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Abstract
Despite a burgeoning literature, the role of bohemians in the urban milieu and in initiatives toward regeneration remains contested. As a first step toward later modeling and application, we present a thoroughgoing literature review, a short commentary on bohemian phenomena, and suggested readings. Since qualitative sources dominate the field, the review is structured rather than fully systematic in the scientific sense. After discarding innumerable irrelevant and incidental papers, three strands remained for subsequent analysis: “bohemian,” “bohemian + creative-city,” and “smart regeneration.” The first is static or historically contextualized, situated best in the humanities. The last two strands are dynamic and dissect, descriptively or analytically, elements of bohemianism relevant to the urban scene. Wherever and whenever they emerge, radical bohemian artists test existing limits or incite transformative action.
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Introduction: Contested Space
Cities have concentrated human capacity since antiquity (Mumford, 1961). The quest for regeneration, whether competitively or ecologically inspired, has occupied many urbanists worldwide, but its nature and mechanisms have not been conclusively established (Randers, 2012). A key figure over the past 15 years in debates among scholars and planning practitioners has been Richard Florida. He has emerged as an advocate for the selective and deliberate enhancement or importation of talent, combined with an emphasis on urban design, in the quest for change. Individual and social capital thus becomes central to the development, or redevelopment, of “creative” urban areas (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988; Scott, 2008; Storper & Scott, 2009). In a variant of the “function determines form” argument, culture has a part to play in conditioning the character and use of space.
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Among the agents relevant to this supply-side position, bohemians have an intriguing and disputed place. Are they truly creative in a modern or postmodern sense? If so, are they intrinsic to, or could they be co-opted into, the capitalist project? While Florida’s (2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2005, 2010) writing has assuredly bolstered urban revival, it has not settled the contribution, if any, of bohemians. Indeed, their role is unlikely to be resolved soon. This is because bohemianism, aside from any contemporary policy aspirations which might involve it, is a substantial field in its own right (Blumenfeld, 1967; Bonanni & Collits, 2004; Jacobs, 1961; Jansson, 2003; Markusen & Schrock, 2006; Mommaas, 2004; Montgomery, 1997; Norton, 2000; Peck, 2005; Pratt, 2008; Rausch & Negrey, 2006; Sorkin, 2009; Vivant, 2010, 2011; Zukin, 1988). In these circumstances, our aims are twofold. The longer-term one, notwithstanding the classificatory endeavor of Nathe (1978), is to counter the ontological uncertainty attending bohemians by construction of new analytic tools. Foreseen is a model of those actors who might actually contribute to urban development or renewal as distinct from just adding background noise. To achieve this outcome, our immediate intent must be to scour the literature for productive leads. This move can circumvent effort easily wasted among a plethora of contributions and simultaneously assist others interested in the phenomenon. We approach these ends by hybridizing the systematic review method of the clinical sciences—an irony immediately evident to any passing bohemian!

Florida regards “bohemians” as people recorded as working in art-related industries. His interpretation could represent a rather simple, statistical approach toward a particular group among the élites said to channel the investment needed for urban regeneration. Arguably, it fails to distinguish between substance and style, or to capture the nuanced complexity distinguishing “innovators” from less productive “diffusers” of new products, services, ways of thinking, or modes of behavior. Focusing no doubt on the latter, Marx (1992, p. 197) dismissed bohemians as “decayed roués of doubtful origin and uncertain means of subsistence” or “ruined and adventurous scions of the bourgeoisie.” They were, at best, a distraction if not complicit in the “vast discriminatory [urban] apparatus” to reinforce the “domination of the strong over the weak” (Benevolo, 1980, p. 786).


Creativity is not something that can be merely imported into the city on the backs of peripatetic computer hackers, skateboarders, gays, and assorted bohemians but must be organically developed through the complex interweaving of relations of production, work, and social life in specific urban contexts. (p. 15)

Kratke (2010) is blunter and dismisses the “creative class” as “dealers” rather than bohemians. Florida’s critics suggest that selective precinct treatments could, via property boosterism, increase rent-seeking and privilege without necessarily providing jobs for ordinary people. Schwarz (2010) dismisses the efficacy of any public disbursements to developers of overlooked central neighborhoods as no more than a stunt. For Schwarz (2010, p. 4), the “sprinkling of light industry and raffish characters” in Greenwich Village or Soho is an ephemeral aberration in the valorization, under continual demographic and capitalist pressure, of central and inner-city areas. “Bellyaching about authenticity and lost soul” (conservation) or “bohemian embellishment” via “stage props and scenery” merely distracts from “productive,” private creativity or meaningful public intervention (Hall, 2000; Scott, 2006; Weber, 1958).

In reality, progressive urban betterment must extend beyond artistic adornment to encompass political, logistic, technical, and community considerations (Hamnett, 2000; Rofe, 2004). Rather than confronting the merit or waste of “Jacobsin fetishism” and “bohemian simulacra” (Schwarz, 2010), many authors prefer to study these more bureaucratic domains. Landry (2000) and Carmona (2009) advocate substantive upgrading of urban form rather than a preoccupation with less tangible
elements which might or might not deliver the social goods. From another angle, Scott (2005) argues that, in complex and evolving urban systems, reconstruction or landscaping is insufficient to spark or spread creativity. A complex mix of factors and policies at different spatial scales is called for, including tolerance, policy to promote “art,” governance, robust institutions, and informed, long-range planning (Evans, 2003, 2009; Scott, 2006). Propping-up or reconstructing consumptive “brunching” establishments or entertainment for the well-heeled literati (aka the “lattélites”) is insufficient, if not misdirected (Sorkin, 2009, p. 141). Sometimes hegemonic, other times paternalistic, such public intervention will alone neither increase competitiveness (Glaeser, 2005; Glaeser, Kolko, & Saiz, 2004) nor lift a self-determined quality of life (Wadley, 2010).

These divergences prompt a need to reappraise in a disciplined manner the literature surrounding bohemians to enable further theorization about their place in regeneration. Our remit is purposely restricted to certain urban spheres. To explain, organizational writing about the impact of multicultural agents on work–place creativity is disregarded; so, too, purely geographical accounts of the Bohemian region of central Europe. With these constraints, we begin by looking at the origin and evolution of bohemianism.

Who Are the Bohemians?

As commonly understood, Bohemians are rebellious, transgressive, or unconventional artists, such as Cezanne, Toulouse Lautrec, or Utrillo living in creative precincts, who came to prominence under the auspices of Victor Hugo in early 19th century Paris (Harper Collins, 1991; Murger, 1846/1964; Nicholson, 2003; Wilson, 2000; Zola, 1885-1886). Renoir’s 1868 portrait, The Bohemian, captures their gypsy or troubadour roots with links to the orient via Czechoslovakia.

Siegel (1986) views bohemia as a “social phenomenon distinguishable from the literary and artistic subculture.” Bohemians need a backdrop of bourgeois luxury, both as a possible source of patronage and to mediate their oppositional identity (Berry, 1994; Haine, 1996). Passionate bohemians are disputative but productive agents who break reactionary religious, cultural, or status taboos with their incendiary ideas or iconoclastic art. Consumptive flâneurs (strollers) in the sense of disengaged bourgeois dilettantes are thus excluded (Featherstone, 1998), as is Baudelaire’s (1863, p. IX) “homme riche, ossif” or dandy. In contrast, bohemians resist surveillance in the urban panopticon (Foucault, 1975), “eat garlic,” and break “the shackles of bourgeois convention” (Bristow, 2009; Nicholson, 2003). Puccini’s 1896 opera, La Bohème, puts on stage the menacing, revolutionary atmosphere surrounding them. Even in poetry, bohemians reject the “empty formalized bore” which pedants endlessly drone their notes and explanations” (Fitzgerald, 1940/1963). Bohemian sedition is democratic, not totalitarian (Gorsuch, 2000); so, despite his love of art, the uniformed Hermann Göring was no bohemian but, rather, a debauche or reprobat.

Bohemian moral, cultural, or intellectual authenticity can be diluted by the “emulative predatory impulse” of conspicuous consumption in an economy that is neither rational nor predictable (Veblen, 1898/1994, p. 120). Nowadays, even in China, stylized bohemian symbols evoke transient fashionable elegance and “trendy” status (Wang, 2005). Thus, what we would call consumptive bohemians have been characterized as degenerates, labeled as “quasi” or “neo” bohemians, or simply, “bobos” (Brooks, 2001; Frisch, 2007; Lloyd, 2002, 2006; Quirk, 2001). In contrast, productive bohemians, socially and sexually unconventional (Sibalis, 2004), might directly spread, indirectly catalyze, or strengthen regenerative urban capacities (Landry & Bianchini, 1995; Simon, 1955). Bohemian artisans and entrepreneurs (now including “nerds” and “geeks”) could act as network “brokers” disseminating new ideas and tacit knowledge across fledgling enterprises (Håkansson, 2005). They could make “small-scale, intangible [and] symbolic” (Currid, 2009, p. 379) contributions to creativity, even outside “edgy” central milieux or those districts considered culturally liberated. Bohemian discourse in cafés and gastronomic oases (Zachary, 2006), for instance, could nourish authenticity and cut Blake’s “mind forged manacles” (Blake, 1998, p. 124; see also
Erdman, 1954). Their destabilizing dialogue provides some democratic assurance and could catalyze innovation or stem the tides of “managerialism,” the conventional, and debilitating strategic drift (Wadley, 2008). Since they could possibly facilitate processes of gentrification or city regeneration, it is this genre of productive, rather than frittering, bohemians that should interest both radical and mainstream students of urban policy and development.

Mixing the humanities and social sciences, this rich but convoluted background calls for scoping and analysis. To these ends, a structured literature review is undertaken.

**Literature Review**

To underpin projected model building, currently available literature on bohemianism and the urban underwent extraction and refinement, scanning and screening, sorting, and analysis for final retention. More than 19,000 references from seven databases were evaluated. Those selected had abstracts including the terms urban and bohemian (adjective) or bohemians (generic art), but not Bohemians (from the particular location) or Bohemia (geographic, as in Czechoslovakia). Also excluded were the following topics: creative cities (too broad), art and culture, gender and homosexuality, urban history (alternative foci), and drugs and health (irrelevant). Signiﬁcant book reviews were incorporated, but not those without an academic pedigree (e.g., simply appearing in a newspaper).

Selected items were assessed at length, but only ones which made an original descriptive or analytical contribution to urban bohemianism were categorized and retained (indicated by an asterisk in the reference list). Results of the first three of the four abovementioned stages of the review appear in the appendix, following an analysis and compte rendu of the role of bohemians in the city.

**Analysis and Compte Rendu**

Bohemia, though potentially elusive and surrounded by mythical domains such as Vagabondia, Licentia, Philistia, and Saevitia (Nathe, 1978), has been noted in various cities around the world. Among them are Montmartre and Montparnesse in Paris; Chelsea, Fitzrovia, and Soho in London; Mitte in Berlin; Schwabing in Munich; Skadarlija in Belgrade; Tabán in Budapest; Cais do Sodré, Mouraria, and Alfama in Lisbon; Greenwich Village in New York; North Beach in San Francisco; Venice and surrounds in Los Angeles (Deener, 2012); Topanga and Tiburon elsewhere in California; Fremantle in Perth; Newtown in Sydney; and Fitzroy in Melbourne, a city which, from 1939 to 1967, produced a journal called Bohemia under the auspices of the all-male, art and literary “Bread and Cheese Club.”

Three themes, found in 29 key sources, emerged from the structured investigation. The first, a purely bohemian one, had a static, humanities or historical flavor and was, in the end, considered useful mainly in offering context and background. More prospective articles combined bohemian and creative city themes or had a clearer focus on “smart regeneration.”

**Bohemian**

The 15 retained “bohemian” papers include books detected via several reviews. For instance, Mary Gluck’s Popular Bohemia (2005) was cited five times, including by Mossman (2008), who provides a central historical reference. Richard Lloyd (2006) is another author on the bohemian circuit whose book develops earlier ethnographic work (Lloyd, 2002, p. 520) to dissect the “finer grained distinctions” in the symbolic local economy of Wicker Park, Chicago. Other prolific observers include Wilson (1998) and Currid (2009) in the United States and Vivant in France (2010, 2011). Having pointed out the ambiguity characteristically surrounding bohemians, Wilson undertakes a literary overview of bohemian love, noting its transformation from a marginal to a mass aspiration. Her later, book-length treatment paints bohemians as “glamorous
outcasts” (Wilson, 2000). Currid unpacks cultural production in California and New York, while Vivant investigates the music scene in Paris. More conventionally, Comunian, Faggian, and Li (2010) provide a snapshot of the bohemian graduate labor market.

Often overlooked by modern writers, Nathe (1978) and Miller (1978) investigate bohemia to separate phoney from authentic aspirants, but also to enrich the bohemian–bourgeois dualism. As part of a helpful historical primer, Nathe taps into earlier sources, including Irwin (1903) and Grana (1964). She considers bohemia a useful, albeit temporary, place of sanctuary for individual artists. It is a loose society . . . [where] . . . other deviant groups, such as surfers, ski-bums, greasers and bikers, thieves, hoboes and winos . . . [mingle] . . . with other nonconformists . . . [so bohemia exists] . . . apart from its artistic, intellectual or revolutionary elements. (Nathe 1978, p. 412)

At some point, freedom, unconventionality, and rebellion can morph into degeneracy. For Miller, bohemia represents the nemesis of the traditional order of barons, abbots, emperors, popes, and monarchs, a mutative and creative proto-culture which offers a third, progressive alternative to Nazi romantic or bourgeois-technocracy. It is a spirit of liberty, impatient of authority. Reviewing the period 1830 to 1930, Siegel’s (1986) view of the subculture is less optimistic, recognizing bohemia’s conflicted nature caught among markets, tendencies to bourgeois incorporation, and ideologies of aestheticism. Arguably, the movement dissipated somewhat when Barrès, Zola, Impressionists, and even Surrealists were incorporated. Just as the avant-garde captured parts of bohemia, so did bourgeois society in assuming some of its mores. Wynn (2003, p. 432) further examines the assimilation of bohemians into geographic and historical contexts, noting progressions to flâneurs in France’s Second Empire and, otherwise, in mid-20th century America, from “Beats to more consumerist hipsters” within or outside the counterculture. Beyond these sources, the universal appeal of the self-destructive bohemian myth extends all the way to the Antipodes (Bradshaw & Holbrook, 2007; Davison, 2001; McCann, 2002).

**Bohemian + Creative-City**

Twelve papers retained at the interface of bohemians and creative cities divide into four discursive and eight analytic contributions. The first quartet focuses on the components of, and policy behind, the creative city. Traverso (2002, p. 126) gives air to romantic and utopian elements of bohemia “wrenched from the much more prosaic surrounding reality.” Ideals of freedom, fraternity, and relatedness would come together to create a microcosmic community on the fringes of capitalism, able to foreshadow the universal humanity of the future. Quirk (2001) exposes today’s well-educated “bobos,” whose bourgeois mindset is fused with bohemian counter-culture values of the 1960s. They flip between one trait and another as, for example, being avid consumers (bourgeois) but insisting on inconspicuous consumption lest they be thought vulgar (bohemian). If such vacillation constitutes creativity, Hall (2000, p. 640) rightly wonders whether the contemporary expression is as genuine as in the mid-18th century “when Watt took that fateful Sabbath walk across Glasgow Green.” At least the individuals who forged the film industry were “archetypical small and opportunistic entrepreneurs who retained the attitudes of their youth; often they rebelled against their bankers” (Hall, 2000, p. 648). Smyth and Hattam (2000) research university settings but, again, their notion of the “hustler” in bohemian rebellion stands out. Spicer’s (2005, p. 675) concern is the limitations or, indeed, incommensurability of a rationalist approach and that of other grand narratives in the postmodern condition. “Value pluralism forces itself upon us, no longer simply as an intellectual abstraction, but rather as a part of our ordinary lived experience.” In this regard, simple dualisms such as that of the bourgeoisie and the creative seem to make less sense than in the past: one almost expects the unconventional.

The analytic set concentrate around the “creative class theory,” which argues that places most conducive to creative activity will, in fact, attract creative people. The more traditional account
of the economist Alfred Marshall emphasizes networks and the importance of proximity in industry groupings, whereas, for Jane Jacobs, the American urban writer, cross-fertilization of ideas occurred throughout the wider community, often serendipitously. Between these outlooks, this group of papers dwells on statistical appraisal of output, employment growth, or migration as dependent variables against education or creative sector indicators, including the presence of bohemians or other creative workers (independent variables; Hansen & Niedomysl, 2009; Mellander & Florida, 2011). An insightful contribution is that of Storper and Scott (2009), who dispute an emerging emphasis on amenity values in attracting high levels of human capital. Because of sunk costs, the creative class will only migrate in response to a structured match between their talents and the forms of economic specialization and labor demand on offer. Specialization, rather than amenity, is the real crucible of creativity.

Wojan, Lambert, and McGranahan (2007) move in the mainstream of contemporary enquiry within economics and geography by undertaking regression and other techniques to track bohemian and creative appeal at county level across the United States. Marlet and van Woerkens (2007) use Dutch data and conclude that Florida’s creative class contributes more to explaining urban employment growth than do indicators of education because it matters what people actually do at work. Historically, central places like New York, London, Copenhagen, Munich, or Vienna act as magnets for creatives. In Europe, Boschma and Fritsch (2009) and Lorenzen and Andersen (2009) conduct rigorous empirical investigations into the spatial distribution of the creative class. Centrality, bohemians, facilities, and economic growth are confirmed as factors driving distinctive creative articulation. Yet, as Boschma and Fritsch note from their study across 500 regions in seven countries, bohemian statistical enquiries cannot pinpoint causes based on jobs or urban form for the spatial concentration of creatives in some locales. In addition, geo-statistical investigations into bohemia are perennially plagued by data limitations. First, people classified as bohemians might not, in fact, be creative at all, a point which we certainly intend to pursue in future enquiries. Second, spatial fragmentation studies lack fine-grained urban form data. Instead of regional demographic surrogates, perceptive diagnostics of urban creativity require block or street level aesthetics and facilities data. Here, online tools like Google street view could help provide solutions.

**Smart Regeneration**

Only two papers were retained under the smart regeneration theme, which, in the event, was not a primary focus for the review. The first is Christainsen’s (1993, p. 52) reflection on Keynes’ writing to Hayek which sets political-economy boundaries to urban interventions, ruling out “government activities of a special interest nature” but not a “state-insured minimum level of sustenance for all.” Hayek had recommended adherence to a “Rule of Law” as opposed to the “Rule of Men.” The former would apply impartiality, rather than discretion, to public policy and would limit the size of government. As an example, the Rule of Law excludes legislation intended to discriminate in favour of, or against, particular people, occupations, industries, or regions. . . . In contrast, the general rules of property and contract make no reference to particular industries. They merely provide a legal framework within which dispersed private individuals, not centrally located government planners, direct resources.

By this yardstick, public intervention to stimulate creative industries is disputed, while broad-scale facilitations to regenerate infrastructure and the built environment might be more acceptable, partly because they are thought to provide widespread positive externalities. Accordingly, this formula is often seen within contemporary urban development.

Scott (2006) relays how, in the context of the “new economy,” certain historically specific forms of the creative city are emerging. His analysis allows speculation as to what policy makers
can realistically achieve in attempts to enhance urban creativity and reinvigoration through place-making, promotion, re-imaging, branding, and renovation. Networks of creative cities are forming into innovation, learning, and production systems featuring both competition and co-operation. Yet within their workforces, these cities characteristically polarize high-income human capital from a lower or underclass of “flexible,” menial workers, even though both elements are essential for vitality. Scott (2006, p. 12) sounds the alarm about simplistic recipes for a “steady march . . . towards some sort of creative utopia,” in that bohemian enclaves are vitiated by the countervailing reality of “massive numbers of unstable low wage jobs” and social marginalization. “There can be no truly final achievement of the creative city where these stubborn problems remain” (p. 15). Moreover, “the mere presence of ‘creative people’ is certainly not enough to sustain urban creativity over long periods of time in the absence of a developmental ‘creative-field effect’” (p. 11).

Conclusion

A fulsome literature on bohemians has not doused skepticism in certain quarters about their role in urban life, development, or regeneration. Yet despite a strand of academic polemic, innovation produced by struggling bohemians lingers as a distinctive, creative force in the public psyche. In this preliminary article, our contribution has been to conduct a structured review of urban bohemianism with regard to its potential for urban advance. In no way straightforward, it emerges, like bohemians themselves, as a complex and congested enterprise. Unhelpful for present purposes are descriptive papers, which elaborate interests centered in the humanities. They comprise a static literature and convey a bourgeois, pretentious, or even perverse preoccupation with the encumbrances of style and status. In this way, quasi-bohemians, deficient in real creative power, represent either an empty protest against the prevailing social structure or simply sordid likenesses of true artistic leadership. Contrariwise, in its search for catalysts of urban regeneration, social science could benefit from an emphasis on, and academic participation in, the rebellious but productive bohemian strand. Its members are internally driven cultural explorers, rather than entitled or superficial consumptives. Authentic bohemians must be strong-willed, independent, and rebellious to challenge patriarchal, religious, or sexual taboos (El Saadawi, 2009). Prosperity or patronage can nurture them but, paradoxically, they can also die impoverished, like Schubert or Mozart. Often, but not necessarily, bohemians are unsavory. Sometimes character defects are the quid pro quo for probing limits, breaking free from repression, or unsettling bourgeois conventions (Traverso, 2002). Like the Cuban writer, Reinaldo Arenas (1943-1990), they drown out skeptics with their confronting art and calls for reformatory action:

Past closed shops, closed markets, closed cinemas, closed parks, closed cafes. Sometimes showing dusty signs, justifications: “CLOSED FOR RENOVATION,” “CLOSED FOR REPAIRS.” What kind of repairs? When will these so-called renovations be finished? (Catoira, 2005)

We close this short, but arguably comprehensive, account of urban bohemianism with a substantive reading list of some hundred sources. It has been selected to benefit similarly minded scholars but excludes study of urban regeneration per se, which other journals characteristically organize in different ways from those employed here (Ploeger, 2006; Sæter, 2011). The review has shown the importance of classifying the outlook and capacities of bohemians, a fundamental theoretical step enabling onward progress. Demonstrably, they are not all the same in their conduct, orientations, or bearing on city development. From the platform now established, our subsequent research direction is to pursue the situation and role of the productive bohemian. Sources uncovered here will permit model-building more hermeneutic than would otherwise have been possible. The goal, shared with Falck, Fritsch, and Heblích (2009), among other authors, is to determine whether the artisanal bohemian can actually contribute to urban regeneration. If so, we would like to know which agents lead the push and more about how, individually or communally, they might achieve it.
## Appendix

Review Stages 1 to 3 Process Details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Basic search terms</th>
<th>Time range</th>
<th>Refinements</th>
<th>Primary results (no. of papers)</th>
<th>Additional filter terms</th>
<th>Additional refinements</th>
<th>Final result (no. of papers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest Sociological Abstracts</td>
<td>bohem*</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Limited to “Peer Reviewed” items</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>(urban* OR city OR cities)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest Social Sciences Journal</td>
<td>bohem*</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(1978-2012)</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>(urban* OR city OR cities)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest Research Library</td>
<td>bohem*</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(1978-2012)</td>
<td>9956</td>
<td>(urban* OR city OR cities)</td>
<td>Limit: time range (1970-2012); document type to “article”; language to “English.” Exclude: “Trade Journals”, “Magazines” and “Conference Papers and Proceedings” as source types; selected subjects (see Appendix 1*); selected scholarly journals (see Appendix 1**).</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scopus</td>
<td>bohem*</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(Fields searched: “Article Title”, “Abstract”, “Keywords”)</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>(urban* OR city OR cities)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>bohem*</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(Fields searched: “Topic”, “Title”)</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>(urban* OR city OR cities)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI/Inform Global</td>
<td>bohem*</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(1986-2012)</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>(urban* OR city OR cities)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Public Affairs (APA FT)</td>
<td>bohem*</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>(Fields searched: all subject fields)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(urban* OR city OR cities)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Notes

2. Defined as members of the well-to-do professional class who espouse bohemian values but lead bourgeois lives (Merriam Webster online dictionary).
3. ProQuest Sociological Abstracts; ProQuest Social Sciences Journals; ProQuest Research Library; ProQuest ABI/Inform Global; Scopus; Web of Science; and Australian Public Affairs APA FT.
4. Subjects Excluded:
   Novels; novellas; personal profiles; musicians and conductors; animals; race; musicology; paleontology; fossils; rodents; classical music; musical performances; geology; air pollution; motion picture criticism; race relations; Black literature; meteorology; art criticism; motion picture directors and producers; history; literary criticism; politics; women; poetry; writers; humans; books; Jews; religion; poets; motion pictures; literature; minority and ethnic groups; African Americans; feminism; sexuality; essays; linguistics; education; female; Christianity; male; international; music; drama; European; children and youth; writing; nationalism; magazines; homosexuality; ecology; men; war; aliens; history, 20th century; American history; middle ages; popular music.
   Scholarly Journals Excluded:
   The Journal of Ecclesiastical History; Physiological Research; Journal of Palaeontology; Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies. University of London; The Journal of Economic History; History Today; Central European History; Modern Fiction Studies; Popular Music; The Art Bulletin; East European Quarterly; The Opera Quarterly; The Journal of American History; Journal of Women’s History; The English Historical Review; International Review of Social History; GeoJournal; African American Review; Journal of American Studies; Americas; Journal of Social History; Shakespeare Quarterly; Oxford Art Journal; Journal of the History of Sexuality; Film History; Geological Magazine; The Catholic Historical Review; Texas Studies in Literature and Language; Journal of the Geological Society; Holocaust and Genocide Studies; Journal of Drug Issues; Journal of Latin American Studies; Environmental Monitoring and Assessment; Theatre Journal; College Literature; The Journal of American Culture; American Music; Water, Air and Soil Pollution; Journalism History; Comparative Literature; German Quarterly; Partisan Review; Harvard Ukrainian Studies; Studies in the Novel; Feminist Studies; Historian; The Huntington Library Quarterly; Rocks and Minerals; Cinema Journal; Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900; Canadian Slavonic Papers; Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences; Scandinavian Studies; World Literature Today; The China Quarterly; Mineralogical Record; The Midwest Quarterly; Biography; Theatre Survey; Journal of Canadian Studies; Journal of Contemporary History; The Journal of Modern History; Victorian Studies; British Journal for the History of Science; Church History; Journal of the American Musicological Society; Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society; Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies; Comparative Drama; Literature/Film Quarterly.
5. As likely hinted in Queen’s (1975) Bohemian Rhapsody, written by Freddie Mercury. See the extensive efforts to interpret this piece at: http://songmeanings.com/songs/view/3187/
Key Web Sources

http://www.thechicfashionista.com/bohemian-fashion-style-tips.html
http://highholder.tripod.com/bohemia.htm
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