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ABSTRACT

In 1910, Eugène Atget began a photographic series documenting apartment spaces of different classes throughout the city of Paris. Later bound into albums, and entitled *Intérieurs parisiens, début du XXe siècle, artistiques, pittoresques et bourgeois*, this series incorporated sixty black and white photographs of a dozen separate uninhabited, residential interiors — each framed by a brief, handwritten caption describing the identity of the now absent resident. Atget eventually made three, slightly different editions of the *Intérieurs parisiens* series, which he sold to photographic archives within the Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris, the Musée Carnavalet and the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Despite the expanding art historical discourse that developed around Atget’s body of work over the final decades of the twentieth-century, the *Intérieurs parisiens* series has received remarkably little extended academic investigation, perhaps because of its peculiarity and relative obscurity within Atget’s larger, better known body of work. Using the three editions of Atget’s *Intérieurs parisiens* as a material foundation, the present paper attempts to situate the *Intérieurs* photographs within a series of overlapping historical contexts: 1) Atget’s commercial practice, and the institutional circulation of his photographs; 2) the changing physical and cultural space of the late nineteenth-century Parisian interior; 3) discourses of taste, hygiene and interior decoration; and 4) the art historical discourse that developed around Atget’s practice over the final decades of the twentieth-century.

Within the *Intérieurs parisiens*, Atget’s camera creates a meticulous, almost obsessive catalogue of the fabric, furniture, and knick-knacks that populate otherwise empty rooms. Lining walls and overflowing tabletops, these objects form a surplus of captivating banality, and seem saturated with valuable evidence. Here, the remnants of everyday life (the motif used on a piece of furniture, the titles of books sitting amongst a collection of others lining a shelf) reveal intersections between class, gender and national identity. Yet Atget’s photographs, I want to claim, speak little of the private narratives they claim to possess — of the traumatic and indiscreet relationships between spaces, objects and bodies. This silence refuses any attempt to objectify identity — that is, to reduce identity to object and object to identity.
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I want to start with a single volume: a monograph, in fact, the first monograph, on the French photographer Eugène Atget (Plate 1).1 Innocuously titled Atget, photographe de Paris, this monograph was produced in conjunction with the first major exhibition of Atget’s work held in the winter of 1930 at the Wehye Gallery in New York. The volume’s pages contain nearly one hundred prints documenting various aspects of Atget’s photographic practice — prints drawn from a much more expansive collection acquired by photographer Bernice Abbott and New York gallery owner Julian Levy from Atget’s estate a few months following his death in August of 1927.2

Amongst the photographs collected within Atget, photographe de Paris, a single image catches my eye. Imprinted upon page fifteen, a white tablecloth gleams blankly, illuminating an otherwise dimly lit room (Plate 2). Scattered around its white surface, several chairs sit unused. At the center of the image: a collection of uncorked wine bottles, an empty bread bowl and a place setting for one. From within the dark recesses of this room, light glints slightly off rows of barely visible objects — light that seems like it could only be radiating from the brilliant whiteness of the tablecloth itself. Within the photograph, the room seems small, not quite cluttered, but still slightly claustrophobic.

Produced twenty years prior to the 1930 New York exhibition, Atget’s print was originally part of a larger photographic series documenting apartment spaces throughout the city of Paris (Plate 3, negative number 732). Bound into several individually crafted albums entitled Intérieurs parisiens, début du XXe siècle, artistiques, pittoresques et bourgeois, this work incorporated a total of sixty black and white prints of a dozen separate uninhabited, residential interiors (Plate 4).3 Within his Intérieurs parisiens, Atget included a hand written caption below each photograph — text not included in the Atget, photographe de Paris exhibition catalogue. Using the briefest of terms, Atget’s captions describe the identity of the now absent resident: indicating their gender, the first initial of their surname, their

---

3 Eugène Atget, Intérieurs parisiens, début du XXe siècle, artistiques, pittoresques et bourgeois [Paris, 1911].
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professional occupation, and the street of their address. Atget falsified the majority of this information — a deceit that was uncovered only in the final decades of the twentieth-century. In the *Interieurs* albums, only the identity of Mademoiselle Cécile Sorel, a well-known actress of the Comédie Française, remains unaltered. Atget’s photographs of Sorel’s Champs Elysées apartment are also the only prints within the series that he precisely locates within the Parisian topography. At least six of the *Intérieurs parisiens* photographs represent Atget’s own Montparnasse apartment, although here he takes on the guise of both an unnamed *ouvrier*, and Monsieur R, *artiste dramatique*. Upon close investigation, the fragmented details that fill the *Intérieurs* photographs clearly document Atget’s duplicity. Amongst the clutter filling these rooms, certain objects clearly appear out of place. It is impossible to judge whether Atget included this telling minutia on purpose, or whether he was simply undone by the photography’s indexicality — its willingness to register information, ad infinitum.

While Atget sold individual, uncaptioned prints from the *Intérieurs parisiens* to the broad private sector clientele he had built over the previous decade (including interior decorators, set designers, and commercial illustrators), the series itself circulated exclusively within archives operated by the French state. Atget sold the first edition of the *Intérieurs parisiens* photographic series as loose, unbound prints to the Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris in July 1910, where they became part of a newly formed *Actualités* division, which concentrated on documents of contemporary Parisian life. A month later, the Musée Carnavalet bought the *Intérieurs* series as a bound paper album. Atget produced a third edition of the *Intérieurs* series, this time hard bound and trimmed in leather, which he sold to the Bibliothèque Nationale in January 1911.

For the bound editions of his *Intérieurs parisiens*, Atget mounted photographs on both recto and verso pages, and included a typeset title page — that is, he mimicked the format of a proper book. Within the Département des Estampes et de la Photographie at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Atget’s *Intérieurs parisiens* entered the collection as if it had been subject to the *dépôt légal*, and Atget entered the library’s card catalogue as author. However, Atget’s albums were not properly published books.

---

4 A complete list of the captions from each edition of Atget’s *Intérieurs parisiens* appears in Appendix B. This list includes slight irregularities between individual editions. For clarity, the captions from the copy currently at the Bibliothèque Nationale have been used throughout the present paper, unless otherwise noted. Also, individual photographs are indicated by Atget’s negative numbers, which remain constant across each edition of his series.
5 For sales records of Atget’s *Intérieurs parisiens*, see Appendix A.
Although they included identical photographs, Atget's albums bare the mark of their individual production. Unlike a mass-produced volume, each edition of the *Intérieurs parisiens* took a different form and included slight irregularities. Each edition has been also physically stained by its unique history — defaced as proof of its entrance into, and ownership by the separate institutional archive within which it circulated (Plate 5).

During Atget's lifetime, the visibility of his commercial photographic output remained largely limited to the institutional milieus for which it was produced — protected within the photography collections of library and museum archives within Paris. Yet in the temporal gap between the turn of the century and the present, the circulation of Atget's photographs has shifted considerably. Today, these photographs emerge from a much broader range of institutional and popular contexts: filling the pages of a plethora of coffee table photography books, circulating freely within various online electronic archives and above all, lining the white walls of North American art museums. Within these interconnected spaces, Atget's photographs have been synthesized into a history of photography, and inscribed by an array of art historical discourses.

Despite this expanding discourse, the *Intérieurs parisiens* series has received remarkably little extended academic investigation, perhaps because of its peculiarity and relative obscurity within Atget's larger, better known body of work. The first (and only) substantial research on the series came out of a 1982 exhibition organized by the Musée Carnavalet and curator François Reynaud. Molly Nesbit's essay, "Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens*, the Point of Difference," published in the accompanying catalogue, marked an important initial attempt to synthesize Atget's album into the context of his larger commercial production. In the essay, portions of which appear in her influential book *Atget's Seven Albums* (published ten years later), Nesbit argues that the *Intérieurs* photographs establish a series of juxtapositions.

---

7 This is no longer the case. The Bibliothèque Nationale's copy of the *Intérieurs parisiens* is missing two plates from the series (negative numbers 743 and 744).
8 Musée Carnavalet, *Eugène Atget (1857-1927) Intérieurs parisiens, Photographies* (Paris: Musée Carnavalet, 1982). While individual photographs from the *Intérieurs parisiens* appeared in various monographs published throughout the twentieth-century (of which *Atget, photographe de Paris* is an early example), the 1982 Musée Carnavalet exhibition was, as far as I am aware, the first exhibition of a copy of Atget's album in its entirety.
between different class positions. For Nesbit, these contrasts — legible within the style of objects that fill these rooms and emphasized by the duplicity of the photograph's captions — evoke Atget's own leftist, pro-syndicalist, political identity.

While my own reading of Atget's photographs has been significantly influenced by Nesbit's research, I want to focus less on how Atget situated his own political and personal identity within the *Intérieurs* series. Rather, using the different editions of Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens* as a material foundation, I want to situate the *Intérieurs* photographs within a series of overlapping historical contexts: 1) Atget's commercial practice, and the institutional circulation of his photographs; 2) the changing physical and social space of the late nineteenth-century Parisian apartment; 3) discourses of taste, hygiene and interior decoration; and 4) the art historical discourse that developed around Atget's practice over the final decades of the twentieth-century. Within the framework, Atget's captions establish a theoretical focus for the present paper. Rather than attempting to uncover a possible truth they so cleverly conceal, I want to address how these captions structure and subvert our visual experience of the *Intérieurs parisiens* albums.

Atget's captions structure his photographs through an interplay between interior space and personal identity. Yet, this is a system that ultimately breaks down as the search for order and continuity yields the multiplicity of the discontinuous fragment. Visible within interconnected traces of everyday life, these fragments neither reject our gaze, nor do they acquiesce to it. The interior spaces within Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens* invite us to look, but remain forever guarded — forcing us to come to terms with the indecency of looking at another person's effects without them present. Within these private spaces, a myriad of surfaces calmly display their collections of objects, from the crude trinket to the luxurious bibelot. These are objects marked by a past which they will forever inhabit. But this is a history only accessible in the vaguest of terms, such as those codified through the discourses of style and commodity exchange. Here, the remnants of everyday life (the motif used on a piece of furniture, the titles of books sitting amongst a collection of others lining a shelf) reveal intersections between class, gender and national identity. Yet Atget's photographs, I want to claim, speak little of the private narratives they claim to possess — of the traumatic and indiscreet relationships between spaces, objects and bodies. This silence refuses any attempt to objectify identity, that is, to reduce identity to object and object to identity.
CHAPTER ONE:  
THE Intérieurs parisiens AND EUGÈNE ATGET'S COMMERCIAL PRACTICE

Yet, to introduce the question of Atget's relation to history is to raise a series of partisan, ideological questions; that is the nature of the historical beast. If these questions are sidestepped, then Atget's relation to history is compromised, reduced to a watery zeitgeist, and Atget's documents are led blindfolded away from their rhetoric, condemned to do nothing. This is by and large what happened to them in the MOMA show — not because of some mean-spirited formalism, but because the good question about history has not been mined to full potential. That is to say, it has not been used as a leading question.  


As things would have it, Bernice Abbott and Julian Levy’s collection of Atget photographs eventually found its way into the hands of the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Organized by the director of the Museum’s photography department, John Szarkowski, the MOMA’s 1968 purchase of the Abbott-Levy photographs assembled a significant portion of Atget’s entire body of work within a single, highly visible institution. This physical relocation — across both national and institutional borders — inscribed Atget’s photographs within a drastically different context.

At the MOMA, the work of synthesizing Atget’s commercial practice into a still nascent historiography of photography began almost immediately. Initially lead by curators Yolanda Hershey (1968-1969) and Barbara Michaels (1973-1976), this process was eventually completed in the late 1970s by then Columbia University PhD student Maria Morris Hambourg. Working directly under Szarkowski, Hambourg used the individual reference numbers inscribed into each of Atget’s 9000+ glass negatives to decipher the complex (and often contradictory) system of numerical series and sub-series that structured Atget’s entire commercial output. Exploiting the breadth and depth of the Abbott-Levy Collection, Hambourg was able to identify five major series each containing thousands of individually numbered prints: Paysages-Documents divers, L'Art dans le Vieux Paris, Environs de Paris, Paris pittoresque, and Topographie du Vieux Paris.

Forming the basis of a dissertation completed for Columbia University in 1980, Hambourg’s research was eventually published a few years later in conjunction with the MOMA’s four-part Work of

---

10 Nesbit, “The Use of History,” in Art in America (February 1986): 82.
11 The MOMA’s Abbott-Levy Collection contains over 4500 prints, 1300 glass plate negatives, 85 individual paper albums — a collection that easily rivals the breadth and depth of any institutional holdings of Atget’s images both within and outside of France.
Atget exhibition. The culmination of a series of smaller Abbott-Levy Collection exhibitions organized during the seventies, the more catholic Work of Atget exhibition attempted to condense the apparent “incoherence” that seemed to characterize Atget’s diverse commercial practice into a unified, artistic oeuvre. While Hambourg’s research for the MOMA took steps toward parsing out aspects of this commercial practice, it ultimately stressed Atget’s distance from the external demands of these professional associations. Instead, Hambourg argued (along with Szarkowski) that Atget’s practice developed according to the singularity of his personal photographic vision. In her dissertation, Hambourg writes that Atget, “rarely digressed from the territory bounded by his predilections, even when working for commissions for others. The oeuvre is therefore remarkably coherent and, to an equally remarkable degree, it is a portrait of its maker.” In emphasizing the autonomy of Atget’s newly constituted oeuvre, the MOMA hoped to write Atget into a history of modern photography — one which it had already begun formulating through a string of exhibitions in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

The most significant of these exhibitions was Peter Galassi’s highly contentious Before Photography. Held in the fall of 1981, just three months prior to the first installment of The Work of Atget, Before Photography mobilized a largely formalist language to rewrite the history of an entire field of photographic practice through a unified modernist logic that emphasized the autonomy of photography’s unique “pictorial syntax.” Within this context, the pretexts of a documentary photographic practice were fully overturned by the imperatives of autonomous art production. As Allan Sekula explains, “suddenly the hermeneutic pendulum careens from the objectivist end of its arc to the opposite, subjectivist end. Positivism yields to a subjective metaphysics, technologism gives way to auteurism.” Metastasizing in direct opposition to an emergent materialist history of art, the ideological framework established by MOMA exhibitions like Before Photography and The Work of Atget sparked fierce criticism from the academic community. Many critics, including several writing within the October circle, argued that the

14 Morris, The Structure of the Work, 37.
MOMA's unified modernist approach to an entire history of photography served only to justify its own curatorial and connoisseurial biases. Furthermore, critics argued that exhibitions like Galassi's Before Photography fleshed out a larger ideological framework that allowed photographs such as Atget's to enter the space of the museum as unified art objects — divorced from the messy particulars that cloud their individual histories.

Against the research disseminated within the MOMA's department of photography, other scholars formulated different methodological approaches to Atget's commercial practice. Amongst this research, Molly Nesbit's work proved the most concrete attempt to overwrite the MOMA's modernist account of Atget's body of work. Initially formulated in the late 1970s and 1980s and eventually published in 1992 as Atget's Seven Albums, Nesbit's research provided the first fully theorized and rigorously historicized reading of Atget's photographs. As her title indicates, Nesbit's research focused on a series of bound albums that Atget produced over the first two decades of the twentieth century. Between 1909 and 1915, Atget developed seven of these album series, each containing sixty individually captioned photographs: L'Art dans le Vieux Paris (1909/10); Intérieurs parisiens (1910); La Voiture à Paris (1910); Métiers, boutiques et étalages de Paris (1912); Enseignes et vieilles boutiques de Paris (1913); Zoniers. Vues et types de la zone militaire de Paris (1913); and Fortifications de Paris (1915). As with his Intérieurs parisiens, Atget's sold editions of these albums exclusively to large museum and library archives operated by the French State. In the years leading up to 1909, these public archives provided an important supplement to Atget's broad private sector clientele, and included both large institutions like the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Musée Carnavalet, and the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, and smaller archives like those at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, the Ecole Boulle, and the Musée du Sculpture Comparé. With his bound albums, Atget began tailoring his production to the organizational structure of these institutional archives.

Prior to developing these album series, Atget typically sold his photographs unmounted, as individual prints within larger sale lots. He displayed these prints to potential clients within a number of crude, loose-bound, paper albums. These paper albums were the focus of a study conducted in the 1970s by Barbara L. Michaels, the second curator of the MOMA's Abbott-Levy Collection. This research was published in "An Introduction to the Dating and..."
place by small diagonal slits in the folios' folded pages. This established an impermanent system that
allowed these paper albums to accommodate an ever-changing range of photographs, edited to suit the
interests of Atget's diverse client-base. Once purchased, these individual photographs were typically filed
individually according to subject, and thus dispersed throughout larger archival collections. Unlike these
unmounted prints, Atget's bound albums established a permanent, ordered network of photographs. The
visual dialogue between individual photographic plates was especially apparent within the bound editions
of Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens* series, where, unlike his other albums, photographs were mounted on
opposing pages — thus suggesting a rigid, temporal cohesion from verso to recto.

For Nesbit, Atget's seven album series provided entry into Atget's larger commercial practice. They serve as quasi-discrete reference points set amongst an overwhelming vast photographic output. Pivoting around these photographic collections, Nesbit attempted to locate Atget's broader commercial output within the often-irregular specificities that characterized the milieus in which they circulated. Specifically, Nesbit addressed Atget's ties to a broad private and institutional clientele within Paris. Evidence of these associations remained embedded within Atget's own account books. Only one of these books remains extant, known now as the *répertoire* after the title imprinted on its black leather cover.\(^1\)

Currently retained within the MOMA's Abbott-Levy collection, the *répertoire* contains the detailed account and contact information Atget used to track his diverse clientele. For Nesbit, the *répertoire* became a valuable (if incomplete) archive — an unmined sourcebook documenting the entangled specificities that formed the often-complex mechanics of Atget's commercial practice.

In many ways, Atget's bound photographic albums form a peculiar foundation for a materialist history of his commercial practice. They represent only the barest sample of his broader photographic output — a mere four or five percent of his entire commercial production. Unlike Atget's bound album series, the majority of this production concentrated on photographic representations of architectural and topographical sites taken within the remaining older sections of the city of Paris. These photographs documented "Vieux Paris," that is, the physical remains of Paris' receding urban past. Atget produced these *Vieux Paris* photographs over the entire span of his career (1895-1927). It quickly became a

---

\(^1\) On the *Atget's répertoire*, see Molly Nesbit, "The Répertoire," in *Atget's Seven Albums*, 20-26.
specialization that Atget used to market himself to his various private and institutional clients — taking the title of "Auteur, Editeur d'un <<Recueil photographique du Vieux Paris>> (Monuments et aspects)" on both his 1902 carte de visite and his personal letterhead (Plate 7).

These Vieux Paris photographs shape the body of work that Atget is best known (and loved) for today. Typically, commentators praise these photographs for their quaint variety, that is, their failure to reproduce the monumentalized vision of the Parisian urban environment that remained so familiar over the entire twentieth-century. Yet within the context of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries, the meaning of Vieux Paris remained highly complex — emerging from within an interconnected network of academic and popular spaces of knowledge.

The history of late nineteenth-century interest in photographic representations of Vieux Paris remained rooted, at least partially, within the now famous municipal redeveloped initiated under Napoleon III's Second Empire. Over the first half of the nineteenth-century, the population of Paris rose sharply, doubling from just fewer than 550,000 in 1801, to over 1,000,000 in 1851. Stimulated partially by a dramatic increase in immigration, this new urban density placed severe strains on the city's available housing and basic infrastructure. Upon taking control of the French State in 1848, Napoleon III initiated a range of public works projects in an attempt to accommodate and control this growing population.20 Begun in 1853, the modernization of Paris was the responsibility of Baron George-Eugène Haussmann, the newly appointed prefect of the Seine. As head of administrative authority within the city, Haussmann oversaw a vast group of redevelopment projects, ranging from new housing development and urban landscaping to sewer construction and slum clearance.

At the heart of Haussmann's scheme lay the construction of a series of new, extremely wide boulevards extending radially from Paris' medieval center to the city's expanding outer suburbs. Two new thoroughfares — the Boulevard du Centre (which eventually incorporated the Boulevard de Sébastopol and the Boulevard Saint-Michel) and the Rue Rivoli — were to bisect the city, forming what Haussmann described as "la croisette de Paris." Developed according to a radically new, rectilinear plan, the Paris cross (and a connected array of other new arteries) cut straight level corridors through the most impacted areas of the city — spaces readily associated with social unrest and medical insalubrity. Using these new, wide

---

boulevards as a base, Haussmann attempted to order the Paris's urban topography through a series of monumental vistas — terminating each of his new thoroughfares at an existing or newly constructed public monument that was in turn disengaged from the structures that surrounded it.

The urban redevelopment begun during the Second Empire would extend long beyond the fall of Napoleon, continuing with increased intensity following the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune of 1871. Initially managed by Haussmann's lieutenant, Jean Alphand, this Third Republic construction largely followed the former prefect's original plans. Over the last decades of the nineteenth-century, a number of existing boulevards were significantly expanded, and new thoroughfares, including the Avenue de l'Opéra and the Boulevard Henri-VI, were constructed.

Massive in scale and vast in scope, this redevelopment radically transformed the social and structural organization of the city of Paris. In a city plagued with periods of social unrest, continual outbreaks of communicable disease, and crippling traffic congestion, nineteenth-century municipal policy established the beginnings of a modern infrastructure that would support Paris' developing industrial economy well through the beginning decades of the twentieth-century. Paris' new urban modernity would carry a substantial cost though, hardly limited to its remarkable, multi-billion franc price tag. Under Second Empire and Third Republic municipal development, hundreds of thousands of (mostly working class) Parisians were displaced from their residences. Tens of thousands of structures were also destroyed — demolitions that made way for a new, lasting topographical order dramatically at odds with the city's architectural past.

The period of sustained urban redevelopment spread over the last half of the nineteenth-century eventually catalyzed interest in Paris' architectural heritage. During the Second Empire, ardent criticism against the "Haussmannization" of Paris emerged mainly from within a small group of artists and

---


22 As David Pinkney explains, "[The financial] costs were enormous. In 1869 Haussmann estimated that the expenditure on rebuilding the city since 1850 at 2,500,000,000 francs, about forty-times the city's outlay on all other expenses of government in 1851... The city sought to raise money from taxes (it levied no new ones), the resale of public property, subsidies from the national government (which always involved a struggle with the provincial majority in the Legislative Body), and public loans, but these means proved to be inadequate, and Haussmann resorted to less orthodox methods of financing," (Pinkney, The Rebuilding of Paris, 5). Anthony Sutcliffe argues that the financial costs of this municipal development left the city in such debt, that the programs would have eventually collapsed if the fall of the Second Empire had not forced a dramatic financial restructuring under the Third Republic (Sutcliffe, The Autumn of Central Paris, 41-45).
antiquarians. After the fall of Napoleon, this criticism largely subsided, only to be replaced by concern for the preservation and documentation of Paris' remaining architectural heritage. Encouraged by an expanding number of new preservationist societies like Les Amis du Monument Français (formed in 1885) and larger, more established institutions like the Commission du Vieux Paris, awareness of ancien régime architecture spread from a localized intelligentsia to a curious (and increasingly international) bourgeois public.

As material remnants of a seventeenth and eighteenth-century past, the architectural and topographical spaces of Vieux Paris remained oddly juxtaposed to the contemporary urban spaces in which they were situated. While still a central feature of Paris' early twentieth-century landscape, these physical spaces were more readily associated with the idiosyncrasies of a rapidly receding "medieval" Parisian history. Thoroughly codified with a discourse radiating from a broad academic and antiquarian milieu, these Vieux Paris spaces represented physical incarnations of France's architectural (and historical) patrimony.

For an academic audience, photography represented an important technology of documentation, allowing accurate detailed records to be made of Vieux Paris sites still imminently threatened by the constant demands of Paris' urban realities. Yet by the turn of the twentieth-century, photographic representations of Vieux Paris had begun to circulate more widely — collected by amateur antiquarians and stored within the studios of professional illustrators and artists. Amongst this broader audience, a rigorous (if often problematic) academic discourse of Vieux Paris became increasingly entangled with highly commercial, increasingly touristic enterprises feeding off middle-class nostalgia and nascent French nationalism. Within this context, representation of Vieux Paris could easily be isolated as history and consumed as a picturesque counterpart to an increasingly regularized and often alienating modern urbanity.

Atget was one of many early twentieth-century photographers to establish a viable commercial practice responding to developing popular and academic curiosity in photographic representations of Vieux Paris. By the second decade of the twentieth century, Atget had produced thousands of Vieux Paris

photographs, concentrating on both architectural and topographical aspects of the older sections of Paris. Forming the core of his commercial output, these photographs spread over four of Atget’s five numbered series: *Paysages-Documents divers* (1888-1927), *L’Art dans le Vieux Paris* (1897-1927), *Paris pittoresque* (1898-1927) and *Topographie du Vieux Paris* (1906-1915).

Unlike many *Vieux Paris* photographers, Atget did not typically work on commissions, nor did he operate within a single institutional setting such as the Commission du Vieux Paris or the Commission des Monuments Historique. Rather, he generally sold his photographs directly to a variety of both public and private clients, sometimes working through individual dealers including the Parisian book dealer Rapilly to whom he sold prints for resale to the Bibliotheque Nationale. Although Atget often received less for his prints than other *Vieux Paris* photographers working exclusively for large commissioning bodies, the independence of his commercial practice meant that Atget was able to maintain a certain degree of autonomy, limited by the changing demands of the market. Atget was also able to retain the rights to his negatives, allowing him to sell identical prints to a variety of different clients.

The largest of Atget’s *Vieux Paris* numbered series, the *Topographie du Vieux Paris*, signaled an important shift away from the independence that had formally marked his commercial practice. Begun in 1906, just three years prior to the *Intérieurs parisiens*, this work continued for ten years and eventually included nearly seventeen hundred prints. These photographs focused specifically on topographical sites threatened by new municipal development. Unlike his other numerical series, Atget developed the *Topographie* photographs in direct conjunction with *Vieux Paris* academics and archivists at the Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris.

Over the last decades of the nineteenth-century, the Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris existed as a sort of adjunct to the Musée de la Ville de Paris, within the Musée Carnavalet. After moving to an independent location at the Hôtel Le Peletier in 1898, the library became a repository for primarily
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26 Over the course of his commercial practice, Atget’s prices ranged generally between one to two francs per print, depending on the client. He typically received a better price from institutional and commercial clients than from amateur collectors, who were sometimes charged as little as twenty-five centimes per print. Photographers who worked directly for institutions like Commission du Vieux Paris, often made up to twenty-five francs for a negative and two prints, plus traveling expenses (Morris, *The Structure of the Work*, 78-81).
documentary material, including ephemera such as maps, prints and photographs. Following this
relocation, the Bibliothèque historique went through a series of reorganizations, initiated by the library's
newly appointed Conservateur-en-chef, Marcel Poète. A foremost expert on the urban history of Paris,
Poète attempted to reintegrate the Bibliothèque's archival operations into an expanding Vieux Paris
community. Developed within "La Commission de reorganization du service de la Bibliothèque et des
Travaux Historiques de la Ville de Paris," Poète's reorganization revitalized the work of the Travaux
Historiques and helped encourage a series of public and private lectures and annual exhibition on a variety
of Vieux Paris topics. Poète also significantly expanded the scope of the Bibliothèque's archival
collection. Formally restricted to material of historical import, the library began collecting ephemeral
documents of contemporary Parisian life. This material became part of a newly formed Actualités
division, managed by print and photography curator Edmond Beaurepaire.

Marcel Poète's Actualités division, which eventually retained the first unbound edition of the
Intérieurs parisiens, would have an important impact on the content and structure of Atget's work. This
impact is evidenced partially within the Topographie du Vieux Paris, which became Atget's first work for
the Bibliothèque after its 1906 restructuring. While the photographs that made up Atget's Topographie
series were often visually indistinguishable from those he had produced prior to 1906, they marked
Atget's first attempt to produce a methodical topographic survey of Paris. With the Topographie du
Vieux Paris, Atget also began including detailed captions within his photographs. Typically this text
broadly framed each space within any relevant local history. Atget probably culled this information
from Félix de Rochegude's pocket guidebook, Guide pratique à travers le vieux Paris, published continually
throughout the first decade of the twentieth-century. Like his Intérieurs albums developed the following
year, these captions indicated the address of the site and often established connections between
architectural space and inhabiting bodies. Here, the focus remained on creating a palpable connection

28 Morris, The Structure of the Work, 271. The relocation of the Bibliothèque historique split its former ties to the
Musée de la Ville de Paris, which remained located within the Musée Carnavalet and continued to acquire material
deemed to be of decorative or artistic value.
29 For a bibliography of Marcel Poète, see Robert Anzelle, "Marcel Poète," The Town Planning Review 21, no. 2 (July,
31 Within this, series Atget probably also produced a number of photographs specifically for a series of annual
exhibitions on Vieux Paris (including Paris sous la République de 1848 held at the Bibliothèque historique de la Ville
de Paris and organized by Marcel Poète (Morris, The Structure of the Work, 284).
32 This established a format that Atget would eventually employ within his first bound album series, L'Art dans le
Vieux Paris, drawn from the numbered series of the same name.
between ancien régime architecture and a narrative of French history. Yet Atget's captions also often positioned each Vieux Paris site within the contemporary specificities of present day Paris, a shift that belies the effect of Bibliothèque historique's new Actualités division on the structure and content of Atget's work.

In the first edition of the Bulletin de la Bibliothèque et Travaux Historique published in 1906, Poète wrote:

Paris, semeur d'idées, doit être représenté à la Bibliothèque par une sélection d'ouvrages synthétisant son rôle intellectuel et social. Ajoutons au plan la reproduction photographique de rues ou édifices et des scènes de la vie Parisienne, et nous aurons un aperçu du vaste cadre qu’au simple point de vue de l’existence courante de la cité il nous apparaît de remplir... Il faut rattacher ce présent au passé, et c'est Paris dans les transformations de son être à travers les âges, qu’il importe de pouvoir suivre sur les rayons de la Bibliothèque.

By focusing on the contestations between a Parisian urban modernity and its historical past, Poète significantly shifted established academic negotiations of Vieux Paris. Within this framework, the Actualités collection became a space not only for retaining records of contemporary Parisian life for use by future historians, it also marked a new interest in situating Paris architectural and topographic history within the context of an increasingly modernized present.

Atget's work within the Actualités division at the Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris laid the commercial foundation for the series of photographic albums that he would produce between 1910-1915. These albums represented a substantial departure from the Vieux Paris subject matter that formed the core of Atget's commercial practice. Unlike Atget’s broader Vieux Paris output, which concentrated on sights within Paris increasingly isolated from contemporary life within late nineteenth-century discourses of urban history, the photographs within Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens series (like those in his subsequent bound albums) specifically documented spaces intertwined with an emerging Parisian modernity. Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens focused on domestic apartment spaces. Structurally ubiquitous, but visually marginalized, these urban residential spaces were physically and socially transformed by the municipal redevelopment of the last half of the nineteenth-century.


Under the Second Empire, the structural appearance of residential architecture became extremely regularized throughout the city of Paris — a uniformity that was in marked contrast to the architectural aesthetic of the preceding century. Unlike public architecture, which remained both individualized and highly decorated, the facades of newly built apartment buildings became largely unadorned and generally unified over the length of entire blocks. This homogeneity was ensured through both late nineteenth-century private building practices and municipal legislation.

Second Empire reconstruction opened up significant areas for redevelopment. With the help of the municipal government, large tracts of this land were developed by individual building firms, utilizing largely identical architectural designs. As Anthony explains,

The authorities encouraged this process, being themselves unable to acquire and develop large areas of land on the periphery. The developers responded willingly to the authorities' views on the appropriate type of development, partially because it was in their financial interest to be absorbed in the broader planning strategy linked to the official street building programme. Although the number of apartment houses actually designed and built by the French State remained relatively limited, municipal architecte-voyers, responsible for new building permits, helped encourage a unified aesthetic from one building to the next. This homogeneity was bolstered by new legislation, set out within the municipal building regulations of 1859. The first comprehensive building codes since the end of the eighteenth-century, the 1859 legislation attempted to limit building and ceiling heights based on the width of individual streets. While principally designed to sustain adequate light and air circulation with the city's working class districts, these regulations also encouraged developers to build to a unified height over the length of entire streets. By limiting the width of balconies and the degree of facade ornamentation, the 1859 regulations only further emphasized the horizontal continuity between one building and the next.

While many commercial architects, including such well-respected figures like César Daly and Viollet-le-Duc, initially celebrated the new harmonization of the Parisian topography, others, like Charles
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Carnier, architect of the Paris opera house, openly criticized the monotony of the city's new residential architecture. By the fall of the Second Empire, many commercial architects began to use the homogeneity of the city's existing residential structures to mark out the difference of their own architectural practice. This commercial resistance was eventually bolstered by vocal popular dissatisfaction, which remained consistently entangled with a nostalgic middle-class curiosity in the spaces of *Vieux Paris*. In the popular illustrated guide, *Paris in Old and Present Times with Special Reference to Changes in its Architecture and Topography*, published in London in 1892, Philip Gilbert Hamerton, writes, for example:

Before Louis Napoleon the houses were generally of unequal height, but the love of the regular line made Haussmann's Paris almost as regular at the cornice as at the curbstone. These changes no doubt gave a more orderly appearance to the city, but detract sadly from its picturesque variety. In old Paris there were three distinct and notable irregularities: those in the tops of the houses, the slope of the fronts, and the ground-plan of the street, all of which are now replaced by straight lines.

Yet while popular and commercial pressure produced some degree of variation, Parisian residential architecture remained highly standardized well through the Third Republic. The aesthetic regularity of Paris' apartment structures actually increased after the turn of the twentieth-century, as mass produced building materials became more readily available, and such viable architectural alternatives such as those developed within Art Nouveau and Internationalist circles were largely rejected as "un-French."

By deemphasizing individual bays, a unified Parisian residential architecture emphasized the aesthetic continuity over the length of a boulevard, and thus redirected the pedestrian's gaze away from specific apartment structures. Established under the Second Empire and accentuated by the building booms of the Third Republic, this aesthetic arrangement ensured that apartment buildings emerged only at the visual margins of the Paris' urban topography. Within a modern Parisian topography structured through a series of monumental vistas, the visual marginality of the city's residential interiors was only emphasized by the lush rows of newly planted trees that lined each of Paris' new boulevards — foliage
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41 An example of late nineteenth-century commercial dissatisfaction is laid out by Félix Monmory in the introduction to a ten volume series of photographs and floor plans documenting newly constructed residential apartment spaces throughout Paris: "Pour peu qu'on s'intéresse aux progrès de l'architecture privée en France, on est justement frappé du caractère de monotonie, de banalité que revêt cette architecture, telle qu'on l'a vue surgir de terre il y a quelque trente ou quarante ans, à l'époque de la grand impulsion imprimée aux travaux de Paris par Haussmann... Eh! bien! cette rage de l'uniformité, nous l'avon vue s'écir, sans fin ni trève, durant les dernières années de l'Empire et pendant les quinze ou vingt premières années de la République actuelle. Les rues et les boulevards se sont multipliés, offrant dans leur ensemble, un aspect identique et menaçant de transformer Paris en un vulgaire amas de constructions semblables." See Félix Monmory, *Nouvelles maisons à loyer et hôtels particuliers à Paris: comprenant vues d'ensemble, plans et détails*, v.1-10 (Paris: Librairie de l'architecture et des arts industriels, 1895), np.
that both softened the uniformity of the city's residential facades, while also largely blocking visual access into its interior spaces.\textsuperscript{43}

While Haussmann's thoroughfares established a series of new, highly visible public spaces, Sharon Marcus suggests that visual access into the city's already marginalized private interiors became increasingly restricted.\textsuperscript{44} As Marcus explains, "Because the new boulevards seemed to occupy a space distinct from apartment buildings, it became easier, even imperative, to perceive streets as exterior spaces and apartment buildings as interior ones."\textsuperscript{45} The new opacity of the Parisian domestic sphere represented a significant shift from the early nineteenth-century.\textsuperscript{46} During the July Monarchy, Marcus suggests that the Parisian apartment existed as a "relatively transparent structure" within the urban landscape, while individual apartment facades functioned "less as a boundary between external, public surface and its internal, private depths, and more as a series of views into and out of the building."\textsuperscript{47} Toward the latter half of the century, this unity between the interior apartment space and the exterior street began to dissolve. From within the visual margins of the Parisian topography, apartments became increasingly hermetic spaces, culturally and physically isolated from the public sphere of the street.

Atget's \textit{Intérieurs parisiens} specifically focus on the interiors of the visually marginalized residential structures that lined a modern Parisian topography. Meticulously documenting room after room within apartments throughout the city of Paris, Atget's camera fixes their contents onto the surface of a reproducible, durable, and highly transportable format. His prints depict both public and private spaces within these interiors, documenting salons and dining rooms just as carefully as bedrooms and washstands. Amongst the \textit{Intérieurs parisiens}, the viewer is allowed to linger without guilt; permitted to spy without the fear of being found out.

As photographic records, the \textit{Intérieurs parisiens} seem especially invasive. Not only do they grant the viewer visual access into private interiors, but they also bare witness to Atget's own physical presence.
within residences. Within the *Intérieurs* photographs, traces of Atget’s intrusion remain clearly visible. Consider, for example, three consecutive photographs identified by Atget as the Champs de Mars interior of one Monsieur M, financier (Plates 8, 9 and 10, negative numbers 746, 747 and 748). The photographs represent a room — the same room — in a well-decorated bourgeois apartment. Along the walls, the surfaces of two large mirrors reflect the variety of well placed bibelots that fill otherwise sparsely decorated mantles: a miniature Venus de Milo, a vaguely neoclassical bather and two identical, orientalist vases. In the first and third photograph (negative numbers 746 and 748), a peculiar two-sided chair, known as a "conversation," fills the center of the frame. In Atget’s other photograph of the room (negative number 747), the conversation seems to have moved (or been moved), replaced instead by a cluster of elegant chairs. At the center of the room a delicate Louis XVI table is decorated with a large bouquet of lilacs. The same bouquet is clearly visible in the reflection of the large mirror in negative number 746, here, positioned on the mantle just outside the photograph’s frame. When viewed in sequence, these prints record Atget’s movements through space, marking his physical interaction with the domestic goods his photographs document. 

Another photograph yields more damning evidence (Plate 11, negative number 709). The image is of a bedroom attributed by Atget to Madame D, petite rentière, Boulevard du Port Royal — the same room that appears in three other photographs within the *Intérieurs parisiens* (negative numbers 707, 708 and 728). Along the back wall, the surface of a mirror captures the reflection of Atget’s camera. This photograph evokes another, more famous image by Atget, from a series of work documenting the sumptuous hôtel Matignon on the rue de Varenne (Plate 12, negative number 5110). Again, a mirror allows a camera to image itself. Also visible are Atget’s hat and overcoat, tossed casually onto a slip-covered couch. On the glowing surface of Atget’s photographs, these details seem at once poetic and incidental. They invite readings of solemn self-reflectivity and photographic self-portraiture, but also suggest the realities of the daily grind. Mirrors filled the walls of French interiors and photographers often caught glimpses of their own reflection.

A close look at other photographs within the *Intérieurs parisiens* exposes more moved furniture, some subtle, other dramatic. For example, note negative numbers 729 and 745, in which the worktable of a décorateur is replaced by an oddly positioned cluster of chairs. The gap in the negative numbers indicates that Atget might have returned to this apartment a second time after taking the initial photograph (negative number 729). In this case, it is impossible to tell whether Atget himself moved the furniture, or whether the décor was changed in the span of time between the first and second photograph (Musée Carnavalet, *Éugène Atget Intérieurs parisiens*, 106).

The photograph is in fact part of a larger collection of images Atget made of the hôtel Matignon, several of which include reflections of Atget’s camera.
In front of these photographs, I cannot help thinking of *Camera Lucida*, and of Roland Barthes' effort to come to terms with the weight of photographic objectivity:

For the photograph's immobility is somehow the result of a perverse confusion between two concepts: the Real and the Live: by attesting that the object has been real, the photograph surreptitiously induces belief that it is alive, because of that delusion which makes us attribute to Reality to the past ("this-has-been"), the photograph suggests that it is already dead. Hence it would be better to say that Photography's inimitable feature (its noeme) is that someone has seen the referent (even if it is a matter of objects) in flesh and blood, or again in person.50

For Barthes, the photograph, as index, not only "certifies" the presence of the referent (in Atget's case, "a matter of objects"), but also the photographic operator's relationship to that referent.51 Yet Atget's photograph fails to represent Atget, "in flesh and blood." Rather, within the reflective surface of these mirrors, we see only Atget's metonym — round, glass lens peeking out from a mass of black fabric.

50 Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, 79.
51 In his essay "Dismantling Modernism, Reinventing Documentary Photography," Allan Sekula offers a more cautious articulation of photographic indexicality: "The only 'objective' truth that photography offers is the assertion that somebody or something... was somewhere and took a picture. Everything else, everything beyond the imprinting of the trace, is up for grabs" (Sekula, "Dismantling Modernism," 57, my emphasis).
CHAPTER TWO:  
CLASSIFYING STYLE AND HYGIENE WITHIN THE MODERN FRENCH INTERIOR

One can... divide the inhabitants of a town by [social] category, according to the number of rooms in their dwelling. A workspace without a home represents the deepest poverty; a room with a stove that serves as a bedroom and a kitchen is the worker's dwelling; if the kitchen is separated from the room, then it's one step up. If one has a dining room, that's an indication of a higher situation; if one has a salon, then one has definitely emerged from the inferior classes. The dwelling is above all the exterior and permanent sign of the social situation.  


For his *Intérieurs parisiens*, Atget's camera registers the material effects that filled Parisian interiors from conspicuously disparate class positions. The point is both obvious and deeply significant. The surface of Atget's photographs remains filled by an often dizzying collection of objects: an assortment of furniture, punctuated by a jumble of decorative bibelot. In the absence of concrete human activity, these belongings become the actors in a quiet drama of the everyday, bearing witness to the highly stratified consumer culture from which they emerged. In contrast to the period of full-fledged mass consumption that would follow the First World War, Third Republic Paris was marked by intensified consumption amongst an urban bourgeoisie charmed by the relatively recent availability of ready to wear fashions and affordable household goods. This new consumer economy largely excluded the working and artisanal classes, while at the same time, encouraging France's growing petit-bourgeoisie (who, as a group, often earned little more than those amongst the working class) to mirror patterns of consumption naturalized within bourgeois circles.

This economic framework was nourished by the novel sites of bourgeois leisure and consumption that emerged in the wake of the Second Empire. Between 1852 and 1870, over a dozen different *magasins de nouveautés* opened throughout Paris. Encouraged by recent municipal
redevelopment and the new availability of increasingly standardized goods, these department stores would radically transform the character of the Parisian retail economy. The Third Empire *grand-magasins* mobilized a remarkably modern business model, including the use of fixed prices and increasingly sophisticated advertisements. Unlike the smaller retail shops common throughout the first half of the nineteenth-century, Paris' large department stores sold a remarkably diverse assortment of goods acquired through a network of local and national manufacturers. This system separated sites of production from those of consumption — spaces increasingly isolated within different arrondissements within Paris.

With these new networks of distribution came increasingly stratified patterns of consumption. While Paris' new department stores represented more democratic spaces of consumption than the smaller boutiques they replaced, they remained only truly accessible to established bourgeois and petit bourgeois communities. Largely excluded by "cash only" policies and class-based cultural codes of social respectability, Paris' urban working class entered the department store only as low paid employees. Assembled using highly modern recruitment strategies, the department store's working class labour force operated within highly organized, "gender appropriate" departments.

When department stores began to sell furniture in the final decades of the nineteenth-century, they functioned chiefly as sites of distribution. Unlike smaller boutiques, which sold furniture produced and or assembled by an onsite labour force, the late nineteenth-century *magasins de nouveautés* typically stocked finished products manufactured in the faubourg St-Antoine by contracted workshops or independent *ateliers*. Many of these independent manufacturing companies established separate retail spaces near the department stores to which they supplied ready-made products. As Leora Auslander argues, the impact of the Parisian department store on the late nineteenth-century furniture retail industry
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(1855), Au Printemps (1865), the Bazar de l'Hôtel de Ville (1860), La Samaritaine (1869) (Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 168 n 43).

36 On the department store's clientele, see Tiersten, *Marianne in the Market*, 215-217; and Miller, *The Bon Marché*, 178-179. A Parisian working class typically shopped at the lower-end stores like the Magasins Dufayel that emerged on the fringes of this new retail economy.

37 On gender, labor and the Parisian department store, see Theresa M. McBride, "A Woman's World: Department stores and the Evolution of Women's Employment, 1870-1920," in *French Historical Studies* 10, no. 4 (Fall 1978): 664-683. According to McBride, "men sold male clothing, household furnishings, and even women's gloves, while women handled yardage and women's dresses." Unlike domestic service, which typically drew young women into Paris from the countryside, Paris' department stores employed a predominantly urban, female labor force. Supplementing a larger, better-paid male work force, these women were often housed within highly restrictive on or off-site facilities operated by individual department stores.

must be set against the market presence of these independent sites of consumption. During the decades surrounding the turn of the twentieth-century, these specialized furniture retailers and custom furniture shops provided important competition, and proved remarkably adaptable within a radically shifting modern economy.

Within the context of this new availability of goods, and an expanding bourgeois female consuming public, a new discourse on taste and consumption began to develop in France. Reproduced within a diverse collection of journaux de mode, this discourse scrutinized modern French taste in an attempt to regulate patterns of bourgeois consumption. Largely targeted to a female bourgeois and petit-bourgeois audience, these publications ranged from decorative arts and interior journals such as Art et Decoration, L'Intérieur, and Le Moniteur de l'ameublement, to a broader assortment of fashion and society periodicals, such as Femina, Le Figaro-modes, and La Mode pour tous. These periodicals were supplemented by a number of instructional books on modern interior design and the decorative arts like Henri de Noussanne's Le Goût dans l'ameublement, published 1896. While neither of these textual forms — the popular magazine or decorating manual (and its close cousin, the etiquette book) — were entirely novel inventions of the late nineteenth-century, they did significantly shift the existing discourse on the interior space. Through the sophisticated codification of domestic goods, late nineteenth and early twentieth-century literature on interior decoration established connections between the goods displayed within the bourgeois home, and the social and personal identity of the resident.

Bourgeois taste throughout the Second Empire and Third Republic favored an inventive, historicist pastiche of seventeenth and eighteenth-century styles. This was a stylistic mode that in many ways developed in the wake of the ancien régime, as consumption and display became increasingly important to a newly powerful bourgeoisie hoping to stake out a class identity relative to a shrinking aristocracy and growing working-class and petit bourgeois populations. Drawing from styles associated
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59 Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 325-326. Auslander contrasts the mitigated impact of department stores on the furniture industry to the dramatic impact they had on the retail fashion market.

60 As Lisa Tiersten explains, not much is known about the circulation of late nineteenth-century fashion and interior magazines. These journals probably circulated primarily within a bourgeois context, which probably expanded toward the end of the century as lower cost, more widely circulated journals became available (Tiersten, *Marianne in the Market*, 215, and 215 n 126).

61 For a partial list of popular magazines circulating at the turn of the twentieth-century in Paris, see Tiersten, Bibliography (Periodicals), in *Marianne in the Market*: 289-290. Atget sold photographs to a number of these decorative arts journals including L'Illustration, Je Sais Tout, Architectural Record, and The Studio.

with the aristocracy, historicist pastiche exploited the grand legacy of France's artistic patrimony, and thus a normalized notion of a national French aesthetic. Yet rather than simply producing exact replications of older designs, nineteenth-century pastiche typically modified and recombined established, historical forms, creating a final product that, as Auslander argues, "'passed' as historically authentic discursively, but not visually.”

The taste for historicist pastiche only expanded within France's modern market economy, remaining largely intact until the First World War despite the introduction of rival styles from within art nouveau and style moderne circles. If these rival styles represented a contemporary antithesis to the pastiche furniture circulating within a bourgeois mainstream, they never fashioned a cohesive French modern style. Rather, most turn of the century French taste critics suggested that the modern bourgeois interior be decorated not with the unity of ameublement de style, but through the eclectic combination of different period styles within the same interior space.

In his 1896 popular treatise on taste, Henri de Noussanne quotes Emmeline Raymond's understanding of the modern style in the contemporary journal Mode Illustre:

Il contiendra des sieges de tous styles: petites canapés Louis XV, bergères Louis XVI, fauteuils Henri II, sièges garnis de canne dorée, petits panneaux de soie brodée chinoise ou japonaise, grand panneau de vieilles tapisserie, écarnés avec tablettes, consoles Louis XIV, petits meubles en marqueterie de provenance hollandaise; pendules anciennes, porcelaines de Chine anciennes.

We have already seen this type of eclectic modernism within Atget's photographs of Monsieur M's Champ de Mars interior (Plate 9, negative number 747). Within this space, a Louis XVI table stands beside a Regency chair positioned in front of a neoclassical mantle, decorated with a matching pair of orientalist vases. This is the most modern interior that Atget photographs. A careful inspection of its rooms reveals its eclectic recombination of period furniture is matched by the presence of twentieth-century conveniences, including electric lights and a wired telephone (Plate 13, negative number 749).

Within the Parisian retail market, the taste for eclecticism was probably partially satisfied through innovations in furniture production, specifically the mixture of modern elements into furniture designed within an ancien régime idiom. Yet as Lisa Tiersten argues, it was ultimately the female
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64 Henri de Noussanne, Le Goût dans l'ameublement, 151.
65 Musée Carnavalet, Intérieurs parisiens Eugène Atget, 100-101.
consumer's responsibility to assemble the truly eclectic interior. Tiersten writes: "Pastiche by itself did not constitute the modern eclectic style. Refiguring creativity as a kind of original imitation, modern eclecticism sought novelty over permanence and individual expression over mimesis. Although experts encouraged the consumer to borrow motifs from other periods and places, they extorted her to use them in a fresh and original way that revealed individual sensibility."  

By replacing the unity of *ameublement de style* with the novelty of recombination and juxtaposition, a modern eclectic style seemed to offer the consumer more choice in the decoration of their interior space. Indeed, as Tiersten points out, modern eclecticism emerged alongside a general distain for the *métier* of the *tapisser-décorateur* — the professional men of taste who had traditionally guided the decoration of the bourgeois residential spaces within France. Within the context of the late nineteenth-century, it became the Frenchwoman's social responsibility to represent her household and nation, and not allow her taste to be subsumed by that of the self-interested interior decorator. Tiersten explains that "just as the wife and mother owed it to her family to decorate her own home, the female citizen owed the same to the nation, according to the author of a housekeeping handbook of 1890: 'You are too good a French woman to believe that you have fulfilled your duty by giving carte blanche to a decorator.'"  

Yet while discourses on taste often appeared in the guise of increased freedom of consumer choice, they also frequently sought to regulate and codify the consumption of domestic goods. This is a sentiment suggested by a 1911 article written for the journal *L'Intérieur*: "[The well decorated interior] must match perfectly the secret tendencies, the mentality, the psychology, the physiology, the social condition, the habits of the inhabitants... To those who look and comprehend, the interior reveals the mediocrity or superiority of those who live there." If the tastefully modern interior established a coherent, individualized decor out of a seemingly disparate group of elements, the *L'Intérieur* article warns that the poorly decorated residence reveals only the poor taste of its inhabitants. This is admonition mimicked in a catalogue for the Trois Quartiers department store: "Her tastes and her character are so completely reflected in her home that without knowing her... [an observer] can represent to himself or
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herself the mistress of the house as she really is... of course, the faults of laziness, absence of taste, and thoughtlessness will also leave their signature.  

Within both of these statements, the writers mobilize a trope common within turn of the century decorating literature. Preying on the fear that one’s interior might be in poor taste, they warn the reader of the potential condemnation of an outside visitor. For example in 1911, Marcelle Tinayre writes in the journal *Femina*:

Our home is our realm, as well as the extension and reflection of our personality. Our furniture, our bibelots, chosen by us, reveal our secret tastes, even our ideas, our conceptions of happiness and beauty. When an unknown visitor waits for us alone for a few minutes in our salon, in spite of himself he interrogates the objects, witnesses and confidantes of our lives.

Again, this trope sets the good intentions of the *maitresse de maison* against the judgment of her guests. It also isolated the knowledgeable gaze from the illiterate one. To “those who look and comprehend,” *L’Intérieur* claims, the domestic interior marks out much more than a localized class identity. Rather, furniture and other domestic objects become a direct cipher for the sophistication, personality, and even the morality of their owners.

The connections between domestic objects and personal identity drawn out within this literature on taste were formed within a modern commodity culture that was socially and economically invested in the association between consumers and the objects of their consumption. In her extensive study of consumption and display within France, Leora Auslander suggests that by the turn of the twentieth-century, the cultural meaning of ancien régime styles had been thoroughly codified within contemporary discourses on taste. This process emerged as a fluid, often contradictory, system that defined individual styles in terms of concrete social identities, allowing the individual period style of a piece of furniture (as well as its color and the wood it was made of) to connote the age, wealth, and marital status of the inhabitant(s). As Auslander explains, ancien régime styles were also highly gendered, not within a binary, but along a fluid spectrum that allowed for masculine and feminine, as well as “hermaphroditic” styles.
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72 Tiersten, *Marianne and the Market*, 139.
76 Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 279-280. As Auslander emphasizes, this was system that only emerged from a nineteenth century gendered perspective on both ancien régime history and the stylistic forms of period furniture: “The gendered attributions had noting to do with absolute aesthetic associations between certain forms and the
While the style of a man's furniture could potentially denote his social position, discourses on taste emphasized the relationship between the objects filling a woman's interior space and her physical body. Thus women were instructed to coordinate the style of their furniture to their age, and their colour of their interior to that of their hair, eyes, and skin. Noussanne offers similar advice in his 1896 *Le Goût dans l'ameublement*: "Quant à la couleur des draperies et des sièges, elle depend de vous. Votre salon, Madame, n'est que le cadre destine à vous faire valoir. De les nuances des cheveux et de celle du teint, se déduit aisément celle qui convient aux fauteuils."

The discourse produced within this prescriptive literature was part of a broader cultural connection drawn between the bourgeois woman and her interior space. As Lisa Tiersten explains, "the objects in a woman's home (or adorning her body) played a synecdochal rather than a symbolic role in relation to her identity, so that the room decorated by the *maîtresse de maison* was ultimately less her creation than an extension of her very being." While this discourse emerged from within a culturally restrictive, and economically prescriptive society, it provided the syntax for potentially radical modes of self-actualization. These new patterns of consumption had the capacity to overturn the gendered economy of goods — as Auslander argues, potentially reframing acts of consumption as those of production.

"In those days I had an apartment at the corner of the Champs-Élysées and the present Avenue George V. I was exultant with joy, not only at living in that dream-avenue which, as yet, no shop had spoilt, but also at knowing poets, authors and stage-folk whom I questioned eagerly about the new character I was to create." This was the Champs-Élysées apartment of Cécile Sorel (née Céline Seure), a well-known actress within the Comédie Française — the same apartment Atget photographed for his *Intérieurs parisiens* series. Atget probably knew Sorel through his connections to the Parisian theatre world. A trained actor himself, Atget gave frequent lectures on the theatre at several of Paris' Universités Populaires — spaces that functioned through leftist cooperation between Parisian intellectuals and

masculine or feminine, but everything to do with the gendering of the past and of history" (Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 287).

77 Auslander, 285-286.
79 Henri de Noussanne, *Le Goût dans l'ameublement*, 151.
workers. At these public universities, Atget spoke several times on the plays of Molière, including several lectures on his play *Le Misanthrope*. Molière's *Le Misanthrope* was a play that had catalyzed Sorel's success in the early years of the twentieth-century, and her portrayal of Célimène would eventually define her persona both on and off stage.

By the time Atget photographed her apartment in 1910, Sorel was in fact quite a Parisian celebrity. She had already worked throughout Europe, and had even starred in a film version of *La Tosca*, produced by the respected Films d'Art. Sorel's status within Parisian society is evidenced by her extensive write-ups within the popular Parisian media. Within this context, photographs of Sorel circulated widely, both within popular Parisian journals like *Le Théâtre* and as cartes de visite (Plate 14).

These photographs of Sorel evoke the complex sexuality of the Grande Coquette. Within the French stage, the Grand Coquette was both an emploi, or line of work, and a discursive category of embodied femininity. Typified by Molière's Célimène, the coquette was, as Rebecca Free argues, "a woman who excelled at performing herself as a tantalizing yet elusive object of masculine sexual desire, [posing] a challenge and a puzzle to the men who seek to control or to know the feminine subjectivity that animates her impenetrable façade." By the turn of the twentieth-century the coquette became a mode of embodied artistic performance practiced both on and off stage, and represented a certain sophisticated relationship to both the world of art and male desire.

Contemporary Parisian journals also reproduced photographs of Sorel's interior. A photograph of the salon of Sorel's Champs-Elysées apartment appeared, for example, in a 1911 edition of *Je sais tout* (Plate 15). A year has past since Atget's photograph, and the décor remains almost identical (Plate 16).

In the *Je sais tout* photograph, Sorel herself appears, donning an elegant wide brimmed hat. On the
In Arget's photographs of Sorel's interior, Sorel's body is replaced by the antiquities that filled her domestic space (Plate 17). Here, the delicate engraving and beautiful, dark wood of a cabinet suggest a refinement and affluence conspicuously absent elsewhere within the Intérieurs parisiens series. Against a white wall, beyond the ornate, blank face of clock, Sorel emerges from a portrait painted in a vague eighteenth or nineteenth-century manner. Within these photographs, the style of individual objects remains far from benign — the curve of a table leg and the gilding of a mirror are loosely coded markers of social and cultural identity.

In the first decade of the twentieth-century, Sorel crafted an elegant, if nouveau-riche, taste that helped solidify her newly elevated status within Parisian society. Describing Sorel's Quai Voltaire apartment (where she resided in the second decade of the century), Cecil Beaton writes:

Though the taste was derived from Largillière and Nattier, Cécile Sorel's predilection was to wield considerable influence for the next half century... This is an example of classical taste allied to an individual point of view, through the personal touches have been so widely copied that it is difficult for us today to realize the full force of their original impact.

When Sorel describes her own apartment in a 1946 autobiography, there is a slightly different inflection:

The perfect art of the Regency was an obsession with me. I loved its style in all the artists who contributed to its brilliance — painters, sculptors, carvers, goldsmiths. How often the nobility of the masterpieces gathered about me isolated me from importunate guests! How often I got up during the middle of the night to go and feel some unique piece of furniture I had just acquired! I used to kneel before their perfect forms and stroke them devotedly. Some evenings, after hectic receptions, when my guests had gone, I loved to remain alone among the silent things and let my whole being be possessed by their mysterious power.

While Sorel stresses her use of taste to stake out a class position relative to her peers, there is a greater emphasis on her personal, even bodily connection to the objects that filled her private interior. For Sorel, consumption became a form of self-definition, accentuating not only her relationship to the hierarchy of a contemporary social sphere, but also her connection to an entire history of French art and culture. In her autobiography, Sorel explains, "Pieces of furniture are friends. Works of art are extensions of us. In their

---

90 "Cécile Sorel," Je sais tout, 163.
presence, I ennobled my personality. They stood for me, and in them, I thought, I rediscovered my former incarnations.93

The new bourgeois discourses on taste and identity that Cécile Sorel participated in operated within a shifting aesthetic language. During the ancien régime, a powerful aristocracy cultivated a neoclassical notion of aesthetics that located value securely within objects themselves. Within the modern French market, the tasteful consumption of goods became more important than the quality of their individual production. As Lisa Tiersten explains, a modern French bourgeois aesthetic sensibility "defined the exercise of taste in everyday life as much more than the passive appreciation of beauty, casting the expression of individual aesthetic sensibility, even in the mundane acts of consumption, as an active, creative, even artistic enterprise."94 Within this new economy of taste, it became the individual's responsibility to transform the aesthetic value of increasingly standardized goods through the refinement of individual patterns of consumption.

By reclassifying consumption as a mode of artistic creation, France's early twentieth-century market economy transformed the meaning of stylistic modes of production that had formally defined social and class boundaries within French society. As furniture became increasingly standardized, taste could now be bought and sold, style no longer an absolute sign of one's wealth and sophistication. By the turn of the century, many critics began to worry that new modes of consumption, production and display, were corrupting the celebrated legacy of the French decorative arts. In her 1913 book of etiquette, Adrienne Cambry lamented the adulteration of ancien régime high culture by the French masses: "Today, the display of false and imitation [furniture] has given the modest households the ambition of elegance and the vanity of appearances. This failing would be moving, if it did not damage the most serious of interests, for on the one hand it exaggerates coquetry and on the other leads to extravagant spending."95

Yet if, for example, ready to wear clothing revolutionized French fashion, effectively rendering certain signs of class illegible, the modern economy of taste and domestic consumption presented an altogether different story. Even though the furniture bought and sold within working class shops and open-air markets in Paris typically reproduced the historicist pastiche of ancien régime furniture popular

93 Cécile Sorel, Cécile Sorel, 100.
94 Tiersten, Marianne in the Market, 7.
95 Adrienne Cambry, Fiancailles et fiançés, 122, quoted in Auslander, Taste and Power, 219.
amongst a wealthy bourgeoisie, the working class interior itself came into representation differently than did its bourgeois counterpart. Just as the working and artisanal classes were largely excluded from the new spaces of consumption that spread within Paris' new market economy, they too were deliberately isolated from contemporary (bourgeois) discourses on taste and style. Unlike the bourgeois interior, which entered representation through a language of poetic individualism, a contemporary discourse of the working class interior mobilized around issues of public health and social morality.

By the middle of the nineteenth-century, the working class interior became the focus of an expanding field of knowledge generated within a developing public health discipline. Second Empire municipal improvement schemes developed partially along these lines: slum clearance disguised as urban modernization. Because it allowed the State to take possession of large tracts of land at a time, municipal redevelopment also provided a relatively cheap and effective way of demolishing large sections of working class housing. Significantly, these demolitions focused not only on districts most affected by communicable diseases like cholera, but also sites thought to be centres of political unrest. As Leon Faucher declared on the eve of construction on the Rue Rivoli, "The interest of public order, not less than those of salubrity, demand that a wide swathe be cut as soon as possible across the district of barricades."97

Public health officials concerned with the spread of transmittable disease within Paris knew that redevelopment and demolition could only be effective in conjunction with municipal policies directed at the salubrity of existing dwellings. Against continual outbreak of cholera within the city, the Prefecture of Police issued an "Ordonnance concernant la salubrité des habitations" in 1853:

It would not be enough to have established, at great expense, a vast system of sewers and water distribution for the cleansing of streets; to have, by creating numerous new streets, eased the circulation of air in the various quarters of town, if similar measures, no less important for public health, were not extended to every house, and more particularly to those occupied by the working class.98

Within the Parisian municipal government, the responsibility of investigating the public health of individual working class dwellings remained within the Commissions des Logement Insalubres established in every arrondissement. Despite the fact that existing tenant and landlord rights severely limited its

96 Auslander, Taste and Power, 219.
97 Quoted in Sutcliffe, The Autumn of Central Paris, 35.
98 Quoted in Bullock and Read, The Movement for Housing Reform, 343.
ability to inspect private property, these Commissions still investigated over thirty thousand private dwellings throughout the length of the Second Empire.99

By the beginning of the Third Republic, continual improvements to the Paris municipal infrastructure helped dramatically decrease rates of death by infectious disease. Yet against the steady decline in outbreaks of diseases like cholera and typhoid fever, rates of death caused by respiratory infections including tuberculosis continued to rise sharply — from 11,023 cases in 1880 to 12,376 in 1894.100 As rates of tuberculosis rose to epidemic proportions, a Third republic municipal government again turned to the salubrity of Paris' working class dwellings.

Under the Third Republic, municipal authority for investigating the health conditions of individual dwellings shifted from the older Commissions des Logement Insalubres, to a newly established Bureau de l'Assainissement de l'Habitation. Taking advantage of new financial resources, the Bureau developed the Casier Sanitaire, a comprehensive registry of dwellings within Paris where a death had occurred from a transmittable disease.101 Within this registry, each dwelling was given an individual file, used to record its any changes to its structural or sanitary conditions. Operated by only ten employees, the Casier Sanitaire eventually investigated 79,982 working class residences over a ten-year period. A 1907 report from the commission set out the term of its work:

Before declaring war on unhealthy dwellings, it is important to know with certainty each of the causes of unhealthiness, to know on which illness these causes have direct repercussions, in order to make the remedy suitable to the evil it must combat... One can say that each house is followed day by day, and that it possesses its own sanitary journal.102

Initially completed in 1900, the Casier Sanitaire helped map the spread of tuberculosis throughout the city; eventually pinpointing six tubercular zones spread mostly amongst the remaining working class neighborhoods in central Paris. For health officials, this remained valuable data, as new stages of slum clearance begun again in earnest in 1909 after a small, yet significant portion of a 900 million franc municipal spending loan was allocated to housing demolition.

By the turn of the century, the work of state funded organization like the Casier Sanitaire was mirrored by an expanding popular and pseudo-scientific literature on public health and lower-class
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housing. This discourse was chiefly disseminated through a growing network of private housing societies and public health associations. Yet while they often responded to the real need for adequate low income housing in wake of the wide spread gentrification of the last half of the nineteenth-century, these private associations became increasingly concerned with the systematic documentation of the social and moral conditions of dwellings within Paris' working class neighborhoods.

A survey of working class interiors produced in 1912 under the title *Une enquête sur le logement des familles nombreuses à Paris* offers a fairly typical example.103 Funded by L'Amélioration du Logement Ouvrier, this ten-year survey used comprehensive statistical information to describe the poor conditions and overcrowding of working class spaces throughout Paris and its outskirts. Like the State studies it mimics, this information was compiled within standardized forms used to document the conditions of individual residential spaces (Plate 19). Here, the exact address of each dwelling is carefully recorded, along with its rent, overall dimensions, and details of its condition (number of windows and beds, odor, humidity, etc). These forms also document the age, gender, profession, salary, and health of each inhabitant within a given dwelling. Within the text, numerous descriptions of individual interiors flesh out this raw data:

Nous voyons ici un nettoyeur de carreaux qui habite avec sa femme et ses cinq enfants un chambre meublée, louée 8 francs la semaine; c'est à grand peine qu'ils ont pu trouver à s'y loger. L'unique fenêtre donne sur une petite cour sombre qui sert de dépotoir à toutes les immondices de la maison. L'ouverture de la fosse d'aisance se trouve à proximité du logement et laisse filtrer des gaz méphitiques. La chambre est très sombre, il y faut de la lumière en plein jour.104

The visibility of working class interiors was built into the late nineteenth century discourse of public health that emerged around alongside the tuberculosis epidemic which swept the low-income neighborhoods of Paris. By the turn of the century, public health officials isolated the cause of disease to the conditions of urban housing: residential overcrowding, poor air circulation, and inadequate direct sunlight. Within a broad medical community, efforts had already been made to quantify these connections. Studies charted, for example, the deaths from tuberculosis by arrondissements against the number of doors and windows for every inhabitant (Plate 20). With this statistical information in hand, an international community of architects was deployed to design appropriate housing for a growing working class public. In 1905, Austine Rey, an architect for La Foundation Rothschild housing society,

presented a set of such plans to an international congress on tuberculosis held in Paris. In a plate entitled “La tuberculose dans la chambre habitée,” a cross section reveals the familial home of a respectable working class mother, as rays of sunlight penetrate every corner of the space (Plate 21).

Between 1899 and 1913, Atget produced a photographic series documenting slums on the outskirts of Paris. Contained within the Zoniers. Vues et types de la zone militaire de Paris, this album series recorded on the refuse and decay of a modern Parisian poverty. Atget’s photographs focus on the shacks of rag pickers, yet here we see only their exteriors, watched over, cautiously, by the slum’s own inhabitants (Plate 22, negative number 351).

Poverty like that which fills Atget’s Zoniers album series is notably absent from the Intérieurs parisiens photographs. These spaces were probably outside the scope of the artistiques, pittoresques et bourgeois that qualifies the title of Atget’s Intérieurs albums. Yet, Atget’s Intérieurs series does represent the several working class interiors (negative numbers 711, 740-742 and 743-744). As Nesbit points out, within the album editions of Atget’s series, these photographs establish visual comparisons between wealth and poverty. Yet what is surprising about these juxtapositions is not only the contrasts in class they suggest, but also the fact that they bring together representations typically isolated within the different discursive spaces of public health and bourgeois consumption. Here, neither the bourgeois home, nor its working class counterpart remains isolated within a single field of knowledge. Rather, they emerge, radically, from the same textual site of representation.

---

105 On the Zoniers. Vues et types de la zone militaire de Paris, see Nesbit, Atget’s Seven Albums, 165-175.
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CHAPTER THREE:
READING ATGET'S Intérieurs parisiens

The text is indeed the creator's (and hence society's) right of inspection over the image: anchorage is a control, bearing a responsibility — in the face of the projective power of pictures — for the use of the message. With respect to the liberty of the signifieds of the image, the text has thus a repressive value and we can see that it is at this level that the morality and ideology of a society are above all invested. 107


Amongst the pages of Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens, my eyes begin to drift to the margins — to their lower edges, and the fluid script of Atget’s handwritten captions. The descriptions are almost painfully brief, yet these texts still yield valuable (mis)information. Within the gap between word and image, Atget situates each of his Intérieurs photographs within a larger organizational scheme. Amongst the absence saturating the Intérieurs parisiens, these captions remain a declaration of presence. They claim to order Atget’s album through a network of exchanges between lived space and personal identity; that is, they invite the viewer to read space as portraiture.

Within Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens, clues take the form of single capital letters: the lead initial (apparently) of each resident’s surname. This is a format that mimics a convention common within the expanding popular discourses on taste and interior decoration that developed within Paris over the decades surrounding the turn of the twentieth-century. 108 In the journal Le Figaro-modes (A la ville. Au Théâtre. Arts décorative), for example, the feature, “Le Mode et le goût dans la décoration des intérieurs,” regularly used pseudonyms when describing the interiors of bourgeois women of French society. The editorial text for “Le Mode et le goût” was typically handled by Léon Roger-Milès, who, at the time, wrote extensively not only on the contemporary decorative arts, but also on the entire history of the French fine arts. 109 In an issue of Le Figaro-modes published in the summer of 1903, Roger-Milès describes the interior of the apartment of “Madame F.”: “The way in which the room is arranged... creates a particularly intense sensation... a century — and more — is recreated, piece by piece, in the

108 See, for example, Henri de Noussanne’s description of the interior of “la Belle Mme de Z” (Noussanne, Le Goût dans l’ameublement, 8), and a discussion of the apartment of “Mlle X” in the journal Le Moniteur de l’ameublement (July 1868, 180). A similar convention was frequently used within contemporary auction catalogues, like those produced at the Galerie Georges Petit.
109 See, for example, Léon Roger-Milès, Corot (Paris: Librarie de l’art, 1891); and the preface to Catalogue de trois tableaux, portraits par J.-L. David (Paris: 1905).
form of precious furnishings, [in] hand picked objets d’art, in chairs upholstered in silk, in rare porcelains, [and] congenial portraits." A few pages prior to this text, *Le Figaro-modes* includes a full-page reproduction of the space, captioned, discreetly, "PETIT SALON DE Mme F..." (*Plate 23*). Another example: also from Roger-Milès' "Le Mode et le goût." Here, the text praises the bourgeois salon of "Madame B," applauding the restraint of its modern décor, and its use of old French master paintings. The lead page of Roger-Milès' editorial is again accompanied by a photograph, this time captioned "PETIT SALON DE Mme B..." (*Plate 24*). Here, spread across the salon walls, lushly gilded frames encase tasteful landscapes — incontestable signs of Madame B's bourgeois status.

Within the textual space of popular literature on interior decorating, the use of pseudonyms was intended, ostensibly, to protect the identity of the resident. Yet through this practice, identity remains neither completely intangible, nor wholly articulated. In this in-between space, the resident's identity, legible only as a single letter, function as a complex cipher within a broader late nineteenth-century discourse of taste, display and bourgeois consumption. This convention authenticates the "reality" of these residential spaces, and thus the concrete connection between the represented interior and a distinct identity. Simultaneously though, it effaces the agency of the individual maîtresse de maison, whose personal taste can now be possessed by the viewer/reader.

This construction worked only in conjunction within the consumer's own ability to distinguish the individual commodities depicted within these representations — that is, it operated through their connaissance of a history of French style. By the turn of the twentieth-century, an extensive apparatus was in place to build this knowledge amongst a Parisian bourgeois public. Texts like Roger-Milès's own treatise, *Comment discerner les styles du VIIe au XIXe siècle, études pratiques sur les formes et les décors propres à en déterminer les caractères*, were designed to nourish the familiarity of French decorative styles needed to operate within the modern marketplace. As Molly Nesbit explains, this literature specifically relied on the use of visual representations, including photographic images, to establish visual comparisons between different historical styles:

---


The definition of style solidified in the act of comparison, particularly as one moved from page to page, matching one style to another. For example, the stern qualities of Louis XIII, with rusticated entrances and solidly rectilinear panels, were read against other styles, like that of Louis XV, where decisive lines were disguised in arabesques encrusted with rocaille, scrollwork, and gilt.¹¹³

Atget’s commercial practice developed partially within the limits of this discourse of ancien regime styles. Within his L’Art dans le Vieux Paris numerical series, Atget documented dozens of ancien regime interiors, photographs similar to those that filled his small series on l’hôtel Matignon on the Rue de Varenne (Plate 25). These spaces represented the pinnacle of French craftsmanship and haute design — a sumptuous and gilded analogue to the contemporary domestic spaces that fill the Intérieurs parisiens series. In Atget’s photographs, Vieux Paris interiors are marked by their vacuity. With their formal tone and slip-covered furniture, these interiors seem frozen in moments of stasis — mourning their past history and awaiting their future use.

Atget’s Vieux Paris interior photographs preserved the style of an entire history of French decorative arts. These documents were a useful resource for a broad range of Atget’s private sector clientele, where the ancien régime styles they documented became references for the design and manufacture of contemporary furniture and decorative architecture. Atget’s own répertoire hints at how crucial this market was within his broader practice, listing well over one hundred individual clients spread over more than a dozen of specialized fields, from professional décorateurs and tapissiers to individual manufacturers and artisans.¹¹⁴

Atget’s ancien régime interior photographs also circulated within a number of State operated archives that emerged alongside Paris’ developing decorative arts industry. Atget’s largest institutional client was the Union centrale des arts décoratifs, to which he sold over seventeen hundred individual photographs.¹¹⁵ Founded in 1882, the Union centrale served as an intermediary between the French State and private manufacturers, taste critics and local artisans — sponsoring public lectures, holding regular exhibitions and providing funding for a library and museum dedicated to the decorative arts.¹¹⁶ In this capacity, it operated within an interconnected network of State and municipal organization that oversaw

¹¹³ Nesbit, Atget’s Seven Albums, 47.
¹¹⁴ On Atget’s connection to this market, see Nesbit, “The Building Industry,” in Atget’s Seven Albums, 46-61. For a list of Atget’s clients within the building industry, see Nesbit, Atget’s Seven Albums, Appendix 3: Atget’s Clients, by Profession, 271-284.
¹¹⁵ Nesbit, Atget’s Seven Albums, 50.
¹¹⁶ On the Union centrale des arts décoratifs, see Auslander, Taste and Power, 356-359.
the commercial production and national consumption of the decorative artists, including the Comité Français des Expositions à l’Etranger (founded 1886, under state control in 1904), the Société d’Encouragement à l’Art et à l’Industrie (founded 1889, under state control 1905), and the Ecole Boulle (founded 1886). At the Union Central, Atget’s photographs circulated at the Bibliothèque des arts décoratifs, where they would have been filed individually within larger folio-volumes according to subject matter. Located within the Louvre, the library at the Union centrale was frequented by professionals, including painters, architects, and decorators, as well as amateur connoisseurs and men and women of society. To this broad audience, Atget’s documents would have provided valuable reference for both the production and consumption of domestic objects — forming, as Molly Nesbit suggests, a tangible archive of ancien régime style.

Within institutional spaces like the Union centrale, photographs of Vieux Paris interiors would have circulated amongst a broad range of other visual representations, including photographic documentation of the application of ancien régime styles within contemporary French domestic spaces. Like the images reproduced within “Le Mode et le goût” in Le Figaro-modes, these contemporary photographs usually depicted lushly furnished, but uninhabited residential interiors. As within popular journals on the decorative arts, these photographs almost always operated in dialogue with the text that accompanied them. As in Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens, captions often use single letter pseudonyms to disguise the identity of each resident and typically included the street address of the interior. Both popular and academic photographs of contemporary domestic interiors would also almost always be accompanied by text indicating the period style of the objects depicted within the scene. This text, notably absent within Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens, frames the depicted interior spaces specifically within the space of late nineteenth-century consumer economy.

---

117 On the luxury industry and the French State, see Greenhalgh, “The Struggles within French Furniture;” and Leora Auslander “After the Culture of Production: The Paradox of Labor and Citizenship,” in Taste and Power, 351-376. As Nesbit points out, the Ecole Boulle, which oversaw the training of apprentices in the woodworking trade, also purchased a number of photographs from Atget from 1902 to 1910 (Nesbit, Atget’s Seven Albums, 51).

118 Auslander explains: "In 1906 the library was heavily frequented and charged no admission... One-third [of its patrons] gave no profession and were understood by the library to be 'young society ladies, connoisseurs, dilettantes, and unknown.' Of those who gave their occupation, there were over 5,000 painters, 3,000 architects, 2,000 sculptors, 1,000 decorators, nearly 400 jewelers, 350 teachers, 178 engravers, and only 44 ébénistes" (Auslander, Taste and Power, 358).
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120 Musée Carnavalet, Eugène Atget Intérieurs parisiens, 99. If the resident was well known within Parisian society, their name might be included within photographic captions, and they often appeared within the photograph itself. See, for example, photographs of Cécile Sorel’s interior from Je sais tout (Plate 15).
In his “Short History of Photography” published in 1931, Walter Benjamin speaks of the photographic caption’s ability to “turn all the relations of life into literature.” Amongst a body of text, a photograph can yield the clarity of narrative. Within a modern consumer society, Roland Barthes argues that a photograph’s “linguistic message” functions as an “anchor” for the photographic referent, containing its meaning within a selective field of knowledge. In “Rhetoric of the Image,” Barthes writes:

All images are polysemous; they imply, underlying their signifiers, a ‘floating chain’ of signifieds, the reader able to choose some and ignore others. Polysemy poses a question of meaning and this question always comes through as a dysfunction… Hence in every society various techniques are developed intended to fix the floating chain of signifieds in such a way as to counter the terror of uncertain signs; the linguistic message is one these techniques. At the level of the literal message, the text replies — in more or less direct, more or less partial manner — to the question: what is it? The text helps to identify purely and simply the elements of the scene and the scene itself.

Within Barthes’ construction of the linguistic message, text can not only tells us what to see, but also how to see it. Like a magnifying glass, it isolates certain signs while reducing others to a visual and discursive periphery.

Within photographic representations of domestic interiors, historical style, defined within textual captions, allows the objects within a unified scene to become legible as isolated commodities. This legibility was encouraged by the visual representations of individual items of furniture that circulated beside photographic images of fully decorated spaces. Common within both private and institutional decorative arts archives, these (often illustrative) representations mobilize a highly schematic visual language, typically isolating individual objects against a neutral, white background. In the absence of a visually unified domestic space, objects become pure commodity (Plate 26). Indeed this was an aesthetic mimicked within contemporary advertisements for furniture and other domestic goods (Plate 27). In both cases, text again defines the style of objects depicted. This allows a loose pastiche of historicist styles to become readable as a unified stylistic mode. Once mapped within the progression of a history of the French decorative arts, these objects can operate fully within the contemporary discourses of taste and style that defined objects in relationship to concretized social and bodily identities. The process is circular, and highly restrictive.

---

The photographs filling Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens* series would have operated in dialogue with this diverse array of visual representations. Yet against the legibility of these contemporary images, I remain constantly surprised by the complex ambiguity of Atget's photographs. While difficult to isolate, I want to argue that this imperspicuity operates through both the visual and textual language that structures Atget's series.

Throughout the *Intérieurs parisiens* albums, Atget's captions situate the excessive visual detail of his photographs within particular, socio-political contexts. Through a dialogue between textual narrative and visual representation, isolated photographs begin to emerge from within a wider network — as separate rooms become not only segments of unified interior spaces, but also layers within the socio-economic strata of turn of the century Paris. Within the bound editions his *Intérieurs* album, these captions chart a loose social hierarchy, legible, at least initially, within the diverse métiers scrawled below each print.

At first glance, the breakdown looks all too clear. Twenty-five of Atget's photographs appear to document solidly bourgeois apartments: Mr M, financier (negative numbers 746-751); Mr F, négociant (763-767, 710, 774); Mr A, industriel (768-771), Cécile Sorel, sociétaire de la Comédie-Française (752-759). Seven represent the interiors of two workers (negative numbers 711, 740-742 and 743-744). Twenty-eight depict what seem to be petit bourgeois residences: Mr R, artiste dramatique (negative numbers 690-691, 734, 772-773; an employé aux magasins du Louvre (721-723, 725); Mme C, modiste (735-739); Mr C, décorateur appartements (729-733, 745); Mr B, collectionneur (760-762); Mme D, petite rentière (707-709, 726-728). These classifications are reinforced by the street addresses included within Atget's captions — precious information that locates visually isolated interior spaces within the regional typography of Paris, immediately evoking a loaded set of cultural and economic subtexts reified under Second Empire and Third Republic municipal development.

Within the *Intérieurs parisiens* photographs, an array of domestic goods confirms the class hierarchy suggested within Atget's captions. As Molly Nesbit argues, this process functions partially through the juxtaposition of objects both within and between each interior: "By demonstrating the contrasts between the rooms housing modern life and then writing the métier and profession into the captions, Atget points... to the real economy of style. The album gives an object lesson in the owning
and non-owning classes." Amongst these belongings, signs of class pervade, as style and quality expose to the economic and social value of objects, and an individual's ability to possess them. Yet this clarity of this hierarchy breaks down upon a closer investigation of the photographs themselves. If Atget's captions support a series of juxtapositions between the Parisian different interiors, they also initiate an open-ended search for congruency and overlap.

Within the eclectic décor of Monsieur M's champs de Mars interior, a Louis XVI-style table forms the center of a cluster of chairs (Plate 9, negative number 747). The piece is obviously finely crafted — its legs delicately carved, and its white surface brilliantly white. Yet, within the *Intérieurs parisiens* the table is not one of a kind. It has a double across town, located within the Montparnasse apartment of Monsieur C, apartment decorator (Plate 28, negative number 745). Another intersection. Above Monsieur C's overstuffed settee, a reproduction of Chardin's *L'Enfant au toton* crowns a larger cluster of framed prints (Plate 29, negative number 730). Within Atget's *Intérieurs* albums, Chardin's *L'Enfant* appears again, in a photograph just two pages prior. Here the interior is Monsieur A's, *industriel* (Plate 30, negative number 771). Again, the overlap occurs between the relative modesty of Monsieur C's petit bourgeois interior and its bourgeois counterpart. Within Atget's series, these hidden congruencies become compelling fissures, evoking the new fragility of reified signs of class within a new modern consumer economy saturated within increasingly standardized goods.

Other gaps remain within Atget's captions themselves. Unlike the typeset text that accompanies contemporary photographic and illustrative representations of domestic interiors — which operate through the positivist language of objectified knowledge — the *Intérieurs parisiens* inscribed captions remain both provisional and highly irregular. The script is uniquely Atget's own — idiosyncratic, but not overly affected. Written in place of a proper artist's signature, this text retains the charming impermanence of a handwritten note.

---

123 Nesbit, "Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens*, the point of difference," 16. On the contrast between the furniture within the working class, petit bourgeois and bourgeois interiors within Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens*, see also Auslander, *Taste and Power*, 268-271.

124 A closer look does reveal slight differences (the table in negative number 745 is on wheels unlike the one in number 747 is not), but upon the hazy surface of the Atget's prints, these inconsistencies are fairly imperceptible.

125 The Louvre purchased Chardin's *L'Enfant au toton*, and its pendant *Le jeune Homme au violon*, as recently as 1907, sparking a renewed popular and academic interest in the painter's work (Musée Carnavalet, *Intérieurs parisiens Eugène Atget*, 105-106).
Although Atget’s captions follow a stand format, there are innumerable deviations. In his photographs of Cécile Sorel’s interior (negative numbers 752-759), the actress’ name and address are provided in full, perhaps because of her wealth and notoriety within Parisian society. The interior of an employee of the Magasin du Louvre (negative numbers 721-723 and 724), and the interiors of two workers living on the rue de Romainville and the Rue Belleville (negative numbers 711 and 740-744), remain completely unnamed. Atget’s photographs of two kitchens (negative numbers 710 and 774) appear without an indication of the resident’s name or métier. These exceptions establish a hierarchy between the named and unnamed, one that operates alongside the class stratification of the Intérieurs parisiens’ diverse métiers.

A comparison between the different editions of Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens turn up other irregularities. All of the photographs within the Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris’ copy of the Intérieurs parisiens are dated “1910,” information completely absent within the other two editions of the series. Two of Atget’s photographs of his own interior (negative numbers 772 and 773), labeled “Intérieur de Mr R. Artist dramatic Rue Vavin” in the editions of the series at the Bibliothèque historique and the Bibliothèque Nationale, are labeled “Intérieur de Mr B. Collectionneur Rue de Vaugirard” in the Intérieurs album at the Musée Carnavalet. Other, minor inconsistencies emerge alongside these more dramatic moments. Spread throughout Atget’s albums, these are discrepancies in punctuation, in capitalization and in spelling. At first barely visible, a closer look reveals countless cases.

Atget does little to hide the irregularities that pervade the Intérieurs parisiens’ textual narrative. Traces of Atget’s own relationship to his work, their particularity resists the instrumentality of the archive — suggesting Atget’s unwillingness to subject his photographic collection to the closure provided by a proper organizational structure. Within his photographs, these become tiny moments of slippage, puncturing the unified continuity of his photographic series on an almost imperceptible level. The

---

126 For reference to the variations in Atget’s captions, see Appendix B.
127 One of these photographs (negative number 710) is now though to possibly be of Atget’s own apartment, because of the proximity of its negative number to another photograph within the series identified as that of Atget’s washstand (negative number 709) (Musee Carnavalet, Un album de musée Carnavalet, 104).
128 Two other photographs of Atget’s interior (negative numbers 690, 691 and 734), labeled “Mr R.” in the editions of the series at the Bibliothèque historique and the Bibliothèque Nationale, remain completely unnamed in the Intérieurs album at the Musée Carnavalet. A slightly different, but equally intriguing slippage: An individual print of negative number 750, labeled “Intérieur de Mr M Financier Avenue Élisée Reclus champs de Mars 1910” within the Bibliothèque nationale’s copy of the Intérieurs parisiens, appears within the MOMA’s Abbott Levy Collection labeled, “Intérieur Monot.” Nesbit suggests that the photograph probably represents the apartment of René Charles Monod, industriel, 33 avenue Élisée Reclus (Nesbit, “Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens,” 16).
129 Importantly, these are inconsistencies that are largely eradicated from late twentieth-century reproductions of Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens photographs.
destabilization of meaning effected by the idiosyncrasies of the *Intérieurs parisiens*’ captions is further emphasized by the visual language of Atget’s photographs themselves.

Within his *Intérieurs parisiens*, Atget’s camera creates a meticulous, almost obsessive catalogue of the fabric, furniture, and nick-knacks that quietly populate otherwise empty rooms. Lining walls and overflowing tabletops, these objects form a surplus of captivating banality, seemingly saturated with valuable evidence. Here, traces linger, trapped within worn textures, and misplaced processions. Amongst Atget’s photographic series, these marks multiply exponentially.

In the apartment of Madame D, *petite rentière*, a pair of scissors rests besides a pile of books carelessly left on a table (*Plate 31*, negative number 726). A closer look reveals still more remains—a barely visible bottle at the photograph’s right margin, and an unused pot perched awkwardly atop a Louis XVI buffet. Through the hallway, a wooden stand cradles three umbrellas, and the morning’s newspaper. Atget photographs the same room from the opposite angle (*Plate 32*, negative number 726). Here, a weeks worth of papers lay in a pile in the corner, beside a chair draped in white fabric. Another print. The interior of Monsieur A, *industriel* (*Plate 33*, negative number 769). Beside the clean lines of an Empire-style hutch, a rolled up poster takes up space. It is a sign of clutter within an otherwise tidy room. The top of a dining table reveals only basket of potatoes, and metal teakettle. A flip of the album’s page, and the kettle now has been places awkwardly below a small table (*Plate 30*, negative number 771). Upon its glowing white surface, a jewelry box spills its contents from an open drawer.

In his unfinished *Passagen-Werk*, Walter Benjamin describes the relationship between bodies and domestic space as a symbiosis, between a shell and its inhabitant:

The nineteenth century, like no other century, was addicted to dwelling. It conceived the residence as a receptacle of for the person, and it incased him with all his appurtenances so deeply within the dwelling’s interior that one might be reminded of the inside of a compass case, where the instrument with all its accessories lies embedded in deep, usually violet folds of velvet.\(^{130}\)

As shell, the dwelling offers protection to its occupant. Yet at its extreme, it threatens to encase her. Within the domestic interior, material objects form the body of this shell. Their surface “bears the impression” of its resident, becoming a coded external sign of an interior identity, thus negating the privacy the domestic space claims to provide.

On Atget's *Intérieurs parisiens* series, poet and architectural critic Lisa Robertson writes:

Yet by "furnishing," we mean something additional to the customary moblia – bed, shelf, curtain, and so on. We mean also the way a room and a person compose an image of time, through a process of mutual accretion, exchange, application, erasure, renovation, and decay. By "furnishing" we also mean surfaces as they index and influence our wandering transit. Furniture, or composed surface, is transitive. It is structure for touch or approach. Its economy shows reception become form. It figures time as the bending and extension and rest of bodies. This is a room. It archives touch.

Through direct physical contact between bodies and objects, a history is inscribed into a residence, protected within the banal clutter that fills a room. Amongst its surfaces, the daily movement of bodies remains encoded within incidental details.

*Atget Intérieurs parisiens* present an inventory of these scars. It is as if the long exposure of his photographs allows the surface of his plates to become saturated with the fragmented details of human existence. Within the album editions of his series, these details emerge in excess through the very nature of the photographic archive. These are traces of life that remain noticeably absent within the photographs of domestic interiors that circulated within contemporary discourses of taste and consumption. Amongst these prints, a resident's impression on their domestic space is eradicated. With surfaces wiped clean, these spaces remain docile and unified. Visually, they take on the appearance of the department store — where goods, assembled to suggest the comforts of home, become pure commodities yet to be marked by a history of bodies (Plate 34).

Amongst these details, am reminded again of *Atget, photographe de Paris*, the Wehye Gallery monograph with which I began. When it was first published in 1930, this volume appeared with a preface written by French poet and novelist Pierre Mac Orlan. In this text, Mac Orlan writes, “the photographic art is an art of submission. Life prescribes its own projects, and sometimes its hypotheses as well. The lens takes its own revenge by revealing, by uncovering, what even the most skillful and sensitive observer does not always see, precisely because of his own two eyes.”

Within photography, Mac Orlan located what he called the “social fantastic” — a momentary glimpse of the social relation of bodies within

---

moment of history made possible through the camera's power to "create death for a second."\textsuperscript{134}

Yet within Atget's \textit{Intérieurs parisiens}, fragmented details speak as much to the clarity of a "social fantastic," as they do to the rupture of punctum. For Barthes, punctum is a way of conceptualizing a personal relationship to a photograph. It is the "detail that wounds," piercing the otherwise unitary space of photography.\textsuperscript{135} Triggered through the individual act of viewing (or remembering), punctum occurs beyond the space of representation, or rather, suggests the limits of representation.\textsuperscript{136}

Atget's photographs quietly inhabit the aphasic space of punctum. Their surfaces reward close looking, but they know not to give up too much. Here, details refuse a move from the specific to the abstract. There is a blockage, as we are forced to gaze upon the specificities of lived experience, outside of legibility of a concrete heuristic. At these limits of photographic knowledge, I turn again to the margins of Atget's images — this time, to the network of hallways that form between otherwise isolated rooms. As he photographs, Atget is careful to leave doors open. It becomes these transitory spaces that draw my eye. Against the claustrophobia of fragmented details, I turn toward these spatial gaps — as if, in their poorly illuminated depths, I might catch a glimpse of the residents whose identities remains just beyond my reach, knowing that I will not.

\textsuperscript{135} Barthes, \textit{Camera Lucida}, 42.
\textsuperscript{136} Barthes, \textit{Camera Lucida}, 59.
APPENDIX A:
Sales of the Intérieurs parisiens

July 1910: Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris, sold as loose, unbound photographs.


January 16, 1911: Bibliothèque Nationale, 210 francs, sold as hard, leather bound, filed as “Intérieurs parisiens 1910.”

APPENDIX B:
List of Plates within the Intérieurs parisiens, with Variations in Captions

The following is a list of plates and captions for extant copies of Eugène Atget’s Intérieurs parisiens. I have attempted to retain all variations in the punctuation, capitalization, and spelling variations in Atget’s original handwritten captions whenever possible. Negative numbers correspond to those inscribed into glass negative plates. Holding institutions are indicated in italics.

Sources: The Musée Carnavalet and Bibliothèque historique de la Ville de Paris captions have been taken from Musée Carnavalet, Eugène Atget Intérieurs parisiens, Un album du musée Carnavalet, 93-112. The Bibliothèque Nationale captions have been taken from Molly Nesbit, Atget’s Seven Albums; Appendix 1 and have been verified against the prints available online through the Bibliothèque Nationale, Gallica notice #FRBNF38496548.

(1) Negative Number 690
Musée Carnavalet: Petit Intérieur Artiste Dramatique Rue Vavin
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr R. artiste Dramatique, Rue Vavin 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Petit Intérieur d’un artiste Dramatique Mr R. Rue Vavin

(2) Negative Number 691
Musée Carnavalet: Petit Intérieur Artiste Dramatique Rue Vavin
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr R., artiste Dramatique, Rue Vavin 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Petit Intérieur d’un artiste Dramatique — Mr R. Rue Vavin

(3) Negative Number 734
Musée Carnavalet: Petit Intérieur Artiste Dramatique Rue Vavin
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr R. artiste dramatique, Rue Vavin 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Petit Intérieur d’un artiste Dramatique — Mr R. Rue Vavin

(4) Negative Number 707
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mme D Petite rentière Bd du Port Royal
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mme D. Rentière, Bd du Port Royal 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mme D, Petite rentière, Boulevard du Port Royal

(5) Negative Number 708
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mme D Petite rentière Bd du Port Royal
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mme D. Rentière, Bd du Port-Royal 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mme D, Petite rentière, Boulevard du Port Royal
(19) Negative Number 746
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Monsieur M, Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus (champs de Mars)

(20) Negative Number 747
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Monsieur M, Financier, avenue Élisée Reclus, (champs de Mars)

(21) Negative Number 748
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Monsieur M, Financier, avenue Élisée Reclus, (champs de Mars)

(22) Negative Number 749
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr M — Financier — Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Monsieur M, Financier, avenue Élisée Reclus, (champs de Mars)

(23) Negative Number 750
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr M Financier Avenue Élisée Reclus champs de Mars
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr M Financier Avenue Élisée Reclus champs de Mars 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Monsieur M, Financier, avenue Élisée Reclus Cabinet de toilette (champs de Mars)

(24) Negative Number 751
Musée Carnavalet: Cabinet de travail de Mr M Financier Avenue Élisée Reclus champs de Mars
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr M Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, champs de Mars 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Monsieur M, Financier avenue Élisée Reclus (champs de Mars)

(25) Negative Number 711
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur D’un Ouvrier Rue de Romainville
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur D’un Ouvrier Rue de Romainville 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur d’un Ouvrier, Rue de Romainville

(26) Negative Number 740
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur Ouvrier Rue de Romainville
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur d’un Ouvrier, Rue de Romainville — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur, ouvrier Rue de Romainville

(27) Negative Number 741
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur Ouvrier Rue de Romainville
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur d’un Ouvrier, Rue de Romainville — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur Ouvrier, Rue de Romainville

(28) Negative Number 742
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur Ouvrier Rue de Romainville
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur d’un Ouvrier, Rue de Romainville — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur ouvrier, Rue de Romainville

(29) Negative Number 743
Musée Carnavalet: Petite chambre d’une Ouvrière Rue de Belleville
Bibliothèque historique: Chambre d’une ouvrière, Rue de Belleville — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: photograph does not appear in this album

(30) Negative Number 744
Musée Carnavalet: Petite chambre d’une ouvrière Rue de Belleville
Bibliothèque historique: Chambre d’une ouvrière, Rue de Belleville — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: photograph does not appear in this album
(31) Negative Number 763
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr F Agent de change Rue Montaigne
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne, 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne

(32) Negative Number 764
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr F Agent de change Rue Montaigne
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne, 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne

(33) Negative Number 765
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr F Agent de change Rue Montaigne
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne, 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne

(34) Negative Number 766
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr F Agent de change Rue Montaigne l'atelier de Mme Sculpteur amateur
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr F, négociant, Rue Montaigne, Atelier de Mme Sculpteur amateur — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne, Atelier de Madame, Sculpteur amateur

(35) Negative Number 767
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr F Agent de change Rue Montaigne Atelier de Mme Sculpteur amateur
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr F, négociant, Rue Montaigne, l'atelier de Mme Sculpteur amateur — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne, Atelier de Mme Sculpteur amateur

(36) Negative Number 710
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur Rue Montaigne La Cuisine
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur Rue Montaigne La Cuisine 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne La Cuisine

(37) Negative Number 774
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur Rue Montaigne La Cuisine
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur Rue Montaigne La Cuisine 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr F, Négociant, Rue Montaigne La Cuisine

(38) Negative Number 768
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr A, Industriel, Rue Lepic ["A" written over "F"]

(39) Negative Number 769
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr A, Industriel, Rue Lepic

(40) Negative Number 770
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic (Montmartre)
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr A, Industriel, Rue Lepic

(41) Negative Number 771
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic (Montmartre)
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr A Industriel Rue Lepic 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr A, Industriel, Rue Lepic

(42) Negative Number 729
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr C Décorateur Appartements Rue du Montparnasse
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr C, décorateur, Rue du Montparnasse — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr C, Décorateur appartements, Rue du Montparnasse

(43) Negative Number 730
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr C Décorateur Appartements Rue du Montparnasse
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr C, décorateur, Rue du Montparnasse — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr C, Décorateur appartements, Rue du Montparnasse
(44) Negative Number 731
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr C Décorateur Appartements Rue du Montparnasse
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr C, décorateur, Rue du Montparnasse — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr C, Décorateur appartements Rue du Montparnasse

(45) Negative Number 732
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr C Décorateur Appartements Rue du Montparnasse
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr C, décorateur, Rue du Montparnasse — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr C, Décorateur appartements, Rue du Montparnasse

(46) Negative Number 745
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr C Décorateur Appartements Rue du Montparnasse
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr C, décorateur, Rue du Montparnasse — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr C, Décorateur appartements, Rue du Montparnasse

(47) Negative Number 733
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr C Décorateur Appartements Rue du Montparnasse
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr C, décorateur, Rue du Montparnasse — 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr C, Décorateur appartements, Rue du Montparnasse

(48) Negative Number 760
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr B Collectionneur Rue de Vaugirard
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr B, Collectionneur Rue de Vaugirard 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr B, Collectionneur, Rue de Vaugirard

(49) Negative Number 761
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr B Collectionneur Rue de Vaugirard
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr B, Collectionneur Rue de Vaugirard 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr B, Collectionneur, Rue de Vaugirard

(50) Negative Number 762
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mr B Collectionneur Rue de Vaugirard
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mr B, Collectionneur Rue de Vaugirard 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mr B, Collectionneur, Rue de Vaugirard

(51) Negative Number 777
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Elysées

(52) Negative Number 773
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Elysées

(53) Negative Number 752
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Elysées

(54) Negative Number 753
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Elysées

(55) Negative Number 754
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel, de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Elysées

(56) Negative Number 755
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Mlle Sorel, de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Elysées
(57) Negative Number 756  
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée  
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée 1910  
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Melle Sorel, de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Elysées

(58) Negative Number 757  
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée  
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910  
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Melle Sorel, de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Élysées

(59) Negative Number 758  
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée  
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910  
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Melle Sorel, de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Élysées

(60) Negative Number 759  
Musée Carnavalet: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française Avenue des champs Elysée  
Bibliothèque historique: Intérieur de Melle Sorel de la Comédie Française 99 Avenue des champs Elysée 1910  
Bibliothèque Nationale: Intérieur de Melle Sorel, de la Comédie Française, 99 Avenue des champs Élysées
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Plate 7 | Tree lifting machine for transplanting full-grown trees.
PLATE 10 | Eugène Atget, "Intérieur de Monsieur M. Financier, Avenue Élisée Reclus, (champs de Mars)," Intérieurs parisiens, negative number 748. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
PLATE 14 | Two undated carte-de-viste of Cécile Sorel.
PLATE 15 | “Mademoiselle Cécile Sorel chez elle,” Je sais tout,
March 15, 1911: 162.
Famille : R. E.
Adresse : Rue Boulay  N° 23  Arrt : 17°
Date : 2 avril 1911.

COMPOSITION DE LA FAMILLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Gain par an</th>
<th>Santé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Père</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>homme de peine</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>brûlé charnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mère</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>sans profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. garçon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>à l'école</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. fille</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fille</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>anémieé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. garçon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>rachitique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. garçon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. garçon</td>
<td>1 1/2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION GÉNÉRALE DE L'IMMEUBLE

| Est-il vieux ? | Oui. |
| Délabré ?      | Oui, maison mal entretenue, humide, mauvaises odeurs. |
| Est-ce un hôtel meublé ? Non |
| Combien a-t-il d'étages ? deux |

DESCRIPTION DU LOGEMENT

| Quel étage ?    | Rez-de-chaussée. |
| Quelle orientation ? | Nord-Est |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1ère pièce</th>
<th>2ème pièce</th>
<th>3ème pièce</th>
<th>Cabinet sans fenêtre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>long. 3.50</td>
<td>long. 2.50</td>
<td>tandis sans air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Indiquer longueur de pièce, hauteur, superficie)</td>
<td>larg. 3.50</td>
<td>larg. 2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâti cube : 30 m²</td>
<td>Bâti cube : 40 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fenêtres</th>
<th>une assez grande sur la rue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lits</td>
<td>l lit pour les parents, un matelas par lit, leur âge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l lit pour les 2 filles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaulsage</td>
<td>poêle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuisine</td>
<td>dans la chambre principale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humidité</td>
<td>très humide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odeurs</td>
<td>odeur de moisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet d'aisances, communs ou particuliers ? communs avec ou sans chasse d'eau ? sans chasse d'eau.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBSERVATIONS (au verso)

M. Marie-Davy arrive à cette conclusion que la mortalité par tuberculose est d'autant plus élevée que le nombre de portes et fenêtres, dont dispose...
LA TUBERCULOSE
DANS LA
CHAMBRE HABITÉE

ÉTUDE DE M. A. AUGUSTIN REY,
ARCHITECTE DE LA FONDATION ROTHSCHILD.

COUPE DE LA CHAMBRE:

PLAT DE LA CHAMBRE:

TOUTES LES PARTIES DE CETTE CHAMBRE,
PLAFOND-PARois VERTICALES-PLANCHERS,
ONT TOUSSES LEURS SURFACES SANS EXCEPTION
SOUS L'ACTION DIRECTE DE LA LUMIÈRE.

FORMULE SANITAIRE
ÉCLAIRAGE VERTICAL
\( \frac{1}{3} \) DE LA SURFACE DU PLANCHER.

PLATE 21 | Augustin Rey, Le tuberculose dans la chambre habitée, 1905.
PLATE 23 | "PETIT SALON DE Mme F...," Le Figaro-modes, May 15, 1903: 19.
PLATE 24 | "PETIT SALON DE Mme B....," Le Figaro-modes, February 15, 1903: 17.
"Chaises en cuir repoussé; XVIe siècle."

PLATE 27 | Bedroom sets, modèle Louis XVI and modèle renaissance, Maison Krieger, n.d.
PLATE 30 | Eugène Atget, "Intérieur de Mr A. Industriel, Rue Lepic,"
PLATE 33 | Eugène Atget, "Intérieur de Mr A, Industriel, Rue Lepic,"
PLATE 34 | N.D. Roger-Viollet, Furniture department at the Bon Marché, n.d.