Life' (written 1859-60 and published in 1863) Baudelaire offers portraits and lapidary definitions of the nature and activity of the modern artist, whose task is to distill from the fleeting and transitory, the eternal qualities of art. He pens an encomium to the work of Constantin Guys, the author of pen and ink sketches and water-colours of Paris scenes and characters. The genius of Guys, writes Baudelaire, lies in his 'keen appreciation of life'¹⁸. With the fresh vision of a child, he evokes by his rapid brushstrokes the exhilaration, the ecstasy of all that is novel; capturing the fleeting, dynamic character of urban phenomena, he makes his 'domicile amongst numbers, amidst fluctuation and movement, amidst the fugitive and infinite'¹⁹. The city creates and demands a new mode of perception, of representation, of aesthetic sensibility and practice. But not in order to pursue a renewed naturalism or imitation of the real; rather in order to infuse the quotidian with the transformative, heroic powers of art.

The death of the flâneur?

During the second half of the nineteenth century, Paris underwent unprecedented growth and transformation: its population doubled in fifty years; Haussmann tore down and reconstructed the city; the commercialisation of the city became ever more blatant. Benjamin suggests that the uneasy tension between the artist and the new commercial society is resolved by the capitulation of the artist who becomes 'the sandwich-board man' of the marketplace and the department store; Zola's *Au bonheur des dames*, 1883, records the new dominance of the department store and the slow death of the individual boutiques of the arcades. Priscilla Ferguson argues somewhat similarly that as the city is increasingly given over to commercial activity, the flâneur is squeezed out, or rather driven home:

Literature & Aesthetics 17(2) December 2007, page 97



the *flâneur* moves indoors and journeys no more except in his mind. And certainly there are signs of his imminent demise. She cites the example of Gautier's *Spirite*, 1866 who moves his *flâneur* indoors and immobilises him in a world of the fantastic. And Flaubert's *Education Sentimentale* where, she argues, the *flânerie* of the hero ends in powerlessness and failure.²⁰ Huysmann's *Arebours*, 1884, in which des Esseintes confines his journeys to travels within his own house is of course the culmination of this tendency. Ferguson concludes categorically that: 'the *flâneur* comes and goes with the century, moving on and then off, the streets of Paris.'²¹

Yet it can be argued that the *flâneur* lives on well into the twentieth century, because his stance is continually called forth by the fractured cultural field. Because a quasi autonomous space still persists in the field of restricted production where a minority and elite group of artists, public and institutions sustain the possibility of an art that escapes from the tyranny of the mass market, he continually re-emerges in new guises and contexts. Indeed the avant-garde movements of the early twentieth century offer many examples of the survival of the *flâneur*. 'Zone' (1913), the famous poem by Apollinaire, the most inventive and influential of French modernist poets, recounts a day's *flânerie* through the streets of Paris, a journey which evokes the still unresolved tensions of the *flâneur*'s stance: part fascination with the animation of the city, part quest for spiritual meaning in a world apparently given over to materialism and technology.

Less well-known is a prose work entitled 'Le Flâneur des deux rives' (1917)²² written towards the end of Apollinaire's (short) life. This text groups together six short pieces, most published earlier in different form, which take the reader on walking tours of little known, secret and rather mysterious quarters of Paris that seem to have no function in the life of the modern city: winding roads which lead nowhere except to memories; buildings whose original purpose is unknown, now fallen into disuse, or which serve only to store useless remnants of the past such as old street lights and statues of Christ; an 'unknown' museum dedicated to Napoleon founded by a ten-year-old boy; houses which once lodged illustrious and notorious inhabitants. Apollinaire takes pleasure in recalling these often



eccentric characters, for the most part members of the 'aristocratic republic of letters' (48), some of whom had slipped from public view and who are preserved for posterity only through Apollinaire's memories.

Though more clearly nostalgic than previous incarnations of the *flâneur's* perspective, the fundamental qualities of the *flâneur's* gaze are maintained in this text. The places Apollinaire describes reveal themselves fully only to his gaze, a gaze informed by unique personal experiences, memories and subjectivity. Paris is revealed - to the writer who knows how and where to look - to be the repository of memory and mystery, the site of strange incidents and coincidences, for example the incident of the rebus³ that may seem to concern him alone, but which hint at some hidden life of the city. He reveals his fascination with all that escapes from the tyranny of the utilitarian, whether people, places or objects: the poets ignored by the literary establishment, for example, who live obscure lives in rooms furnished with an eclectic jumble of *objets d'art* of every provenance, such as toys or old confectionery, including in one case a chamberpot full of watches, a highly surrealist image.

Such images announce the surrealist-inspired *flânerie* of texts such as Aragon's *Le Paysan de Paris*, sub-titled a 'surrealist fable' (1924-26): Paris peasant because he knows the Parisian cityscape as intimately as one who has worked the land in all seasons. This text recounts in minute detail and inventive form (it includes, collage-like in the text, posters, shop signs and other 'literature of the city') the *passage de l'Opéra* which was on the point of being torn down. The passage thus becomes the symbol of the transitory present, but at the same time the passage to another reality, meeting-point of the subjective and objective, of dreams and observations, awakening in Aragon the troubling vibrations of the unconscious.

Another example is offered by Breton's *Nadja* (1927) where the narrator, Breton, for this claims itself as autobiography, searches through the mysterious and labyrinthine city of Paris for Nadja, and for the signs that betray her presence. The city, like Nadja's drawings, must be interpreted, and the narrator proves to have arcane knowledge of its past, and a mysterious affinity with its present secret life that enable him to predict, for example, the occurrence of particular shops in unknown streets.



Finally a perhaps more surprising example can be found in Sartre's *Nausea* (1938)²⁴: Roquentin's *flâneries* in the public spaces of Bouville, along the sea-shore and the streets, in the parks and the squares with their mysterious and portentous statues, in the café watching the card players (35-36), as Diderot watched the chess players so many years ago. *Nausea* is structured around a series of *flâneries*²⁵, each one leading Roquentin closer, through his scrutiny of the dreary or lurid street-scapes, and of the strange actions and reactions of the inhabitants, to the recognition and naming of the dread sensation that haunts him. His relationship to the city and its inhabitants is most clearly evoked in the famous passage describing Roquentin in the rue Tournebride, observing but not participating in the rituals of the Sunday morning crowd, the spectacle that is the 'wonderful show at Bouville' (64). The sheer mass and volume of this crowd that make it almost impossible to move, the 'voluminous din of Sunday', the description of the pedestrians from a distance as so many lines of ants, the routines followed strictly every Sunday in an identical way, all create a contrast between the solitary, individualistic *flâneur* and the conformist masses. They are the object of his gaze - within the perspective of his disengaged, alienating gaze, their conventional gestures become meaningless, even ludicrous; as the arm that raises to doff the hat is de-personnalised, the movement becomes inexplicable: 'Now and then you see one fly off at the end of an arm, revealing the soft gleam of a skull; then after a few moments of clumsy flight, it settles again' (67).

Roquentin's preoccupation with advertisements, with shop signs and posters (scraps of old posters that seem to bear a hidden, violent message (42); the huge red archbishop's hat (67)), recalls the surrealists' attention to the 'literature of the city'. The shop windows, too, often show assemblages of objects which, deprived of their immediate utilitarian function, seem to him to be exotic and strange, seem to hold a different meaning from their everyday one. The juxtaposition of the displays of the pastry-cook, the pork-butcher, the hairdresser and the bookseller, relegates the wares of the latter to the same class of meaningless objects of consumption. Roquentin alone remembers an old advertisement in a shop window, now vanished, knowledge which is on one level now completely gratuitous and which



nevertheless has something to reveal about the hidden life of the town:

Two years ago, at the corner of the impasse des Moulins-Gémeaux and the rue Tournebride, an impudent little shop still displayed an advertisement for the Tu-pu-nez insecticide...I was very fond of this shop, it had a cynical, obstinate look, it insolently recalled the rights of vermin and dirt a stone's throw from the most costly church in France. (66-67)

The shop has been knocked down and replaced by a small lecture hall, absurdly called 'La Bonbonnière', where talks are given, for example on mountaineering, to an audience that no doubt considers such events to constitute serious intellectual pursuits. Only Roquentin, perhaps, still recalls or wants to recall these vestiges of the past, this seditious reminder of 'what lies beneath'.

As Benjamin affirms, the stance of the *flâneur* is an inherently unstable one, poised between alienation and fascination, between insularity and dependence. The *flâneur* must maintain a necessary distance from the social meanings and purposes of the city, which bear the imprint of use and exchange value, to guard against the danger of being sucked down 'through layers and layers of existence' (248) into the mud of Bouville. And he must also confront the contrary danger, that which results from cutting all human ties and social meanings, leaving the consciousness free to float into a depersonalised realm where it shrinks to nothing²⁵, where it is mere consciousness of the world, phenomenological consciousness. Roquentin illustrates well these aporia of the *flâneur's* existence, as well as the salvation through art glimpsed in the final pages of *Nausea*. Solitude and disponibility leave the *flâneur* vulnerable to the overwhelming presence of the city that belongs to others: only the transcendence offered by art gives him the possibility of mastery over that experience.

It would be possible, I am sure, to pursue the hunt for the *flâneur* to more recent times. Edmund White's modern-day *flânerie* published in 2001 is only one example of the strange power of Paris in particular to inspire this kind of activity. White asserts that the *flâneur's* explorations of the city today should take him to Belleville and Barbès, to witness the animation of the 'teeming quartiers' (52) where the hybrid cultures offer the kind of stimulation that earlier *flâneurs* found in the arcades. And he



also advises that if his book is 'dedicated to the random wanderings of the *flâneur*, [...] his wanderings will take him more often to the strange corners of Paris than to its historic centre' (52): the clean efficient lines of Haussmann's Paris may have triumphed, he writes, but 'in the cracks are those little forgotten places that appeal to the *flâneur*, the traces left by people living in the margin - Jews, blacks, gays, Arabs - mementoes of an earlier, more chaotic and medieval France' (190-1). In the final pages he offers a list of some of these strange and little-known places: the Passage Brady with its Indian wholesalers; the antique shops of the Village St Paul, 'hidden' in the oldest part of the Marais. White keeps alive then the *flâneur*'s claim to offer a uniquely personal perspective on the city: 'Flânerie is the best way to impose a personal vision on the palimpsest of Paris (187) he declares, as he adds another layer to the centuries-long re-writing of Paris.

NOTES

- 1 According to Le Grand Robert dictionary, the first recorded use is 1808. However Priscilla Ferguson cites a text from 1806. Ferguson, Priscilla, 'The *Flâneur* on and off the Streets of Paris' in Keith Tester (ed), *The Flâneur*, London: Routledge, 1994, p.26.
- 2 Bloch and von Wartburg, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française*, Paris: PUF, 1968.
- 3 Ferguson, p. 26.
- 4 Edmund White, *The Flâneur: a Stroll through the Paradoxes of Paris* (London: Bloomsbury, 2001)
- 5 Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, trans Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin, (Cambridge Mass and London England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999) 21.
- 6 Bourdieu develops his theory of the fields of cultural production from the 1960s; his most recent extended analysis is found in *Les règles de l'art* (Paris, Seuil, 1992).
- 7 *The Arcades Project*: 'Exposé of 1939. C. Louis Philippe, or the Interior'. I. p. 19.
- 8 All quotations are from the translation prepared by Ian C. Johnston of Malaspina University-College, Nanaimo, British Columbia, Canada, placed in the public domain October 2002.
- 9 Pujol, Stéphane 'L'espace public du *Neveu de Rameau*', *Revue d'Histoire Littéraire de la France*, 1993, sept-oct, 5, pp. 669-684, p. 683.
- 10 Claire Hancock quotes guidebooks to Paris of the early nineteenth century describing the Palais-Royal as the heart of Paris, the centre of fashion, of pleasure and of vice. Hancock Claire, *Paris et Londres au XIXe siècle* (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2003). 88.
- 11 Ferguson, p. 26.
- 12 Lacroix, A. (1841) 'Le *Flâneur*', *Les Français peints par eux-mêmes*, (Paris: J. Philippart, vol 3) 25-35.
- 13 Huart, Louis *Physiologie du flâneur*, (Paris: Aubert, 1841). In this period numerous 'physiologies' of social types and professions were written describing the related physical, moral, and intellectual traits supposedly characteristic of the type.
- 14 Ferguson, p. 29.
- 15 Ferguson, p. 30.
- 16 'le discontinu de l'expérience physique de la rue s'impose à l'écriture proprement dite' Pierre



- Loubier, 'Balzac et le Flâneur', *Année Balzacienne*, 2001:2, p. 146 (pp 141-166).
- 17 Richard Howard (trans), *The Flowers of Evil* (Boston: David R. Godine, 1983) 88.
- 18 Ch. Baudelaire, 'The Painter of Modern Life', *My heart laid bare and other writings*, (London: Soho Book Company, 1986) 31.
- 19 Ibid, p. 33.
- 20 Ferguson, p. 34.
- 21 Ferguson, p. 39.
- 22 'Le flâneur des deux rives', *Oeuvres en prose complètes, III* (Paris: Gallimard, 1928).
- 23 Apollinaire recalls an incident where he found a piece of paper inscribed with strange signs, which he discovers to reveal the identity of an author already met by chance in the street (Ibid, pp. 28-31).
- 24 All quotations are taken from the translation by Robert Baldick (London: Penguin 2000).
- 25 Roquentin's *flâneries* are also commented on by Keith Tester in the introduction to *The Flâneur*, Keith Tester (ed) (London: Routledge, 1994) 8-10.
- 26 'There is knowledge of the consciousness. It sees right through itself, peaceful and empty between the walls, freed from the man who inhabited it, monstrous because it is nobody' (242).

