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Introduction: geographies of modernism

'We live in spacious times.' This bold claim seems to capture how a vocabulary of spatial and geographical terms is becoming increasingly familiar to those working in literary studies. Much work on postmodern writing, for instance, is indebted to Fredric Jameson's spatial turn ('always historicise' perhaps being replaced by a newer slogan for Jameson: always spatialise!). Jameson's influential notion of a 'cognitive map' of postmodernity is, of course, a term derived from the work of the urban geographer Kevin Lynch. For Jameson also one significant difference between modernism and postmodernism lies in their relationships to the concepts of space and time:

We have often been told, however, that we now inhabit the synchronic rather than the diachronic, and I think it is at least empirically arguable that our daily life, our psychic experience, our cultural languages, are today dominated by categories of space rather than by categories of time, as in the preceding period of high modernism.

If we agree at all with this claim, then it is not surprising that we find many strands of literary and cultural studies being reoriented towards spatial questions, since it reflects only the position and the social world occupied by the contemporary critic.

In postcolonial theory and criticism there is considerable attention paid to the political consequences of geographical conquest by imperialism. If imperialism and colonisation were projects intrinsically concerned with the politics of space, then it appears inevitable that we should discuss how writers produce texts that map empire, and of how resistant narratives attempt the rewriting of imposed cartographies. Edward Said, for instance, characterises his aim in Culture and Imperialism as 'a kind of geographical inquiry into historical experience', and claims the book demonstrates how 'the struggle over geography' crucially infuses the cultural forms of imperial power.

Interdisciplinary research has also reinforced this crossover between the cultural and the geographic, with a now extensive body of work by geographers such as Derek Gregory, Doreen Massey and Steve Pile that
Moving through modernity adapts conceptual frameworks from theorists such as Foucault, Lacan, or Deleuze and Guattari. Franco Moretti’s recent book on the nineteenth-century novel, *An Atlas of the European Novel*, shows this critical cross-fertilisation in reverse: Moretti’s stimulating book reads literary texts spatially through a series of maps depicting various locations germane to the novels. Moretti calls this methodology ‘literary geography’, an approach which attempts to show how ‘geography shapes the narrative structure’ of the novel.5

However, if space and geography are important theoretical orientations today, then perhaps they only recapitulate some of the central concerns of modernism. Jameson’s distinction between a diachronic modernism and a synchronic postmodernism looks a little overstated once we realise that the claim ‘We live in spacious times’ comes not from some postmodernist or postcolonial theorist but from the modernist writer and critic Ford Madox Ford.6 It is from his fascinating 1905 book *The Soul of London*, Ford’s impressionistic attempt to ‘get the atmosphere’ of London.7 Ford’s book is part of that long critical tradition that analyses the urban character of modernity.8 More interestingly, Ford’s intuition concerning the spatiality of modern life occurs in a chapter devoted to means of transport into London: by motorcar, electric tram or railway.

It is that kind of connection, between space, geography and movement, in modernist writing from around 1910 to 1939 which is the central focus of *Moving Through Modernity*. Although questions of space and geography have achieved a higher theoretical profile over the last few years, relatively little work, thus far, has been done that specifically locates modernism within a renewed set of spatial or geographic contexts.9 It is useful, therefore, to outline some broad theoretical points that orientate this book’s spatial conception of modernism.

There has been an enduring tradition within critical discussions of modernism that privileges the experience and representation of temporality.10 From Proust’s meditations upon memory to the employment of the ‘stream of consciousness’ narrative technique by writers such as Woolf, Richardson and Joyce, or from T. S. Eliot’s obsession with time and tradition in *The Waste Land* and *Four Quartets* to Pound’s claim in relation to *The Cantos* that an epic is a poem which ‘includes history’, it seems that temporality and history are the dominant themes that plague, torment and enrich modernist writing. Wyndham Lewis’s *Time and Western Man* (1927), for instance, argued that modernist writing fell foul of an obsessive interest in the ‘flow’ of time, to the extent of ignoring the spatial characteristics of narrative and culture.11 This is not my argument, but Lewis’s polemic indicates that we cannot easily disentangle time from space or history from geography – as some scholars of modernism have attempted to do. Indeed, the idea of ‘the modern’ already implies a certain temporality that distinguishes it from the non-modern.12 As David Harvey notes, since ‘modernity is about the experience of progress through modernization, writings on that theme have tended to emphasize temporality, the process of becoming, rather than being in space and place’.13 This book argues that although temporality is clearly a significant factor in understanding the modernist project, discussions of modernism must now consider also the very profound ways in which space, place and geography occupied the modernist imagination. How do we think about the ‘spacious times’ of modernism using concepts of a geographical hue? It is useful to try to clarify a number of conceptual problems in any projected critical literary geography of modernism.

The first revolves around the metaphorical nature of the spaces being discussed in literary and cultural studies. To a geographer like Neil Smith the use, in certain theoretical discourses, of spatial metaphors—such as mapping, margins—centre, deterritorialisation, or location—operate at the expense of analysing the material spaces of, for example, the city. For Smith, spatial metaphors have the tendency to view actual spaces as dead or empty containers in which all objects or events can be located. He suggests that we seek to understand how metaphorical and material spaces are ‘mutually implicated’, and to view space not as a neutral canvas but as ‘social spaces’, produced according to social aims and objectives, and which then, in turn, shapes social life.14 This book argues that we should understand modernist texts as creating metaphorical spaces that try to make sense of the material spaces of modernity. Chapter 1 considers some of the ways in which this approach might progress by discussing work by theorists of spatiality such as Lefebvre, Foucault and de Certeau.

The second problem concerns the representation of space in cultural texts. I argue in this book that we should think in rather more complex ways about how a text represents space, and to do this we might consider the work of the geographer Henri Lefebvre and his distinction between the representation of space and representational spaces. Lefebvre’s sense of social space, discussed in chapter 1, is very broad: both internal and external, the space of the psyche, the body, the city, the house, or the room. By using Lefebvre and other cultural geographers we can analyse in more detail, for example, the nature of the specific cities encountered in modernism: Dublin in *Ulysses*; London in *Howards End*. Not only the cities in a general sense, however, but specific places within them become our concern if we inject a more developed geographical focus into the study of modernism. Now we might consider how specific streets, stations, cafés,
monuments or shops are represented in modernism, and how such places offer an endorsement or contestation of official representations of space. The debates within geographical theory over the problematical distinction between space and place, considered in chapter 1, are also illuminating for how we conceive literary and cultural texts to represent space.

The third problem considers the implications of such representations for the formal properties of modernism. One of the oldest considerations of space and modernism is that of Joseph Frank in his pioneering and controversial discussion of spatial form in modernist writing, published first in the 1940s. Frank's concept of spatial form is an intrinsic theoretical approach indebted to New Criticism: space is conceived as the spread of text upon paper and page, or the narrative pattern of a text read through time. In Frank there is no real discussion of social space: the spaces of geographical analysis, or even the spaces of literary institutions such as publishers or magazines. Frank thus ignores the kinds of space that are represented in modernist texts. But Frank's work is salutary, I think, when we consider how to discuss the representation of urban and other spaces in modernism. We need to reconnect the representational spaces in modernist texts not only to the material spaces of the city, but also to reverse the focus, and try to understand how social spaces dialogically help fashion the literary forms of the modernist text. This would reconnect Frank's questions about the spatial form of modernist writing to the social spaces, such as those of the city, that are often obsessively figured in modernism, tracing how social space intrudes upon the construction of the literary space of the modernist text. Literary texts represent social spaces, but social space shapes literary forms. Throughout this book I use the term textual space to refer to this interaction between spatial forms and social space in the literary text. Emphasis is thus given to the spatial features of literature, such as the typography and layout on the page; the space of metaphor and the shifting between different senses of space within a text; or the very shape of narrative forms, found in open-ended fictions or novels that utilise circular patterns for stories. Discussion of how the formal features of literature are influenced by social or historical circumstances are always fraught with difficulty; the links in this book between space, geography and literary forms are no less tentative. Despite this, it is important, I argue, not only to discuss space and geography thematically, but to address them as questions which have a profound impact on how modernist texts are formally assembled.

To focus upon space and geography in modernism, however, does not result in a rejection of history; rather I wish to pursue an investigation into the spatial history of modernism, an account of the precise historical fashion in which particular spaces and places were conceptualised and represented. In Postmodern Geographies Soja argues that the reassertion of social space in cultural geography entails that we situate the spaces and places we examine within strong historical frameworks. Clearly there is no sense in trying to understand how a modernist text responds to the creation or adaptation of a particular location without grasping that both social space and literary space operate in relationship to historical co-ordinates. Social space, as Soja argues, is dialectically related to history and time, and any reassertion of spatial concepts should not be a simplistic privileging of space over time. Moving Through Modernity is, therefore, guided by a form of critical literary geography, a methodology that draws on concepts such as Paul Carter's 'spatial history' and Kristin Ross's 'synchronous history.' Such a literary geography would seek out the historical links between modernism and the production of particular material spaces in modernity. Chapter 2 examines, for example, how Forster depicts the growth of the suburbs in Howards End; chapter 3 interprets Imagist poetry alongside the growth of the London underground train network; while chapter 4 explores how Joyce, in Ulysses, interrogates the imperial history of Dublin's geography.

Thinking spatially about modernism involves recognition of the diverse ways in which 'space' might be applied to modernist texts. At times it seems as if the term is so semantically vague as to be shorn of all value in critical discussion. However, this problem can be overcome by staying attentive to the precise nuances within spatial vocabularies, recalling Smith's warning about the relation of metaphorical to material spaces. We can consider, for example, psychic space, taking Freud's topographical model of the mind as one starting point for understanding how our inner life can be imagined as a set of spaces that must be related and connected in a way that is meaningful to ourselves, much as a house must have rooms and spaces that connect in some purposeful way. Stream of consciousness technique in modernist fiction has, quite rightly, long been associated with philosophical theories of time and history, such as that of Bergson; but it also represents a model to explore the psychic spaces of character. Narrative techniques such as interior monologue thus offer a method for moving between inner thoughts and outer reality, an approach requiring another sense of spatial terms: inner, outer and the boundary between these. We also need to consider how the interiority of psychic space is often profoundly informed by exterior social spaces. The chapters on Joyce, Woolf and Rhys in particular examine this interplay between interior and exterior space.
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Much of modernism, then, moves away from a purely psychic perspective, introducing a whole range of other spaces. Many modernist texts – perhaps as a formal development of naturalist drama – are based in, or make great symbolic use of, rooms and domestic space. There is the political longing expressed in Woolf’s A Room of One’s Own; the room of confinement in Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s The Yellow Wallpaper; or, to take an earlier example, the door of escape slammed by Nora Helmer in Ibsen’s A Doll’s House. Moving on again, we can note the streets and buildings of the metropolis as the setting for many key modernist texts, such as the perambulations of Leopold Bloom in Dublin, or of Clarissa Dalloway in London. It is significant that city streets and domestic rooms open up the issue of the gendering of spaces in modernism, including critical discussions of the flâneur-flâneuse. Chapters 3, 5 and 6 consider the gendering of space in the writings of Imagist poets, and of Woolf and Rhys. A related theme explored is the gendered politics of ‘the gaze’ and looking in the spaces of the city, discussed in chapters 3 and 4 in particular.

In contrast to the familiar metropolitan flavours of modernism is the often occluded space of the countryside, surviving seemingly as a place of nostalgic refuge for someone like Forster in Howards End, discussed in chapter 2. Also of significance for Forster is national space, and how such spaces overlap with the geographies of imperialism and colonialism. European modernism relied, in important ways, upon the imperial spaces of Africa, the West Indies and Asia, specifically India. The works of Forster and Rhys, examined in chapters 2 and 6, overtly explore these geographical connections, showing how our critical understanding of modernism must involve the various journeys across and between ‘first world’ metropolitan spaces and ‘third world’ imperial spaces.

The arguments of critics such as Said, and many others, over the interrelationships between the great triad of modernism, the metropolis and imperialism highlight how relations between spaces are manifestly relations of power, between the occupancy and dispossession of actual geographical locations in the context of national and international politics. But such relations of power are also registered in the psychic, urban or domestic spaces described earlier. As Foucault noted in 1977: ‘A whole history remains to be written of spaces – which would at the same time be the history of powers ... from the great strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of the habitat.’ Geographical conflict, suggests Said, is ‘complex and interesting because it is not only about soldiers and cannons but also about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings’ And these struggles take place within the literary and cultural texts of modernism, within the rooms, streets, cities and minds represented in the great modernist writing of the early twentieth century.

The switch from rooms to geopolitics, and back again, demonstrates another key characteristic of the modernist engagement with space. The multiple forms of space and geography discussed above cannot, it seems, be kept apart, even though there is, for many writers, a desperate desire to maintain borders and boundaries: rooms bleed into streets, anguished minds migrate to lands overseas. What this produces in the modernist text is that keenly felt sense of disorientation – at once both thrilling and anxious – where, for example, the psychic speculations of a person walking a city street are superimposed upon the national spaces of a great imperial power, as in Peter Walsh’s juxtaposition of private thoughts, metropolitan streets and British imperialism in India in a single short passage in Mrs Dalloway. Modernist textual space, therefore, registers these diverse social spaces: it traces the various movements between and across them; and it tries to find formal strategies to represent these disorientating, thrilling and anxious kinds of experiences. Much of this book focuses upon this polytopic quality of modernist writing.

Movement between these various spaces, then, is a key feature of modernism, and one significant way of interpreting this is via the emergence of modern means and systems of transport, such as the motorcar, the electric tram or bus, or the underground railway. Analysing the significance of transport in Britain in the early years of the twentieth century enables us to understand the spaces of modernity in a more materialist fashion, as called for by Neil Smith. We can also consider how the quotidian experience of moving around the metropolis provided a key impetus to some of the experimental forms of modernist writing. In this way we can develop a more nuanced account of the spatial history of modernism. It is not so much the flâneur, then, but more the voyageur that is discussed throughout this book.

The impact of the motorcar, for example, was pronounced: one early commentator proclaimed that the motorcar ‘will revolutionise the world ... All our conceptions of locomotion, of transport, of speed, of danger, of safety will be changed’. Artists and writers were quick to recognise the revolution in modern transport. The painter Fernand Léger noted how movement through a landscape by automobile or express train initiates a new set of sensory relations to the space perceived by the artist: The condensation of the modern picture, its variety, its breaking up of forms, are the result of all this. It is certain that the evolution of means of locomotion, and their speed, have something to do with the new way of
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of attitudes to the spaces of modernity. Beginning with a discussion of methodological questions concerning space and place, the book then takes a roughly chronological focus upon Forster, Imagism, Joyce, Woolf and Rhys. Again for reasons of coherence and focus, I have tended to concentrate upon a limited range of texts by each author, discussing Forster’s *Howards End*, for example, but little else by this writer. I have chosen these British and Irish writers because of the historical range of their writing across the modernist period, for the variety of styles of writing they employ, and for the multiple geographies of modernism they explore. This book, therefore, aims to demonstrate both the validity of a literary geographical approach to modernism, and a fuller picture of the ‘spacious times’ that modernism inhabited.

Notes

8 For a recent discussion of this issue see Peter Brooker, *Modernity and Metropolis: Writing, Film and Urban Formations* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2002).
9 Two examples of such work are Chris Go rebuilt, *The Invention of the West: Joseph Conrad and the Double-Mapping of Europe and Empire* (Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1995) and Elisabeth Bronfen, *Dorothy Richardson’s Art of Memory*, trans. Victoria Appelbe (Manchester, Manchester University
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10 For an overview of how modernism has been theorised see Astrud Eyteimsson, The Concept of Modernism (Ithaca, NY, and London, Cornell University Press, 1990).

11 Wyndham Lewis, Time and Western Man (Boston, MA, Beacon Press, 1957).

12 For discussion of the problematised idea of ‘the modern’ in relation to temporality see Paul De Man, Literary history and literary modernity in his Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism (London, Methuen, 1983) and Peter Nicholls, Modernisms: A Literary Guide (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1995), ch. 8.


16 One interesting approach to modernist space would be to consider the location of some of the institutions of literature: where modernist works were published, for example, and the role of little magazines in its dissemination. For such an approach, but without an explicitly spatial focus, see Lawrence Rainey, Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1998).


19 Two forms of space that I have not had room to discuss here concern contemporary scientific discourses, such as the theory of relativity, and that of travel writing in the modernist period. For a consideration of the impact of scientific theories see Stephen Kern, The Culture of Time and Space 1880–1918 (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1983), ch. 6, and Randall Stevenson, Modernist Fiction: An Introduction (Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992). On travel writing in this period see Paul Fussell, Abroad: British Literary Travelling between the Wars (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980) and Caren Kaplan, Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement (Durham, NC, and London, Duke University Press, 1996), pp. 27–64.


22 For the significance of rooms in naturalist drama and the link with modernism see Raymond Williams, Theatre as a political forum’ in The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists (London, Verso, 1989).


24 Said, Culture and Imperialism, p. 6.


26 I have been unable to discuss here the full panoply of modes of transport in modernism: vehicles that might play a salient role include bicycles, aircraft, tanks, ships and motorbikes.

27 Ford, for example, in The Soul of London, concludes his chapter ‘Roads into London’ by drawing a link between the ‘pathos and dissatisfaction’ of gazing out of a train window at incidents from daily life that one never sees completed, and the desire for stories to have an ending (p. 43).
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34 This is not to imply that transport did not have a considerable cultural impact on writers and artists in earlier centuries: the case of Charles Dickens and the railways indicates that it did. The focus of this book is, however, on the modernist period and the specific nature of the relationship between modernist writing and transport.

1 Theorising space and place in modernism

This complex historical geography of modernism (a tale yet to be fully written and explained) is David Harvey’s provocative description of Bradbury and McFarlane’s Modernism 1890–1930, the hugely influential account of the emergence of modernism in different cities and countries. In a modest fashion I take up that challenge by trying to develop a form of critical literary geography adequate to the complexities Harvey mentions. This chapter critically considers a number of important theories of space and place as found in Heidegger, Bachelard, Lefebvre, Foucault, de Certeau and Harvey. In discussing these writers my aim is to elaborate a critical terminology of space and place with which to begin a geographical approach to modernism. This chapter, therefore, is mainly expository, outlining a set of arguments and concepts taken from geographers and theorists that will be employed throughout this book. In addition to the broad distinction between space and place, several other spatial concepts will be considered, including Lefebvre’s theory of ‘social space’, Foucault’s conception of heterotopias, and de Certeau’s distinction between the tour and the map. Throughout this chapter these ideas are related, schematically, to a number of modernist texts so that the reader can grasp how these spatial and geographical notions will, in later chapters, be more fully applied.

Modernist writing, this book argues, is about living and experiencing ‘new times’, not in the abstracted location of literary history, but in specific spatial histories: rooms, cities, buildings, countries and landscapes. This understanding of the multiple material geographies of modernism is guided by one of the key sets of terms found in recent geographical and spatial theory: the opposition between space and place. To a number of geographical theorists space indicates a sense of movement, of history, of becoming, while place is often thought to imply a static sense of location, of being, or of dwelling. Much modernist writing oscillates between these twin spatial visions, often in ways that complicate any sharp and easy division between a conservative sense of place and a revolutionary sense of space. In considering these different attitudes to modernity – space or place, movement or location – we can
Moving through modernity

A slightly different account of space and place, but one influenced by Heidegger’s work, is Gaston Bachelard’s *The Poetics of Space* (1958). This quirky yet stimulating blend of phenomenology and psychoanalysis aims to uncover the primary importance of inhabiting a particular place. Unlike Heidegger’s abstract sense of ‘dwelling’ and ‘being’, Bachelard’s is a ‘concrete metaphysics’ that situates the first and primary sense of place in an actual location, that of the house.11 Bachelard wishes to produce ‘a phenomenological study of the intimate values of inside life’,12 eschewing Heidegger’s imprecise notion of dwelling for the specific nooks and crannies of the house, particularly the house in which the child first comes to consciousness. Bachelard’s book thus has chapters upon various aspects of the house, such as the cellar, the attic, chests and wardrobes, and the experiential sense of corners in rooms or the vertical design of a house. Rather than mere descriptions of such places, Bachelard wants to capture ‘the primary function of inhabiting’ that is located in the house; as he suggests, ‘all really inhabited space bears the essence of the notion of home’.13 Bachelard’s term for this form of study is *topoanalysis*, and its focus is upon spaces that have been turned into places of pleasurable belonging, the transformation of a house into a home, where the rooms and corridors of the house articulate ‘the topography of our intimate being’.14 Space, writes Bachelard, ‘that has been seized upon by the imagination cannot remain indifferent space subject to the measures and estimates of the surveyor’.15 As Edward Casey comments on Bachelard’s conception of the house, it is a kind of ‘place-world, a world of places’ where the exploration is not so much geometrical or architectural as imaginative or poetic.16 Bachelard’s examples are nearly all drawn from poetry, since this imaginative realm is closest, he argues, to that of dreams and the unconscious, where our most intimate memories of inhabiting early childhood places are stored, or ‘housed’.

Bachelard, as Casey notes, provides a richer and more tangible account of the sense of place than does Heidegger, while still privileging place over space.17 Bachelard’s work is suggestive, however, in its demand that space be read as a text: we are said to ‘write a room’, ‘read a room’, or ‘read a house’.18 The book is interesting also for Bachelard’s sense of body-space, his seeing the house as a kind of body. Our primary experiences of home inscribe themselves in our somatic lives, leaving memory traces of the rooms and spaces which we have inhabited in the ‘passionate liaison of our bodies … with an unforgettable house’.19 One example, discussed in the next chapter, is the intimate intertwining of house and body in Forster’s *Howards End*.
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However, *The Poetics of Space* seems restricted by what is its most engaging and innovative feature, its topophilia. In its overwhelming focus upon 'quite simple images of felicitous space' \(^{20}\) we find a conception of place as wholly benign, one which is unable to imagine conflict within the realms of intimate space. The home, which for Bachelard is a place of intimacy and warmth, can quite easily contain many dramas of conflict and unease. In Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *The Yellow Wallpaper*, for example, the bedroom is not a setting for serene intimacy, but a place of confinement where a gendered set of power relations is enacted between the imprisoned female and her doctor husband. \(^{21}\)

Another limitation in Bachelard's account is his concentration on interior places. Any sense of exterior space, whether of streets, cities or nations, is left unexplored. Arguably, the sense of intimacy and inhabitation he describes as characterising the house could also be applied to exterior locations. Much of Rhys’s fiction of belonging involves a set of national locations in addition to the interiors of rooms. Bachelard also does not explore the complex relations between the intimate spaces of rooms or houses and where they are found, in streets or landscapes. It is as if he can feel a tender sense of place only when imagining the interior of a house; the passionate attachment to a piece of land, a village, or a city street is never fully discussed by Bachelard. \(^{22}\) Equally, Bachelard does not address questions such as how the architectural design of a house might influence one’s topographic attachments, or how the social and political history of architectural forms might alter one’s intimate inhabitation of a place. As we shall see, for instance when discussing *Howards End* or *Ulysses*, a sense of intimate attachment to place can be properly understood only in relation to the historical constitution of houses, buildings and spaces.

This wider understanding of how space and place interact is found in Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space*, a vital theoretical text for recent cultural geography. Lefebvre’s conception of ‘social space’ is designed to introduce questions of society, history and politics into thinking about space, and involves both a rejection of Heidegger’s ontological valuation of place as a site of dwelling and an extension of Bachelard’s notion of topoanalysis.

**Lefebvre and social space**

Henri Lefebvre’s 1974 *The Production of Space* (hereafter *PS*) has been very influential in introducing a number of key concepts into spatial and geographical theory, perhaps the most significant being that of ‘social space’. \(^{23}\) Lefebvre argues that, for many years, ‘the word “space” had a strictly geometrical meaning: the idea it evoked was simply that of an empty area’ (*PS*, p. 1). This abstract view of space originated with Descartes and was influential throughout the humanities and social sciences, as well as in mathematics and the physical sciences. Lefebvre aims to reverse this widespread view by insisting that space is not a vacuum merely containing other objects and practices: ‘space is never empty: it always embodies a meaning’ (*PS*, p. 154). Since space is always produced by social practices it can always be deciphered for specific social meanings: ‘(Social) space is a (social) product’ (*PS*, p. 26). Here Lefebvre draws on Marx’s view of the role of relations of production in society, applying Marx’s notion to the way that landscapes are altered by human productive practices. This dialectical view of space and society argues that every society produces its own distinctive form of space, from the ancient *polis* of the Greek world to the city-state of the Italian Renaissance, or the high-tech postmodern cities of the present.

Forms of spatial organisation, however, also play a dominant role in shaping societies, determining the realms of mental space and physical space. Most spaces, writes Lefebvre, are ‘at once a precondition and a result of social superstructures’ (*PS*, p. 85), and ‘any space implies, contains and dissimulates social relationships’ (pp. 82–3). Once we leave natural spaces such as uncultivated land, forests or heaths we enter a world where space encounters the social relations of production. A national forest park, for example, though it might appear to be an inherently natural space, assumes certain social characteristics once it is administered by the state or redesigned for visitors or tourists. It becomes a social space because of its relationship to factors such as the economic development of a particular region or a national strategy for tourism. If part of the forest is given over to the timber industry, then this again produces a very different form of social space.

For Lefebvre social space is an overtly political concept:

> Space has been shaped and moulded from historical and natural elements, but this had been a political process. Space is political and ideological. It is a product literally filled with ideologies. There is an ideology of space. Why? Because space, which seems homogenous, which seems to be completely objective in its pure form ... is a social product. The production of space can be likened to the production of any given particular type of merchandise. \(^{24}\)

Lefebvre’s work has thus influenced the development of a ‘socio-spatial’ dialectic, as Soja terms it: \(^{25}\) society shapes spaces according to its needs, but, equally, space plays a formative role in the construction of social life.
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Lefebvre’s conception of social space, as he acknowledges, is a very broad one, with a frustrating tendency towards vagueness. However, one clear and significant feature is that social space is inherently composite, mingling heterogeneous spaces together in one physical location. As the forest park example shows, any single piece of land can be analysed into many different social spaces with quite distinct associated meanings: a place for tourists to walk; a place for timber production; an area for economic development; or a signifier of a particular regional or cultural identity (the highlands of Scotland, the bog lands of the west of Ireland). Unlike Heidegger’s conception of an attachment to discrete places, Lefebvre’s social spaces always intertwine with one another:

*Social spaces interpenetrate one another and/or superimpose themselves upon one another. They are not things, which have mutually limiting boundaries ... Visible boundaries, such as walls or enclosures in general, give rise for their part to an appearance of separation between spaces where in fact what exists is an ambiguous continuity. The space of a room, bedroom, house or garden may be cut off in a sense from social space by barriers and walls, by all the signs of private property, yet still remain fundamentally part of that space. (PS, p. 87)*

This multifaceted character of space makes it particularly suitable for thinking about in modernism, given the multiple senses of literary space – from small rooms to images of the city – outlined in the Introduction. The ‘ambiguous continuity’ of different social spaces is a dexterous concept for the literary geographer, being particularly apt for understanding how modernism combines very distinct spaces in quite startling ways, such as Rhys’s perpetual switching between England and Dominica in *Voyage in the Dark.*

Lefebvre’s description of social space recalls something of Bakhtin’s sense of the heteroglossic nature of language, where each word partakes of an almost infinite number of social discourses that come into contact with one another and help shape any specific meaning amid the constant flux of language. Thus Lefebvre writes that a local space is not eradicated by a larger regional, national or global space, but enters into a complex set of relationships with these other spaces:

The national and regional levels take in innumerable ‘places’: national space embraces the regions; and world space does not merely subsume national spaces, but even ... precipitates the formation of new national spaces through a remarkable process of fission. All these
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spaces, meanwhile, are traversed by myriad currents. The hypercomplexity of social space should by now be apparent, embracing as it does individual entities and peculiarities, relatively fixed points, movements, and flows and waves – some interpenetrating, others in conflict, and so on. (PS, p. 88)

A house in a street, for example, may appear to be solid and immobile as a space. Analysed as social space, however, both the house and the street are ‘permeated from every direction by streams of energy which run in and out of [them]’ (PS, p. 93), such as gas, electricity, radio and television signals. The picture of a static space is replaced by ‘an image of a complex of mobilities, a nexus of in and out conduits’ (p. 93). Each of these conduits opens this space out into wider social, political and economic questions and concerns. For Lefebvre, then, place is not to be sharply distinguished from space. Rather, a writer’s conception of some particular place should be understood in relation to the wider historical and social meanings of that site. Place is ultimately, for Lefebvre, only one form, though with its own ideology and politics, of the many existing discourses of social space. For Lefebvre, the Heideggerian view of place as a universal dwelling for human being embodies only a particular, and historically specific, view of social space and social relationships.

Polytopic texts like Joyce’s *Ulysses* or Eliot’s *The Waste Land* clearly display ‘hypercomplex’ social spaces, with conflicting relations between different spaces being a key element in the formation of their textual spaces. A poem like *The Waste Land* that represents morbid consciousnesses, soiled bodies and dingy rooms in suburban streets, along with references to beaches, mountains, tube stations and other countries, is thus particularly amenable to a Lefebvrenian reading. Analysis should attend not only to the particular significance of each discrete space, but to their interconnection and the quarrels between them. This principle of the ‘interpenetration and superimposition of social spaces’ entails that any ‘fragment of space’ under analysis will reveal not one but many social relationships. Bachelard’s topoanalysis of intimate spaces can, therefore, be usefully augmented by Lefebvre’s notion of the hypercomplexity of social space.

In *The Production of Space* Lefebvre introduces three aspects of social space that are of particular utility for a literary geography of modernism:

- **Spatial practices** refer to the multiple activities that form spaces in each society, embracing features such as production and reproduction; it also refers to the spatial actions of each individual in a
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Society - everyday journeys to work, to home, to sites of leisure or consumption, the roads and the transport practices that dominate material life. Lefebvre refers to these as experienced spaces, to indicate how an individual practically relates to the outside world. Broadly, it refers to what people do in spaces.

- **Representations of space** are linked to official relations of production and order; this is space as perceived by planners, architects and governments, and is the dominant space in any society. Though abstract in nature, drawn on plans, maps and diagrams, representations of space are social and political in practice and considerably alter the production of space through, for example, the construction of a monument, a national museum or schemes for road-widening in a city. Representations of space modify the spatial texture of a city or landscape according to certain ideologies, and are linked to codes and signs - for example, those used on a proposed redevelopment plan of a city site.

- **Representational spaces** embody space as imagined by inhabitants, and is often linked to artists and writers, and to the ‘clandestine or underground side of social life’ (PS, p. 33). It refers to the ‘dominated … space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate’ (p. 39). Representational spaces do not directly alter the construction, for example, of a city, but rather result in symbolic and artistic productions. Representational space refuses the rational order and cool logic of representations of space; instead representational space ‘is alive: it speaks. It has an affective kernel or centre: Ego, bed, bedroom, dwelling, house; or: square, church, graveyard. It embraces the loci of passion, of action and of lived situations, and thus immediately implies time’ (PS, p. 42).²⁸

These three categories for understanding social space are, as we might expect, interconnected. Lefebvre focuses upon ‘the fragmented and uncertain connection between elaborated representations of space … and representational spaces’ as well as the spatial practices of people living within these two forms of representation (PS, p. 230). Frustratingly, Lefebvre does not offer many elaborated examples of how the experienced–perceived–imagined triad interacts.²⁹ But there are a number of ways in which Lefebvre’s theories can be utilised in the study of modernism. The focus on the symbolic qualities of representational spaces can be directly applied to modernist writers who attempted to capture the new spaces of modernity in their works. Modernism was engaged in a diverse set of responses to the official representations of space in modernity, found in new forms of urban life such as the suburb and transport systems, or in relations between the imperial capital and the colony. Some writers celebrated the rational forms and structured logic of these representations of space, while others found much to criticise or challenge in them, as we will see. Lefebvre’s focus upon the hypercomplexity of social space is a good reminder, however, of the myriad responses to space that we find in modernist writing: to homogenise them into a monolithic representational space of modernism is to ignore the contradictory ways in which space and place were conceived and imagined by different writers.

Lefebvre’s work also stresses that the representational spaces found in literary texts are to be connected to material spaces and places, and to the representations of space embodied in them. To study, for instance, the London of *Mrs Dalloway*, the Dublin of *Ulysses* or the Dominica of *Voyage in the Dark* is to consider the material spaces these texts discuss, and to disclose how the representational spaces of these texts reflect, contest or endorse the geographical shaping of these *topoi* by various ideological representations of space. Very often we might consider the ways in which writers appropriate spaces dominated by official meanings, producing representational spaces with quite different meanings, such as Joyce’s revisioning of Dublin’s status as an imperial outpost of the British Empire.³⁰ Lefebvre’s work thus emphasises how a spatialised reading of modernism must always consider relations of power and geopolitics.³¹

Scattered throughout The Production of Space are hints about the nature of space in modernism and the dominant representation of space in modernity. Modernity, for Lefebvre, is described as abstract space, a representation of space from the eighteenth century onwards that wishes to homogenise social space. Abstract space is formal and quantitative, and functions by regarding space as an object filled with materials such as glass and stone, concrete and steel (PS, p. 49). Lefebvre discusses the role of the Bauhaus architectural group in codifying the central tenets of abstract space in the 1920s, forming a direct link between the modernist avant-garde and the space of modernity (PS, pp. 124–7). Abstract space is characterised by three more features: its reliance upon geometry; a stress upon a ‘logic of visualisation’, where the visual gaze predominates over any other sensual feature of the human body; and a desire to fill the empty homogenised space it desires with what Lefebvre terms a ‘phallic verticality’ (PS, p. 287). An expression of masculine violence associated with bureaucracy and the state. Glass skyscrapers and towers might be said to epitomise Lefebvre’s image of this abstract space.
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Lefebvre himself was convinced that art and literature reveal a profound understanding of these new social spaces of modernity. Of Picasso’s great innovations around 1907, with the painting of Les Demoiselles d’Avignon for example, he writes: ‘Picasso’s space heralded the space of modernity’ (PS, p. 302), an abstract space dominated by visuality and phallic violence. Picasso’s Cubism is thus linked to the dominant representation of space found in the abstract space of modernity: social space is intertwined with the aesthetics of spatial form. Later chapters considering Imagist poetry around 1909–10, and the troubled encounter with modernity found in Forster’s Howards End, published in 1910, will be guided by Lefebvre’s linkage of social space to aesthetic space, and by his observation that in Europe ‘around 1910 a certain space was shattered’ (PS, p. 25), the representation of space found in Euclidean and perspectival thought from the European Renaissance onwards. Within the destruction of this space we witness the genesis of the new textual spaces of modernism.

Lefebvre’s suggestion that the spatial forms of modernist culture must be connected to alterations in material space is an important one. One theorist who extends this view in a particularly interesting fashion is Michel Foucault. Foucault’s unique sense of space, which combines both metaphorical and material dimensions, is most noticeable in his conception of heterotopia.

Foucault and heterotopia

Foucault wrote specifically on spatiality and geography only minimally, but the influence of such writings has, perhaps surprisingly, been widespread. We can distinguish three broad ways in which these ideas have been significant. First, there are his scattered comments on questions of geography and space – particularly in relation to topics such as the spatial organisation of power in prisons and the architecture of schools – or on the body. This we might characterise as an interest in a Lefebvrean social space, or what Foucault calls ‘external spaces’ (‘Other spaces’, hereafter OS), p. 23). Second, Foucault employs a variety of spatial metaphors in his work, terms such as ‘site’, ‘field’, ‘domain’, ‘grid’, ‘strata’ or ‘epistemological space’. Edward Said, for example, refers to Foucault’s ‘strategic and geographical sense’ of method, a more spatial mode than the temporal sense of Hegelian or deconstructive forms of theory; while John Marks describes Foucault’s ‘broadly spatial approach to thought’ itself. A third aspect of Foucault’s spatial theory is his concept of heterotopia, which is a provocative way of combining material and metaphorical senses of space.

Space and place in modernism

For Foucault, deciphering discourses ‘through the use of spatial, strategic metaphors enables one to grasp precisely the point at which discourses are transformed in, through and on the basis of relations of power’. In this way Foucault couples his vocabulary of spatial metaphors to an analysis of material spaces, using power as a tool to unpick the ‘social apparatus’ (dispositif) of, for example, the prison or sexuality. In this sense Foucault’s work traces how spatial metaphors and material spaces interact on the basis of relations of power. For example, the panopticon in Discipline and Punish is simultaneously a material presence and a trope for the gaze of disciplinary power in modern societies.

Power is, then, the key for shifting Foucault’s spatial imagination away from the two-dimensional plane of structuralism and into a fully social and historical three-dimensional space. In a 1977 interview Foucault discussed the nature of domestic architecture and how spaces within houses had become historically differentiated. His general conclusion shows a sense of space resembling Lefebvrean ‘social space’, rather than Bachelard’s ‘intimate space’:

A whole history remains to be written of spaces – which would at the same time be the history of powers (both these terms in the plural) – from the great strategies of geo-politics to the little tactics of the habitat, institutional architecture from the classroom to the design of hospitals, passing via economic and political installations. It is surprising how long the problem of space took to emerge as a historic-political problem. Space used to be either dismissed as belonging to ‘nature’... or else it was conceived as the residential site or field of expansion of peoples, of a culture, a language or a State... Anchorage in a space is an economic-political form which needs to be studied in detail.

For Foucault, space is power, and power is always spatially located somewhere within society: social relations of power infuse all spatial sites and concepts, from the micro- to the macro-level. As such, Foucault admitted in the course of an interview with French geographers: ‘Geography must indeed lie at the heart of my concerns’. Certainly, contemporary geographers have found Foucault’s work very helpful in theorising space, place and power. Soja, for example, suggests that Foucault’s theories show a ‘spatialisation of history’, where history is ‘entwined with the social production of space’.

Foucault’s theory of spatiality shares much with Lefebvre’s thinking: it is saturated with the social, and can be traced historically; it is political in nature; and it occurs in many different forms – body, room, house,
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institution, or political geography. Foucault, however, differs from Lefebvre in his rejection of the latter’s Marxism with its privileging of relations of production. Instead Foucault substitutes his conception of power, arguing that the history of spaces is not the history of relations of production, but of relations of power.

A second difference from Lefebvre is Foucault’s concept of heterotopia, found first in the short lecture from 1967 ‘Of other spaces’ (Des espaces autres). For such a tantalisingly brief and cryptic piece, this text has occasioned much commentary. The crucial value of the concept of heterotopia is its ability to connect material and metaphorical senses of space. It also presents a novel way for thinking about the relations between space and place in modernism.

‘Of other spaces’ commences by tracing a brief history of ‘space’, from the medieval to the present. The nineteenth century was, argues Foucault, obsessed with time and history, while the present epoch is captivated with spatial modes of thought, where the key conceptual tropes are those of simultaneity, juxtaposition, the network and the site (OS, p. 22). After a short discussion of Bachelard’s work on the phenomenology of internal spaces, Foucault turns his attention to external spaces. Like Lefebvre’s critique of abstract space, Foucault notes that ‘the space in which we live ... is a heterogeneous space. In other words we do not live in a kind of void, inside of which we could place individuals and things’ (OS, p. 23). Instead, Foucault defines the spaces in which we live as ‘sets of relations that delineates sites’ (p. 23). Indeed, a site is defined by its particular set of relations, an argument recalling Lefebvre’s sense of the flows that interpenetrate any social space.

However, after some discussion of various types of site – such as those of transportation (the train, the street), relaxation (the café, the cinema, the beach) and of rest (the house, the bedroom, the bed) – Foucault outlines the type of site in which he is most interested. These are sites related to other sites, ‘but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect’ (OS, p. 24). These sites of contradiction are distinguished into two sorts: utopias and heterotopias. A utopia is an unreal space, says Foucault, one that inverts an existing society or presents a perfect society. A heterotopia, however, is a real space that acts as a counter-site: it is ‘a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites ... are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted’ (OS, p. 24). It is a place that is outside of all places, but which can be located in reality, unlike a utopia. Foucault cites the mirror as an instance of heterotopia. The mirror is actually located in reality; but

the image of myself I see within it is located nowhere, in a virtual space. The mirror functions heterotopically because it contains both the real space and the unreal space simultaneously; or, more precisely, it functions as kind of ‘counteraction’ upon the person who gazes at the mirror. In order to see herself a person’s gaze must pass through the reality of the actual glass of the mirror, and also through the unreality of the virtual image in the mirror. The real space of the mirror thus functions in a counter-real fashion. The important point is that heterotopia involves a sense of movement between the real and the unreal; it is thus a site defined by a process, the stress being upon the fact that it contests another site.

Foucault offers six principles for the study and description of heterotopias:

- Heterotopias are found in all human societies, but are extremely varied in their forms.
- Heterotopias have a precise function for each historical society. An example given by Foucault is the role and placement of the cemetery. Until the end of the eighteenth century the cemetery was placed near a church, in the heart of the city. This symbolised the way in which bodily remains were regarded, linked to notions of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. During the nineteenth century cemeteries shifted to the edge of the city, and thence to the suburbs, signifying a loss of faith in doctrines of resurrection, as well as a sense of the decaying body as an object bearing illness (OS, p. 25).
- The heterotopic site is contradictory, and can juxtapose a number of different sites within it, a principle recalling Lefebvre’s hypercomplex social space. Foucault’s instances include the cinema and the theatre, rooms which contain other places, the screen or the stage, within them, and which open out into fictional other spaces.
- Heterotopias are linked to ‘heterochronies’ – ‘slices in time’ – particular historical moments of rupture from traditional senses of time. Instances are the fairground, the festival and the holiday village, which are devoted to transitory moments in time. Joyce’s Ulysses contains many instances of this interaction of heterotopia and heterochronia, for example, in the chapter ‘Circe’, set in the festival-world of the nighttown brothel.
- Heterotopias are generally linked to some system of opening and closing that means they are not freely accessible as public spaces. Entry is either by compulsion, as in a prison or military barracks; or one
has to fulfil certain criteria, such as religious rites for certain temples or hygienic gestures for baths or saunas.

- Heterotopias function and make sense only in relation to other forms of space. They function either as spaces of illusion that show up real spaces as more illusory even than fantasy spaces; or they operate by compensation, creating a ‘space that is other, another real space, as perfect, meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled’ (OS, p. 27). Heterotopias of this second kind – ‘absolutely perfect other places’ (p. 27) – might include certain colonies, says Foucault, such as Jesuit colonies in South America, or Puritan colonies in seventeenth-century America. Foucault should not be interpreted as suggesting that colonies were, in reality, perfect places; rather that their conception was guided by this kind of social and spatial goal. Thus these colonial villages were constructed around specific regular formations – the grid, the cross at right angles, the central location of the church. Daily life was also regulated and regimented according to a strict timetable. This example shows how Foucault’s conception of heterotopia is not necessarily of a positive place of freedom or escape. Heterotopias, in Kevin Hetherington’s succinct summary, are simply spaces for an ‘alternate ordering’ of modernity: they ‘organize a bit of the social world in a way different to that which surrounds them’.45

Clearly, not all of these six principles are fully theorised by Foucault, and some are left protan and not a little contradictory. But there is a richness about the vision of space offered here, particularly when applied to modernism. This is demonstrated in the frustratingly brief final paragraph of the lecture, where Foucault describes one more instance of heterotopia: a boat, which is

a floating piece of space, a place without a place, that exists by itself, that is closed in on itself and at the same time is given over to the infinity of the sea and that, from port to port, from tack to tack, from brothel to brothel, it goes as far as the colonies in search of the most precious treasures they conceal in their gardens ... the boat has not only been for our civilization, from the sixteenth century until the present, the great instrument of economic development ... but has simultaneously been the greatest reserve of the imagination. The ship is the heterotopia par excellence. In civilizations without boats, dreams dry up, espionage takes the place of adventure, and the police take the place of pirates. (OS, p. 27)

This cryptic portrait of the boat as heterotopia indicates a fertile link to literary dreams of ‘other spaces’. We need think only of the central role played, for example, by boats in Conrad’s narratives to understand how we might use heterotopia as a tool for revealing complex modernist geographies. Heart of Darkness, for example, not only concerns the central journey of a boat into a colony, but is entirely narrated aboard a boat moored on the Thames. The story that emerges on this ‘place without a place’ functions in relation to the nearby modern city in a strikingly heterotopic fashion: its tale of the savagery of Kurtz in Africa brutally exposes the facade of the civilised city of London. The rational modernity of the imperial city space is shown up as illusion by the violence of the story narrated on the boat. Heart of Darkness constantly stresses the relations between the excesses of imperial trade in Africa and the order of the metropolis, and the boat’s mediating function here is precisely heterotopic. For heterotopia incorporates diverse places, moving between and across them, and in so doing reveals the processes that link together different kinds of topoi.46 The heterotopic boat in Heart of Darkness is a thus a contradictory site, fixed by its anchor, yet moving in its narrative space between the Congo, Brussels and London to illuminate the interconnections between the European metropolis and its imperial domains.47

There seem, then, to be productive ways in which Foucault’s heterotopia can be used in the reading of modernism. Foucault himself, in his only other explicit use of the term, linked heterotopia to literature in The Order of Things, published in 1966, a year before ‘Of other spaces’. Prompted by an essay of Borges that mocks attempts to tabulate human knowledge, Foucault uses heterotopia to describe a form of writing that undermines the idea of such an ordering of knowledge. This kind of disorder is not just about placing incongruous items together, as in the Surrealist image cited by Foucault, of combining together an umbrella and a sewing-machine on an operating table.48 Rather it involves doing away with the operating table itself, or the site upon which strange objects are grouped together:

I mean the disorder in which fragments of a large number of possible orders glitter separately in the dimension, without law or geometry, of the heteroclite; in such a state, things are ‘laid’, ‘placed’, ‘arranged’ in sites so very different from one another that it is impossible to find a place of residence for them, to define a common locus beneath them all.49

Foucault distinguishes this groundless writing from utopias, which offer a consolation in their untroubled image of a perfect order. Heterotopias are considerably more disturbing.
because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this and that, because they shatter or tangle common names, because they destroy ‘syntax’ in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to ‘hold together’... Heterotopias... disslocate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest the very possibility of grammar at its source; they dissolve our myths and sterilize the lyricism of our sentences.\textsuperscript{50}

This is clearly a description of a form of avant-garde writing found throughout modernism, associated in Foucault’s mind with writers such as Bataille and Blanchot.\textsuperscript{51} As Foucault sums it up, this writing shows a linkage of aphasia (speech disorder) with atopia (disturbances of place). But it can easily be applied to the modernist style of Joyce in Ulysses or more widely in Finnegans Wake, the disrupted syntax of much of Gertrude Stein, or the patchwork texture of Ezra Pound’s Cantos.

Significantly, in Of other spaces, Foucault does not return to this strictly literary heterotopia, because he wishes to extend this metaphorical sense of space to heterotopias found in actual spaces. This seems the most important point to glean from Foucault’s comments on heterotopias for the study of modernism, that the metaphorical subversions of heterotopic writing be brought into contact with the actual sites and countersites of modernity. Together they articulate an interpretation of modernism as a set of responses to changes in the material spaces of modernity, shown in, for instance, Forster’s image of metropolitan suburbs in Howards End or Imagist poems set on underground trains. Equally, however, this approach to modernism analyses metaphorical spaces in the text, such as the space of the body in Ulysses, or the interior space of consciousness in Rhys and Woolf. Literary texts, in another sense, combine both metaphorical and material space if we focus upon their formal properties. The disorientating heterotopia of a modernist narrative might be directly indebted to urban space; experiments with typography and line spacing in modernist poetry could be linked to the emergence of heterotopic sites in modernist cities. Here the material form of the text is a transformation of some specific external space; turning, for example, the streets of Dublin into a meandering narrative in Ulysses, such that we read the twists and turns of meaning as an embodiment of urban space. If one function of heterotopia is, in Genocchio’s words, to ‘inscribe instability into a given spatial order’,\textsuperscript{52} then we should look for those moments in a text in which linguistic or semantic instability is associated with a certain site or location in order to find modernist heterotopias.

Use of the concept of heterotopia should also recall Foucault’s comments in the 1970s upon the significance of power in space and geography, a topic not directly addressed in the earlier discussion of heterotopia. Power is implied since heterotopia inverts and contest real sites, and makes sense only in relation to some other real space in society. Certain commentators have interpreted heterotopias as simply sites of resistance to the dominant ordering of socio-spatiality, found in marginal places and locations.\textsuperscript{53} However, Foucault’s conception of power as a set of relations rather than an object one could possess suggests that heterotopias cannot be labelled as inherently sites of resistance. Heterotopias are not sites of absolute freedom or places where marginal groups always resist power; as Hetherington observes, the important point is ‘not the spaces themselves but what they perform in relation to other sites’.\textsuperscript{54} Foucault’s list of heterotopias includes prisons as well as gardens, colonies as well as ships. The heterotopic ship in Conrad’s Heart of Darkness may function as a critique of imperial exploitation, but it is still a ship registered and engaged in those very imperialist practices. We should be aware, then, when reading modernist heterotopias to indicate the ambivalent strategies of power informing their spatial practices. An example of the potentially ambivalent character of heterotopia might be Forster’s use of the house and garden at Howards End. Is it the site of an alternative ordering of modernity or merely a nostalgic escape from modernity? Perhaps the motorcar in the novel is another heterotopia: a real site but one which will not stay put, a ‘placeless place’ that constantly unsettles an acceptable spatial ordering of modernity. The disruptions of Forster’s narrative form and style when describing the motorcar also indicate the linguistic instability of a textual heterotopia. For Forster, however, this is quite clearly a negative heterotopia.

The concept of heterotopia thus represents a fluid sense of social space, and the processes to which space is subject. It shows ‘place’ to be, contra Heidegger’s dwelling, a site of potential instability. It is, therefore, a concept which connects material and metaphorical spaces in the literary text in new and illuminating ways, showing how the formal practices and spatial form of the modernist text should be read in conjunction with a wider understanding of the historical geography of modernity.

De Certeau and the syntax of space

In The Practice of Everyday Life (1984 (hereafter PE)) Michel de Certeau outlines a theory of how people contest the imposition of various forms of power in their daily lives by specific ‘ways of using the products imposed
by a dominant social order' (PE, p. xiii). De Certeau draws upon Foucault's analysis in *Discipline and Punish* of the creation in modern societies of a 'disciplinary power' that seeps through the social body in an anonymous fashion, producing subjects who are moulded by a diffuse mechanism of social obligation. De Certeau's aim is to demonstrate the other side of this disciplinary matrix: the forms of resistance to such powers embodied not in grand political strategies or projects, but in the quotidian activities of the ordinary person. De Certeau's book studies the 'ways of operating [that] manipulate the mechanisms of discipline and conform to them only in order to evade them' (PE, p. xiv).

One of the central insights found in de Certeau is his focus upon the sites of such resistances: 'these “ways of operating” constitute the innumerable practices by means of which users reappropriate the space organized by techniques of sociocultural production' (p. xiv). De Certeau takes this insight from the stress in Foucault's work upon the locations where disciplinary power is instigated, most famously in the example of the prison panopticon. De Certeau's examples of this contestation of space centre upon walking in the city, travelling by rail and the idea of 'spatial stories'. There are two points in de Certeau's work that are pertinent for this discussion of modernism. The first is his insistence upon the relationships of power that suffuse people's occupations and use of space, an argument that extends Foucault's putative link between the history of spaces and the history of powers. Secondly, de Certeau's specific notion of 'spatial stories' as a practice of urban life emphasises the combination of material and metaphorical spaces. The concept of 'spatial stories' thus refines the analogy between language and practice by arguing that '[e]very story is a travel story – a spatial practice' and that all stories 'traverse and organize places; they select and link them together; they make sentences and itineraries out of them' (PE, p. 115). In a sense de Certeau's spatial stories connect Lefebvre's social space and the formal practices of the literary text.

This link between space and narrative illuminates a series of points about the linguistic form of modernist narratives. One is the way that modernist works interrogate the quotidian spaces of modernity: the city, the street, the room, the house, and so on. Another concerns the implications of de Certeau's claim that 'narrative structures have the status of spatial syntaxes' (p. 115). Like Foucault's textual heterotopias, the notion of 'spatial stories' offers a method that focuses upon more than simply how particular modernist texts represent particular spaces: it allows us to outline the formal strategies by which spaces are represented and to understand the relation between text and space in a more interactive fashion. The spaces of modernity alter and transform the literary space of early twentieth-century writing; while the peculiar spatial stories told in the literary texts of modernism shape the ways in which we view and understand modernity itself.

Two corresponding sets of distinctions introduced by de Certeau provide guidance for this approach: a demarcation between space and place; and a related division between tours and maps. For de Certeau, perhaps following Heidegger, a place 'implies an indication of stability' and is a location where 'elements are distributed in relationships of coexistence' (PE, p. 117). Two things cannot occupy the same place: elements can only exist beside one another, each situated in its ‘proper’ location. De Certeau uses ‘proper’ to mean the official and legitimised use to which a place or activity belongs. A space, however, is based not on stability but on direction, movement and velocity:

space is composed of intersections of mobile elements. It is in a sense actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it. Space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs or contractual proximities. (PE, p. 117)

This sense of space as produced by the intersection of different elements owes much to Lefebvre's idea of 'the hypercomplexity of social space'. Space, writes de Certeau, 'is a practiced [sic] place' (PE, p. 117), it is like the meaning of a word actually being spoken rather than its 'proper' meaning as found in a dictionary. De Certeau's example is that of a city street planned in a geometrical fashion. This place is 'transformed into a space by walkers' in much the same way that 'an act of reading is the space produced by the practice of a particular place: a written text, i.e., a place constituted by a system of signs' (p. 117). Places, argues de Certeau, are always determined by a focus upon fixity, or what he calls 'the being-there of something dead', so that an inert object serves as the foundation of place. Spaces, however, are determined by operations attributable to historical subjects rather than lifeless bodies: 'a movement always seems to condition the production of a space and to associate it with a history' (p. 118). 'Place' thus resembles Lefebvre's official representation of space, while 'space' is closer to a combination of Lefebvre's representational space and spatial practice.

Stories constantly oscillate around these two poles, transforming spaces into places, and places into spaces. For example, place becomes space when an inert object, 'a table, a forest, a person that plays a certain role in
the environment’ (PE, p. 118), emerges from a stable location and transforms it by narrative action into a space. De Certeau is careful to suggest that these are not unchanging binary terms, since places and spaces are constantly being transfigured into one another in the play of narrative. He also argues that it might be possible to produce a typology of the ways in which stories enact either an ‘identification of places’ or an ‘actualization of spaces’ (p. 118).

De Certeau’s distinction between space and place can be illustrated by considering how modernist narratives broadly differ from those of realism. De Certeau describes a kind of story in which we witness ‘the putting in place of an immobile and stone-like order’ and where ‘nothing moves except for discourse itself, which, like a camera panning over a scene, moves over the whole panorama’ (PE, p. 118). This seems an apt description of many features of the realist novel of the nineteenth century, noticeable in an extended passage such as the opening of chapter 2 of Thomas Hardy’s *Tess of the D’Urbervilles* (1891):

The village of Marlott lay amid the north-eastern undulations of the beautiful Vale of Blakemore or Blackmoor aforesaid, an engirdled and secluded region, for the most part untrodden as yet by tourist or landscape-painter, though within a four hours’ journey from London.

It is a vale whose acquaintance is best made by viewing it from the summit of the hills that surround it – except perhaps during the droughts of summer. An unguided ramble into its recesses in bad weather is apt to engender dissatisfaction with its narrow, tortuous, and miry ways.

This fertile and sheltered tract of country, in which the fields are never brown and the springs never dry, is bounded on the south by the bold chalk ridge that embraces the prominences of Hambledon Hill, Bulbarrow, Nettlecombe-Tout, Dogbury, High Stoy, and Bubb Down. The traveller from the coast, who, after plodding northward for a score of miles over calcareous downs and corn-lands, suddenly reaches the verge of one of these escarpments, is surprised and delighted to behold, extended like a map beneath him, a country differing absolutely from that which he has passed through. Behind him the hills are open, the sun blazes down upon fields so large as to give an unenclosed character to the landscape, the lanes are white, the hedges low and plashed, the atmosphere is colourless. Here, in the valley, the world seems to be constructed upon a smaller and more delicate scale; the fields are mere paddocks, so reduced that from this height their hedgerows appear a network of dark green threads overspreading the paler green of the grass. The atmosphere beneath is languorous, and is so tinged with azure that what artists call the middle distance partakes also of that hue, while the horizon beyond is of the deepest ultramarine. Arable lands are few and limited; with but slight exceptions the prospect is a broad rich mass of grass and trees, mantling minor hills and dales within the major. Such is the Vale of Blackmoor.  

This is a beautiful evocation of place drawing upon an explicitly topographical style of visual description. Hardy suggests comprehending the landscape from above, like a painter viewing the land ‘extended like a map beneath him’. Attention is drawn to other visual markers of place, such as scale (the valley seems smaller and of a more ‘delicate scale’) and shape (the hedgerows that appear as ‘a network of dark green threads’). We are also located precisely in terms of the names of surrounding villages, by reference to compass directions and by the distance from London. Hardy’s discourse sweeps over this landscape, quietly yielding up the ‘secluded region’ for the eye of the reader, utilising what Lefebvre terms a ‘logic of visualisation’ (PS, p. 287) to identify and pin in narrative form the nature of Marlott. But de Certeau’s sense of space is absent here, precisely because there is no actualization of the landscape by any acting or moving subject.

The passage also illustrates another feature of de Certeau’s ‘identification of place’: reliance on a mode of discourse he terms the *map*. This is juxtaposed with the *tour*, an experiential discourse associated with the ‘actualization of space’. Map discourses order precisely where elements or features occur; the hypercomplexity of social space is constrained by a visual discourse which presents a ‘tableau’ or ‘knowledge of an order of places’, and finding its apogée in the conventional map with its ‘plane projection totalising observations’ (PE, p. 119). Hardy’s text maps the space of the countryside around Marlott, transforming it into the immobility of a known and visually perceived place. Tour discourses refuse to present a visual tableau and are, instead, rooted in ‘spatializing actions’ that ‘organize movements’ (p. 119). The difference is between a discourse that lists where sites are located (‘The girl’s room is next to the kitchen, opposite the bathroom’) and one that describes a location through a set of actions (‘You enter the hallway, go along, you turn right, and then go across the room’). Though Hardy introduces an anonymous ‘traveller from the coast’ to bestow some human presence upon the scene, this person soon stands still and disappears from the landscape. The use of place names only intensifies the cartographic quality of this writing.
For de Certeau, most narratives combine both map and tour discourses, although one mode tends to dominate. The tour is the primary form of spatial discourse because it is connected with the actions of human subjects through space; these activities are subsequently codified into mapped places. The growth of the scientific discourse of modern mapping has, de Certeau argues, over a period of centuries gradually suppressed the role of tour itineraries.\textsuperscript{58} The map 'colonizes space' and eliminates the movements of subjects who had initially produced these very spaces:

The map, a totalizing stage on which elements of diverse origin are brought together to form the tableau of a 'state' of geographical knowledge, pushes away into its prehistory or into its posterity, as if into the wings, the operations of which it is the result or the necessary condition. It remains alone on the stage. The tour describers have disappeared ... maps, constituted as proper places in which to exhibit the products of knowledge, form tables of legible results. Stories about space exhibit on the contrary the operations that allow it, within a constraining and non-proper place, to mingle its elements anyway. (PE, p. 121)

Hardy’s discourse identifying place is indeed one in which the ‘tour describers have disappeared’; everything has its proper position in this narrative, and the land, the sea, the city and the hills do not intermingle or overlap in this mapped place.\textsuperscript{59}

In contrast we could point to the way in which a modernist text like Joyce’s \textit{Ulysses} is much more likely to employ a tour form of discourse, in which the actualisation of space is privileged over the mapping of place. The following passage is from the start of the ‘Cyclops’ episode:

By lorries along sir John Rogerson’s quay Mr Bloom walked soberly, past Windmill lane, Leask’s the linseed crusher’s, the postal telegraph office. Could have given that address too. And past the sailors’ home. He turned from the morning noises of the quayside and walked through Lime street. By Brady’s cottages a boy for the skins loll’d, his bucket of offal linked, smoking a chewed fagbutt. A smaller girl with scars of eczema on her forehead eyed him, listlessly holding her battered caskhoop. Tell him if he smokes he won’t grow. O let him! His life isn’t such a bed of roses! Waiting outside pubs to bring da home. Come home to ma, da. Slack hour: won’t be many there. He crossed Townsend street, passed the frowning face of Bethel. El, yes: house of: Aleph, Beth. And past Nichols’ the undertaker’s. At eleven it is. Time enough. (U, p. 68\textsuperscript{60})

Because of Joyce’s scrupulous attention to Dublin we might take this passage to exhibit an mapping of urban place. But the references to streets and buildings, in de Certeau’s terms, actualise space rather than identify place, since the pedestrian movements of Leopold Bloom produce them. Bloom’s perambulation through the city is a vast tour itinerary since, stylistically, the passage is full of the verbs and terms of movement: Bloom ‘walked soberly’, he goes ‘past’ buildings, he ‘turned’ and ‘walked through [Lime street]’, and ‘crossed Townsend street’. More than this, however, we notice how the use of interior monologue is another technique for the actualisation of space. Joyce describes how Bloom passes the Postal Telegraph Office, but then shifts the discourse from this exterior picture to the interior musings of Bloom about using the Post Office address for illicit correspondence from a possible lover. The sight of the boy smoking prompts an inner dialogue about social disadvantage versus moral guidance on health, and an imagined story of why the boy is waiting outside the pub. Moving past the undertakers serves to remind Bloom of his coming engagement at a funeral. Exterior places therefore serve as the sites for the construction of spatial stories. Or, as de Certeau notes, ‘the street geometrically defined by urban planning is transformed into a space by walkers’ (PE, p. 117).

The passage also demonstrates de Certeau’s point that spatial stories contain both space and place, tour and map in dialogue. Joyce famously wrote \textit{Ulysses} with the aid of a Dublin street map, as well as Thom’s Directory of Dublin Businesses, and there are parts of the novel that are clearly indebted to an identification of place through a kind of semi-cartographic discourse. The ‘paralysed’ place that Joyce perceived as Dublin is, however, transformed in his text into the bustling space of a thousand tours and stories; thus the mapping of Dublin places – the street names, the tram destinations, and the buildings – prompts a spiralling of spatial stories. \textit{Ulysses} displays a perpetual encounter between the stability of the realist novelist’s map and the myriad movements and tours of Dublin characters through space.

De Certeau’s work on ‘spatial stories’ thus emphasises how the distinction between space and place should not be reified into an absolute division. Modernism often oscillates between the two discourses of tour and map, as subsequent chapters show. De Certeau’s book is helpful, then, for focusing upon the interaction of space and place, for its stress upon relations of power derived from Foucault, and for his linkage of language and spatiality. To conclude this survey or tour of spatial theorists David Harvey’s account of modernism and modernity in \textit{The Condition of Postmodernity} is considered. This is a work which draws upon a number
of the writers already discussed, specifically Lefebvre, and suggests a number of congruences between certain theories of space and place and the formal literary innovations of modernism.

**David Harvey: modernity and postmodernity**

Harvey’s *The Condition of Postmodernity* has been very influential in discussions of postmodernist culture, particularly for its attempt to understand the geographical and spatial character of postmodernity. The book has been central in introducing the concepts of space and geography into cultural and literary studies, and so it is helpful to discuss how Harvey conceives of the relation between space and place in modernism and modernity.

Harvey’s analysis of postmodernity relies upon an argument about the contours of modernity and modernism as cultural experiences that are transformed, but not jettisoned, in the present condition of postmodernity. Modernity is characterised by an experience of ‘time-space compression’ in capitalist societies, defined as a ‘speed-up in the pace of life, while so overcoming spatial barriers that the world sometimes seems to collapse inwards upon us’. This powerful experience of compression in our quotidian grasp of time and space is ‘challenging, exciting, stressful, and sometimes deeply troubling, capable of sparking ... a diversity of social, cultural, and political responses’. Harvey analyses how modernity, from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, experienced just such an ambivalent ‘time-space compression’, a process distinguishing that epoch from the earlier conceptions of time and space initiated in the Enlightenment. To comprehend time-space compression Harvey draws upon Marshall Berman’s tripartite division between modernisation, modernity and modernism. Time–space compression begins with capitalist modernisation, the need, first analysed by Marx, to constantly revolutionise economic production by the use of new technologies and practices in order to extend and maintain profits. This produces a set of social, psychological, and cultural responses to the accelerated nature of everyday life undergoing technological and political modernisation; the accumulated experience of these changes is termed modernity. Finally, modernism is, in Harvey’s words, ‘a troubled and fluctuating aesthetic response to conditions of modernity produced by a particular process of modernization’.

One of the major achievements of Harvey is to demonstrate how time–space compression interweaves these three levels of modernisation, modernity and modernism. The chapter ‘Time–space compression and the rise of modernism as a cultural force’ contains an important discussion of the emergence of modernist literature in relation to conceptualisations of space and place. Harvey follows de Certeau in privileging space over place, finding a strain in modernism that reacted to the anxieties produced by time–space compression by encouraging an ‘identification of place’ that was ultimately conservative, nostalgic, and linked to reactionary political programmes such as Fascism. Drawing upon Nietzsche and Heidegger, Harvey associates place with a conception of *being*, while space is linked to a notion of *becoming*.

For Harvey the birth of modernism after 1848 commences a protest against the practical and theoretical rationalisation of space and time in Enlightenment thought. Due to the internationalising of capital, European space became more unified towards the latter half of the nineteenth century. Modernisation, in the form of technological inventions such as the railway, the telegraph, steam-shipping and the radio, all helped the way in which capitalism engaged in a ‘massive long-term investment in the conquest of space’. Linked to this technological take-off was the development of imperialism at the end of the century. Up to the outbreak of the First World War ‘the world’s spaces were deterritorialized, stripped of their preceding significations, and then reterritorialized according to the convenience of colonial and imperial administrations ... The map of domination of the world’s spaces changed out of all recognition between 1850 and 1914’. Such massive transformations resulted in immensely original experiences of everyday life, a new sense of modernity, where a Londoner could consume a product – the peach, for example, that Eliot’s J. Alfred Prufrock may or may not dare eat – shipped across thousands of miles from a colony owned and ruled from one’s metropolitan centre. Modern time and space now felt different, because, for example, one could travel by train at hitherto unimagined speeds, converting vast stretches of space into mere blips on the clock.

This process, whereby the earth’s surface is resignified, is brilliantly shown in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*. Marlow recalls his youthful pleasure in looking at maps and dreaming of the ‘glories of exploration’ of the ‘many blank spaces on the earth’. As an adult, however, those spaces were no longer empty on the map. The map of Africa, ‘the biggest – the most blank, so to speak’, had altered significantly: ‘It had got filled since my boyhood with rivers and lakes and names. It had ceased to be a blank space of delightful mystery ... It had become a place of darkness’. Imperialist expansion is perceived as a process of converting unknowable – to Western eyes at least – spaces into cognised and mapped places.
terms, Marlow’s regret is for the transformation of spaces into identified places, for a tour that is reduced to a mere mapping.

Harvey sketches three ways in which modernism produced a set of correspondences to these massive revolutions in modernisation and modernity. First, Realist narrative, the established norm of the novel, came under duress towards the end of the century. Realism relied upon a linear narrative schema that seemed unsustainable in a world where events did not necessarily occur in consecutive time. If, simultaneously, a trader in America could talk business, transacting a shipment of peaches, on the telephone with a banker in London, then it seemed as if two spatially disjunct events could occur at the same time. Thus Realist narrative ‘structures were inconsistent with a reality in which two events in quite different spaces occurring at the same time could so intersect as to change how the world worked.’71 The narrative form of Joyce’s ‘Wandering Rocks’ chapter of Ulysses, where a number of simultaneous events are represented from eighteen different spatial perspectives, is an example of literary modernism trying to capture the reality of this time–space compression of modernity.

Modernism’s second response to time–space compression, according to Harvey, was the idea of an interiority that existed outside of the rationalised exterior spaces of a modernity which eradicated local differences between various groups and people. Harvey argues that the space of ‘the body, of consciousness, of the psyche’ had been repressed by ‘the absolute suppositions of Enlightenment thought’. Now, however, ‘as a consequence of psychological and philosophical findings’ such interiorised spaces could ‘be liberated only through the rational organization of exterior space and time’.72 Harvey’s argument is here indebted to Lefebvre: modernism’s ‘representational spaces of the body or the psyche are reactions to the abstract and technologised ‘representation of space’ in modernity. Much modernist writing explores these interiorised spaces, not just as a result of innovations in literary history, but as a keenly felt response to fundamental alterations in the spatial history of modernity in the early twentieth century. This is a significant point for interpreting modernism: that the bodily space of a Leopold Bloom or the psychic space of a Clarissa Dalloway must be understood in relation to a wider understanding of social space and geographical history.

The third feature of modernism’s reaction to time–space compression, for Harvey, focuses upon the meanings imbued to particular places in literary texts. In a period when space was being conquered by time, and an internationalist consciousness of various sorts was being fostered, there was also a growing sense of the importance of locale and the uniqueness

of place. Harvey finds the rise of this ‘identification of place’ in features such as the rise of vernacular architecture or the recurrent motif of chinoiserie in French painting at the turn of the century. In much of Pound’s Imagist poetry, for example, we find reference to Chinese themes and, later in his career, the use of a non-Western ideogrammatic language.73 Thus, writes Harvey, the ‘identity of place was reaffirmed in the midst of the growing abstractions of space’.74 Though modernism is most often associated with a certain international outlook, such as the cosmopolitanism to which Forster frequently refers in Howards End, it is clear that many modernist texts draw upon and reproduce a mythology of individual places: Eliot, Woolf and Dorothy Richardson on London; Joyce on Dublin; the Paris of Djuna Barnes and Rhys.

Harvey’s attitude to this focus upon place is, ultimately, a critical one, since he views it as a trend in which being, ‘the spatialisation of time’, is privileged over becoming ‘the annihilation of space by time’.75 Given Harvey’s allegiance to Marxism, with its profound interest in the role of historical becoming in the progressive development of society, it is not surprising that he repeats a general claim made about modernism by many Marxist critics: that it attempts to evade or reject history in favour of a spatialised politics.76 Harvey, therefore, is uneasy with this localised dimension of modernism:

Modernism, seen as a whole, explored the dialectic of place versus space, of present versus past, in a variety of ways. While celebrating universality and the collapse of spatial barriers, it also explored new meanings for space and place in ways that tacitly reinforced local identity. By enhancing links between place and the social sense of personal and communal identity, this facet of modernism was bound, to some degree, to entail the aestheticization of local, regional, or national politics.77

Harvey’s dismissal of modernism’s engagement with place is, however, overstated and rather one-dimensional. In the writings of Joyce and Rhys in particular we see a modernism engaged in a dialectic between space and place in such a way that the stress upon local identities does not necessarily result, as Harvey suggests, in an aestheticised and reactionary politics of the nation. Harvey’s argument here is bluntly formulated and is too locked into the binary categories he employs (being–becoming, place–space) to be able to adequately discern the more nuanced uses of space and geography in modernist literature. If we recall the similar argument about space and place made by de Certeau, we can
say that identification of place and actualisation of space are the twin poles around which the spatial stories of modernism operate. Foucault’s notion of heterotopia, linking material and metaphorical spaces, also offers a more fluid sense of space, place and power than is found in this aspect of Harvey’s account of modernism. Harvey’s work is illuminating, however, in its general claim that ‘time–space compression’ was a significant factor in the aesthetic trajectory of modernism.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued for the validity of thinking modernism in terms of space and place, and has outlined a number of ideas drawn from a variety of thinkers to help formulate this critical literary geography of modernism. These theories inform the readings of the literary texts found in the rest of the book. Therefore, I do not return to them in any detailed fashion later, hoping the reader might return to this chapter if at all puzzled by any of the ideas expressed later.

From Heidegger I have taken the central, but problematic, distinction between space and place, an opposition crucial for many other spatial theorists. Bachelard’s work on the poetics of space indicated the importance of interiors and the intimate space of the body, although his discourse on place contained a number of limitations. In Lefebvre’s complex work The Production of Space there are a number of stimulating ideas about ‘social space’, primarily that of the distinction between ‘representations of space’, ‘representational spaces’ and ‘spatial practices’. Lefebvre’s work also introduced questions of power and politics into the discussion of space, topics taken up again in Foucault’s work on heterotopia. Perhaps Foucault’s most significant insight in his writings on heterotopia, and elsewhere, was his suggestion that material and metaphorical senses of space must be combined. This is a point developed in de Certeau’s notion of spatial stories, and in his contrast between the tour and the map.

Modernity, then, as this book explores in the following chapters, was powerfully obsessed with the relations between space and place, as Harvey argues. But in order to understand the complexity of this phenomenon we must interpret modernist images of space and place with an eye on the form and styles of the writing itself. Any critical literary geography must, therefore, trace the textual space of modernism: that is, how the spatial form of the literary text is inextricably linked to the histories of social space, and how we find a combination of metaphorical and material spaces represented in modernist writings. Chapter 2 begins this movement through the spaces of modernity with a text, Forster’s Howards End, published in 1910, the year for Virginia Woolf when ‘human character changed’, and the year in which, suggested Henri Lefebvre, ‘a certain space was shattered’ (PS, p. 25). It is also a text with two central images representing the relations between place and space: the house at Howards End, and the motorcar that zips through the new spaces of modernity.
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