

## MAPPING LITERATURE MAPEANDO A LITERATURA

*Robert T. Tally Jr.<sup>1</sup>*

I would like to begin by thanking Professor Ana Maria Costa Lopes and other members of the organizing committee for inviting me, the sponsors (including the TOPUS group), and everyone else involved with putting together these International Study Days on Literary Space. I am so sorry that I could not be there in person, but I hope that I can visit sometime in the future. I also want to Matt Greengold and others here at Texas State University for arranging this recording. And, finally, thank you all for coming out to hear this talk today.

### I.

I would like to speak about literary criticism after what has been called “the spatial turn,” and along those lines, I want to focus on geocriticism, a relatively novel approach to literary and cultural studies that establishes space, place, mapping, and more generally spatial relations at the heart of the critical enterprise. I will discuss the spatial turn itself briefly, but an underlying idea is that our own time is somehow distinctively characterized by spatiality, more so than earlier epochs, and that therefore critics must pay greater attention to matters of space than they have done previously. A certain place-mindedness, which I refer to as “topophrenia”, takes on a more urgent role in literary or cultural studies in the present. In a word, then, space is timely.

(And here’s a moment for a shameless plug: My new book is called *Topophrenia: Place, Narrative, and the Spatial Imagination*, and it will be published as part of Indiana University Press’s “Spatial Humanities” series on January 2, 2019.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Texas State University – EUA. [robert.tally@txstate.edu](mailto:robert.tally@txstate.edu) [recorded on July 25, 2018, for the 6<sup>th</sup> JOEEL - International Study Days on Literary Space, on 26, 27, and 28 September 2018 at ESEV (Escola Superior de Educação de Viseu, Portugal), along with the TOPUS (Inter-Institutional Group of Research on Space, Literature and other Arts)]

Thus the geocritical moment is upon us. And yet, honestly, I wonder if I am the best person to advocate for the special timeliness of geocriticism, given my somewhat expansive understanding of the theory and practice. For example, even though I have followed my old professor Fredric Jameson, as well as Michel Foucault, David Harvey, Edward Soja, and others, in affirming that our era is in many ways characterized by an enhanced sense of spatiality and spatial relations, I have also spent a lot of time and energy arguing for an idea of *literary cartography* which, while certainly not ahistorical or even transhistorical, nevertheless is connected to various ways of making sense of the world that I associate especially with narrative.

As such, my ideas about these things draw heavily from theorists like Jameson, yes, but also from Northrop Frye, Georg Lukács, Erich Auerbach, and eventually, I suppose, back to Aristotle. In an article I wrote on literary spatiality a couple of years ago,<sup>2</sup> I focused on examples from *The Odyssey*, *Inferno*, and *Moby-Dick*, which are hardly postmodern texts. (Please note, I am not one of those people who try to extend “postmodernism across the ages” [the actual title of a 1993 collection of essays]; I don’t mean to say that what Jameson has called “that new spatiality implicit in the postmodern” can be simply read into earlier texts.)<sup>3</sup> I do think that a geocritical approach, one that is informed by and reflects upon recent spatial or geographical theories, can be used to good effect in producing novel interpretations and analyses of older texts (as well as new ones), but that’s not entirely my point either.

I also want to distinguish, as best as I can, between the attention to space, place, and mapping that might be associated with geocriticism and the more traditional and yet still spatially oriented aspects of literary studies. Indeed, attention to space and place is nothing new to literature, as distinctive settings, region, landscape, or other pertinent geographical features are often crucial to the

---

<sup>2</sup> See my “Spatiality’s Mirrors: Reflections on Literary Cartography.” *Journal of English Language and Literature* 61.4 (2015), 557–576.

<sup>3</sup> See Bill Readings and Bennet Schaber, eds., *Postmodernism Across the Ages: Essays for a Postmodernity that Wasn’t Born Yesterday* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1993); Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), 418.

meaning and the effectiveness of literary works. Whole genres may be defined by such spatial or geographical characteristics, such as the pastoral poem, the travel narrative, utopia, or the urban exposé. Innumerable other examples across literary history, criticism, and theory could be cited.

I could argue that, while space or place is crucial to discussions of setting, regionalism, certain genres, and so on, many of the critical approaches to them acknowledged such spatial features only to then ignore them or to relegate them to a more-or-less passive presence in the background. For instance, the distinctively “Southern” locale of William Faulkner’s or Flannery O’Connor’s stories is unavoidable, but the critical focus of many readings quickly moves on to other matters of character, morality, sexuality, race, on the one hand, or formal considerations like point of view, stream of consciousness, foreshadowing, and so forth on the other. As the authors of a recent study of geography and narratology state, “Space is a relatively neglected dimension of narrative.”<sup>4</sup> But the purported domination of time over space in narrative criticism may be a discussion for another time.

One last caveat: I realize that I use the term *geocriticism* in a different, broader way than Bertrand Westphal does, at least in his book called *Geocriticism*.<sup>5</sup> There he advocates a “geo-centric” approach to literature, contrasting it with the “ego-centric” approaches that focus on an individual writer, for example. Westphal’s geocritic would start with the place, say, a region or a city, then assemble a corpus of texts so as to provide a multifocal, polysensory representation of the place. The corpus might include not only fiction and poetry, but films, travelogues, tourist brochures, architectural studies, urban planning documents, and so on. A key advantage of this method is that, by drawing together many different texts in an interdisciplinary array, one might avoid or minimize personal bias, prejudice, and stereotypes. An obvious problem, one readily acknowledged by Westphal himself, lies in determining what constitutes a valid

---

<sup>4</sup> Marie-Laure Ryan, Kenneth Foote, and Maoz Azaryahu, *Narrating Space / Spatializing Narrative: Where Narrative Theory and Geography Meet* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 2016), p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> See Bertrand Westphal, *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*, trans. Robert T. Tally Jr. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

corpus. How many texts and of what kind do we gather before we can begin to “read” a place? Westphal speaks of the “threshold of representativeness,” but it’s clear that not all would agree on when and where that threshold has been reached. I think that project is fascinating, but I also have no problem looking at Virginia Woolf’s London or Faulkner’s Yoknapatawpha County or C. S. Lewis’s Narnia, just to mention three different fictional places.

## II.

I want to suggest that geocriticism be understood in connection to what I am calling *topophrenia* and *literary cartography*, and together these form a somewhat complex, discontinuous, and recursive set of creative and critical activities, informing each other while maintaining a degree of semi-autonomy. Speaking too loosely, I could place each term in its own distinctive category, but they would perforce bleed into one another in practice. Schematically, the first is existential; the second, poetic; and the third, analytical, interpretive, or evaluative, which is to say, in a word, critical. Put more simply, if not more clearly, they refer to perceiving, writing, and reading, but of course they are all inextricably bound up in the far messier notion of Being.

I hope you’ll forgive the neologism, but I coined the term “topophrenia” partly in response to “topophilia,” a key idea in Gaston Bachelard’s *The Poetics of Space* and the word used by cultural geographer Yi-Fu Tuan as the title of his influential 1974 book.<sup>6</sup> I find the concept of topophilia to be useful, but Tuan’s sunny disposition occasionally leads him to overlook the less pleasant aspects of our experience with space and place. (In fairness, Tuan also wrote a book called *Landscapes of Fear*, so he was well aware of what might be called *topophobia*, which is actually the title of a recent and fascinating phenomenological study by Dylan Trigg.)<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study in Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990 [orig. 1974]).

<sup>7</sup> See Yi-Fu Tuan, *Landscapes of Fear* (New York: Pantheon, 1979); Dylan Trigg, *Topophobia: A Phenomenology of Anxiety* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2016).

Regardless of the terminology used, it seems to me that a crucial consideration of any properly spatial literary studies is the pervasive sense, not only of place, but of place-mindedness, which characterizes both the subjective experience and the artistic representation of places, persons, events, and so forth. I agree with Jameson's understanding of narrative as "the central function or *instance* of the human mind," but I would supplement it with the proposition that any such narrative function be understood as itself a form of mapping, which is what I have in mind with the idea of literary cartography.<sup>8</sup> The dynamic spatiotemporal relations among subject, situation, representation, and interpretation invite critical approaches to literature that are sensitive to the uncertain, often shifting, but always pertinent ways that place haunts the mind.

Hence, I propose *topophrenia* as a provisional label for that condition of narrative, one that is necessary to any reading or writing of a text, in which the persistence of place and of the subject's relation to it must be taken into account. Such place-mindedness is not to be understood as a simplistic relation between a given writer and his or her distinctive place (Henry David Thoreau at Walden Pond, for example), although any careful analysis of such a relationship would almost certainly disclose that things are not really that simple after all (as when, for instance, the topographic lines of, say, Thoreau's *Walden* narrative extend or reach dead-ends, intersect with others, proliferate, combine, and establish new lines entirely). Rather, topophrenia suggests the degree to which *all* thinking is, in various ways, thinking about place, which also means thinking about the relations among places, as well as those among subjects and places, in the broadest possible sense.

In practice, this represents not so much a *geographical unconscious* as it does an existential comportment toward the world.<sup>9</sup> This comportment creates problems as well as opportunities for spatial literary criticism. Topophrenia characterizes the subjective engagement with a given place, with one's sense of place, and with the possible projection of alternative spaces. Moreover, it requires

---

<sup>8</sup> Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Social Symbolic Act* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981), 13, 123.

<sup>9</sup> See Argyro Loukaki, *The Geographical Unconscious* (London: Ashgate, 2014).

us to consider the apparently objective structures and systems which condition our perceptions and experiences of space and place.

Place-mindedness here must be understood to coincide with an entire range of affects, attitudes, conceptions, perceptions, references, and sensibilities that characterize the spatial imagination. In contrast to Tuan's mostly sweet and light *topophilia*, this sensibility or affect is not always pleasant, homely, or secure, but rather takes "place" in a wildly oscillatory but often systemic array of forces that determine the relationship between the subject and the social or even cosmic totality, if you will. Yet any topophrenic condition or attitude is also necessarily open to the delights of space and place, to the play of spatial practices in which we invariably find ourselves both inscribed and inscribing.

The experience of a place is no simple matter. Any proper orientation or "sense of place" is connected to and complicated by a seemingly infinite network of spaces and places that not only serve as shifting points of view or frames of reference but also can affect the situation of the subject itself. A place is apprehended subjectively, but it is also only understandable as such when located within or in reference to a non-subjective or supra-subjective ensemble of spatial relations, sites, networks, circuits, and so on.

In fact, and this brings me to the matter of *literary cartography*, the apprehension of place is bound up in a discursive or narrative ensemble of relations that determine the outcome by implicating the subjective perception and the objective (or non-subjective) thing-in-itself within a tenuous, unstable, and ever-changing system (that of language, for example). If, as Tuan insists, a place is defined in part as a site or a discrete, identifiable segment of space, a portion of space that is imbued with meaning, therefore that is subject to interpretation and thus an appropriate topic for literary criticism, it also needs to be understood that language, the language used to describe and to interpret the place, itself engenders or conditions the place.<sup>10</sup> The place is a text, but one that is necessarily informed, and indeed formed, by other texts as well.

---

<sup>10</sup> Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), 161–162.

By *literary cartography*, I refer to the way that a writer figuratively maps the territories represented in the work in such a way as to provide the reader with a more-or-less useful sense of the world and the subject's relations to it. The map is at once a rather simple tool and a powerful conceptual figure. Everyone already knows what a map is and what it is used for, and yet the map is also a much contested object or metaphor in critical theory and beyond.

Mapping has been associated with empire, social repression, and all manner of ideological programs geared toward manipulating the representations of space for this or that group's political benefit, for example. Mapping has also been viewed as crucial to any sort of liberatory political project, as the need for spatial and social representation makes itself all too apparent amid the potential disorientation and alienation of unmapped territories. At a more basic, existentialist level, mapping is an inevitable (not to say neutral) activity, for the individual subject cannot help but try to orient itself by imagining its position vis-à-vis that of other subjects and in relation to a broader, objective reality. Indeed, notwithstanding the multiple ambiguities attendant to any cartographic enterprise, one might suggest that mapping is an almost essential to our being. I map, therefore I am.

The injunction to map makes itself felt most urgently, perhaps, in situations in which one is lost, desperately seeking guideposts or markers that can identify one's place in relation to other places. To call for a map or to demand that someone engage in mapping is to recognize one's own disorientation, one's displacement in space, or one's loss of a sense of place, which is undoubtedly alienating if not also terrifying. The spatial anxiety associated with being lost, somewhat like the *Angst* that accompanies the existential condition à la Heidegger and Sartre, brings with it a visceral awareness of place and space, which might otherwise be taken for granted or left safely tucked away in the unconscious.

The sudden need to map, or at least to have access to a map, propels to the fore that *topophrenia* that remains with us at all times, a constant and uneasy "place-mindedness" which characterizes the subject's interactions with his or her environment, which is itself so broadly conceived as to include the lived space of any given personal experience (the stroll about the shopping mall, for example) as

well as the abstract space whose true representation is beyond any one individual's ken (a larger national, international, or ultimately universal space of a "world system"). But although it may be experienced most keenly in those moments of disorientation, the fact is that a persistent place-mindedness as well as a need to map are constant features of our existence.

Topophrenia characterizes nearly all human activity, as a sense of place—not to mention matters of displacement and replacement, of movement between places and overs spaces, and of the multifarious relations among place, space, individuals, collectivities, events, and so on—is an essential element of thought, experience, and being. Along those lines, it is worth noting that merely to think of a place is already to be mapping. This *cartographic imperative* lies at the heart of the spatial imagination. We are always mapping, whether we are aware of it or not.

### III.

Perhaps it goes without saying, the map is a metaphor, of course, but it is no less powerful for being figurative. Indeed, I would say that it is *only just* metaphorical, since the spatial imagination which is both the motive and the basis for the project of literary cartography is necessarily connected to the "real" spaces, to geography and architecture, for instance, as well as to the imagined spaces that constitute the world, whether conceived of as the social sphere, a continent, the planet, or the universe. A holistic view of spatiality informs my sense of topophrenia, as well as the projects of literary cartography in narrative and geocriticism in reading, since the spaces and places involved must also be considered in their persistently real, imagined, and "real-and-imagined" states (to cite Ed Soja's famous expression).<sup>11</sup>

If mapping be partly metaphorical, therefore, it still has its literal force in the fact that spatiality is a fundamental aspect of our own being. Moreover, although it cannot be denied that a certain cartographic imperative or mapping project lies at the heart of human experience and aesthetic representation across different

---

<sup>11</sup> See Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

historical moments, it does seem to me that different historical and social formations have produced distinctive spatial organizations, as Henri Lefebvre has maintained,<sup>12</sup> in which case certain times and places have likely called for a greater attention to or awareness of problems of spatial representation or orientation than others. Consequently, levels of cartographic anxiety may vary depending on one's historical, social, and spatial situation, and the need to produce figural maps may be more or less urgent.

As noted earlier, many prominent critics have pointed out that ours is, and has been for some time now, an epoch of enhanced spatiality. The so-called "spatial turn" in the humanities and social sciences in recent years is partly the result of this heightened sense of the importance of space, place, and mapping to these fields in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

Jameson's idea of "cognitive mapping" was developed in part to deal with this aspect of the present, he called it "postmodern," condition. Jameson has conceded that *cognitive mapping* was really a code word for "class consciousness," but it was nevertheless to be understood as a form of consciousness especially suited to "that new spatiality implicit in the postmodern."<sup>13</sup> He goes on to explain that the figure of the map "retains the advantage of involving concrete content (imperialism, the world system, subalternity, dependency and hegemony), while necessarily involving a program of formal analysis of a new kind (since it is centrally defined by the dilemma of representation itself)."<sup>14</sup> Indeed, whether the map be considered as a literal form or as a figure for the sort of narrative representation I have in mind in my use of the term *literary cartography*, the flexibility and effectiveness of mapping make it an exemplary model for literary and cultural studies, if not for the humanities and social sciences *tout court*.

Inasmuch as humans are political animals in Aristotle's definition, we are also storytelling animals. All narratives may be taken as forms of literary

---

<sup>12</sup> See Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).

<sup>13</sup> Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 417–418.

<sup>14</sup> Jameson, *The Geopolitical Aesthetic: Cinema and Space in the World System* (Bloomington, IN, and London: Indiana University Press and The British Film Institute, 1992), 188–189.

cartography, for in telling stories, we orient ourselves and others with respect to place and space, not to mention moments in time, and we produce dynamic, multiform, and protean cartographies. A geocritical approach to reading these narrative maps enables us to sense more emphatically the ways that space, place, and mapping condition our lives, attitudes, thoughts, and experiences, as well as our more critically distant claims to knowledge about them. As Frank Kermode once said, it is not for critics to help us make sense of our lives—that is the burden of the poets and other creative writers—but merely “to attempt the lesser feat of making sense of the ways we try to make sense of our lives.”<sup>15</sup> In our time, after the “spatial turn,” geocritics, spatially oriented critics, and others working in the spatial humanities can offer new interpretations, analyses, and evaluations of these ways of making sense or giving form to our lives. By paying particular attention to the spatial imagination, its motivations and its results, we may come to see the world, and ourselves, in interesting new ways.

#### IV.

This is where I see *geocriticism*, broadly conceived, as being particularly effective in our own time, a moment in which the spatiotemporal relations and the crises of representation once associated with modernity or even postmodernity have become ever more complicated. I do not wish to indulge in romantic visions of the past, but I do hold to Lefebvre’s idea of the historical production of social spaces, as well as to the spatial history of Fernand Braudel or later Immanuel Wallerstein in attempting to limn the contours of an emergent world system, along with Foucault, Jameson, Westphal, and others who have drawn connections between the existential experience of the individual subject with the structural conditions beyond one’s ken that affect it.

For a variety of reasons having to do with geopolitics, transnational commerce and other economic matters, financialization, telecommunications, transportation, “high” technology, and other things, a certain cartographic anxiety

---

<sup>15</sup> Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 3.

(as Derek Gregory has called it) and a heightened sense of space does seem typical of the present epoch of late capitalism, postmodernism, the age of globalization, to name a few of the popular labels intended to name the present system.<sup>16</sup> It becomes more difficult to make sense of, or give form to, the world as it exists and as we experience it, two registers that do not neatly find themselves aligned, as “the truth of [one’s] experience no longer coincides with the place where it takes place” (to cite Jameson again).<sup>17</sup> In view of this, a profoundly critical—and, given the enhanced sense of the spatial and geographic registers, it is only right that it be *geo-critical*—approach to our experience and our world seems fitting.

I have three related reasons for saying this. First, drawing on Tuan’s definition of *place* with respect to *space*, the former lies squarely within the disciplinary bailiwick of literary studies, since place is understood by Tuan to be endowed with meaning and subject to interpretation, and literary criticism (among other practices) takes interpretation, along with analysis and evaluation, to be central to its mission.<sup>18</sup> Geocriticism, with its heightened attention to matters of space, place, and mapping is all the more well suited to this task.

Second, as Jameson has pointed out, criticism—in its focus on language and its attention to the need to interpret—allows us to deal more effectively with the complexities of our current condition:

no society has ever been quite so mystified in quite so many ways as our own, saturated as it is with messages and information, the very vehicles of mystification. [...] But above and beyond the sheer fact of mystification, we must point to the supplementary problem involved in the study of cultural or literary texts, or in other words, essentially, of narratives: for even if discursive language were to be taken literally, there is always, and constitutively, a problem about

---

<sup>16</sup> See Derek Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).

<sup>17</sup> Jameson, *Postmodernism*, 411.

<sup>18</sup> I maintain that interpretation, of one form or another, is a crucial element of literary criticism or even of literary studies in general, even as this view has come under increasing attack in recent years by advocates of a “post-critical” approach to literature. See, e.g., Rita Felski, *The Limits of Critique* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

the “meaning” of narratives as such.<sup>19</sup>

The narrative maps produced through literary cartography are equally subject to hermeneutic investigation, even as they also serve as means by which to interpret the underlying spaces they endeavor to represent.

And third, I cite Northrop Frye’s impassioned defense and presentation of literary criticism as a means of educating the imagination.<sup>20</sup> If the study of literature produces an educated imagination, then the spatially-oriented study of literature, attuned to literary cartography and geocritical inquiry, can only strengthen the spatial imagination, a faculty all too necessary for making sense of our place, our world, and therefore also ourselves.

## V.

So it makes sense that literature or literary studies occupies a privileged position in both spatiality studies and in our lives. If I have not really discussed a clear methodology for a topophrenic or geocritical reading practice, it is partly because I believe that, in practice, the most effective forms of geocriticism would necessarily embrace a number of different perspectives, methods, theories, and approaches, which in turn might depend upon strategic choices and local conditions. Claude Lévi-Strauss’s *bricoleur* remains apt figure for the geocritic, particularly if we understand (as did Derrida) that the engineer must engage in *bricolage* no less than any other.<sup>21</sup> Along those lines, I continue to marvel at the innovative and exciting ways that critics in recent years have analyzed wide varieties of cultural texts, and I wouldn’t want to prescribe any particular way of

---

<sup>19</sup> Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 60–61. Needless to say, perhaps, that a “literal” interpretation is still a kind of interpretation, as literary texts and the language of which they are made do not simply conform to an objective set of facts, but require ways of reading.

<sup>20</sup> See Northrop Frye, *The Educated Imagination* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964).

<sup>21</sup> See Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*, trans. anon. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 16–18. Lévi-Strauss distinguishes between the *bricoleur*, who by necessity makes do with materials at hand, and the *engineer*, who meticulously plans out a project in advance. Jacques Derrida, in “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences,” notes that the engineer cannot stand outside discourse like some theological entity, but must also deal with materials at hand; thus, “the engineer is a myth produced by the *bricoleur*” (285). See Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 278–294.

reading, even if I could. I suppose that, in my own case, I remain very much a Marxist critic of the Jamesonian sensibility, insofar as I think that various means by which different critics arrive at this or that conclusion may offer further insight into our attempts to make sense of the “big picture” that can only emerge through the painstaking processes of connecting the disparate strands into a cognizable whole.

Similarly, the sort of topophrenic or geocritical approach I have in mind would underscore the significance of spatiality, of space and place, but not to the exclusion of other factors that make up the objective conditions and the subjective perceptions that, combined, shape the world we live in. We are always *situated*, always “in the midst,” and therefore always mapping, but the maps we produce, as well as analyze and evaluate, are themselves provisional, tentative, and subject to constant modification. In giving form to the spaces and places of both our experience and our imagination, we help to establish the contours our own world and to speculate upon protentional alternatives, which necessarily combines the realistic and the utopian dimensions of the cartographic imagination.

All of that said, I am also loathe to end on too triumphal or hyperbolic a note, as I think we all have by now become weary of literary critics making outrageous claims for the moral or social benefits of this or that methodology. “Never believe that a smooth space will suffice to save us,” warn Deleuze and Guattari, after all.<sup>22</sup> If a geocritical approach to works of literature and culture were to offer nothing other than some new, different, and interesting interpretations of this or that text, or maybe provide analytical frameworks for future studies, then that would by itself be worthwhile, without a doubt. If geocriticism can do even more, so much the better. Given what I take to be our fundamentally topophrenic condition, with a sort of cartographic imperative underwriting the concomitant production of literary maps, and the urgency with which we are confronted with spatiotemporal perplexities in our present situation, I think the geocritical approach is well-suited to our present moment, and I look forward to seeing what insights and alternative visions may be disclosed by the geocritical readings to come. Above all, I’m looking forward to

---

<sup>22</sup> Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 500.

seeing what the new maps will show us, not only about the spaces rendered upon their figured surfaces but about the mapmakers as well.

Thank you.

Received 25/07/2018  
Accepted 30/07/2018