

Introduction

A simple question lies at the heart of this book: to what extent do we map as we read? How essential a part of the experience of a literary work is the way in which we spatialise, and visualise (externally or internally) the place and space of the fictional world? *Reading and Mapping Fiction* provides an integrated account of the relationship between maps and texts as part of the totality of meaning for the literary work. The core argument of this study is that this activity, whatever it is called – mapping, diagramming, visualising, spatialising – is a vital and intrinsic part of how we experience literature, and of what makes it so powerful.

Rather than centring a method of mapping on the referential relationship between real-world geography and fictional place and space, as previous influential incarnations of literary mapping have tended to do, this book offers a fully dynamic interpretation of fictional map and text for the twenty-first century. The primary focus of the study is on the juxtaposition of visual and verbal representations of the same fictional world where a map is explicitly present. The book is thus about ‘Reading’ and ‘Mapping’ in a way that repeatedly moves across and between those two acts and applies *both* to both forms of representation (*reading* fictional maps and *mapping* fictional texts). It focuses primarily upon fictional place and space rather than adopting a larger definition of ‘the literary’ that might include forms in which maps with real-world correspondence are present (e.g. the memoir; travel writing). In such works the maps function differently and readerly perception is likely to be more highly predetermined by real-world geography. In contrast, this study is primarily focused on representations of imaginary place and space; on authorial mapping of that imaginative space in composition; and on the integration of map and text by the reader.

In terms of method, *Reading and Mapping Fiction* combines conceptual thinking about literary spatiality and the interconnections of the fields of literature, geography and cartography, with a literary-historical account of the evolution of the fictional map over time and its emergence in popular genres. The *conceptual focus* is informed primarily by the dominant critical cartographic mode of the current period that enables us to read *against* the map. The *historical focus* provides a broad overview of literary and

historical map history from the medieval period up to the late nineteenth century (the point at which literary maps proliferate across new forms of fiction). Whilst these two imperatives could be seen to be in tension with one another, it is to be hoped that this is a fertile tension that brings forth fruit. Close analysis of particular examples opens up thinking about meaning in relation to a specific text or author, on the one hand, while, on the other, the larger nature of the genre is able to be understood spatially in a new way, in and through the specific example. The method thus works in both directions, moving from the inside out (e.g. enlarging from analysis of an influential map in the first work of a new genre) and from the outside in (starting with the emerging genre and moving to analysis of map examples within it). The study is original and innovative primarily because of its strong focus upon empirical maps in relation to genres, but also in bringing together a number of different critical frames (literary-critical and theoretical; historical; critical-cartographic; cognitive) in order to create a model of interdisciplinary interpretation based in literary studies that reaches towards and draws upon other disciplines.

Prior to the twenty-first century, there were few critical studies in the field of literary mapping. Three early collections of fictional maps first stimulated my interest: *An Atlas of Fantasy* by J. B. Post; *Language of the Land* by Martha Hopkins and Michael Buscher; and *You Are Here* by Katharine Harmon.¹ The most famous critical-theoretical intervention into the field, and, again, one that drew me into it, is that of Franco Moretti with a series of key publications in the late 1990s and early twenty-first century.² As we shall see in Chapter 1 (and in Chapter 8 in relation to digital mapping), the work of Moretti (individually and as part of the Stanford

¹ J. B. Post, *An Atlas of Fantasy* (1973), rev. ed. (New York: Ballantyne Books, 1979); Martha Hopkins and Michael Buscher, *Language of the Land: The Library of Congress Book of Literary Maps* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1999); Katharine Harmon, *You Are Here: Personal Geographies and Other Maps of the Imagination* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2004). See also Alberto Manguel and Gianni Guadalupi, *The Dictionary of Imaginary Places* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. Ltd, 1980). More recent studies of a similar sort include: Peter Turchi, *Maps of the Imagination: The Writer as Cartographer* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 2004); Huw Lewis-Jones, *The Writer's Map: An Atlas of Imaginary Lands* (London: Thames & Hudson, 2018); and John Sutherland, *Literary Landscapes: Charting the Real-Life Settings of the World's Favourite Fiction* (London: Modern Books, 2018). Another early readerly-focused work from the field of cartography that influenced this study was Phillip C. Muehrcke with Juliana O. Muehrcke, *Map Use: Reading, Analysis and Interpretation* (Madison, WI: J. P. Publications, 1978).

² Franco Moretti's three most directly relevant books here are *Atlas of the European Novel: 1800–1900* (London: Verso, 1998); *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History* (London and New York: Verso, 2004); and *Distant Reading* (London: Verso, 2013).

LitLab) and of the Moretti-inspired digital mapping projects led by Barbara Piatti is highly innovative for its time, but also presents certain limitations, particularly in terms of its disciplinary value to literary studies.³

Since 2010, interest in both popular and academic literary mapping has considerably increased. There has been a recent surge in essay collections at the intersection between literature and geography/cartography, with three substantial edited books published since 2014 and strong impetus also provided by Robert Tally's 'Geocriticism and Spatial Literary Studies' series with Palgrave Macmillan.⁴ Of the three edited collections, Tally's *Literary Cartographies* has the strongest focus, reflecting his own particular double-take on 'literary cartography' in which the term 'mapping narratives' (the title of his introduction) signals that narrative is both something to map *with* and to *be* mapped. So 'in mapping a place one also tells a story' (2) but 'all spaces are necessarily embedded with narratives' (2). Anders Engberg-Pedersen's collection, *Literature and Cartography*, is centred upon the 'productive tension' (15) between the two fields. However, when we look across the contents of these collections as a whole, we find a strong tendency towards what Emmanuelle Peraldo calls 'a transdisciplinary global debate' (4) that celebrates 'plurality' and 'multi-focal perspectives' (6). This makes a virtue of necessity but cannot quite hide a problem of ever-expanding definitions and boundaries for the field. Engberg-Pedersen, for his part, addresses this problem directly: 'literary studies is faced with a ubiquity problem' but 'the problem is not restricted to the literary field . . . [there is] general overuse of the terms mapping and remapping' (19). His solution – to remember that maps 'guide us and lead us astray at the same time' (19) – is one that I wholeheartedly embrace in this volume. The organisation of Engberg-Pedersen's edition into three sections – relating to theory and method; history and context; and genre and theme – also compares to the dominant approaches employed in this book.

³ See <https://litlab.stanford.edu> and www.literaturatlas.eu/en/. Barbara Piatti et al. also have a number of influential papers, such as 'Mapping Literature: Towards a Geography of Fiction', in *Cartography and Art*, ed. W. Cartwright, G. Gartner and A. Lehn (Berlin: Springer, 2009), 1–16.

⁴ See Robert T. Tally Jr, 'Introduction: Mapping Narratives', in *Literary Cartographies: Spatiality, Representation and Narrative*, ed. Robert T. Tally (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 1–12; Emmanuelle Peraldo, 'The Meeting of Two Practices of Space', in *Literature and Geography: The Writing of Space throughout History*, ed. Emmanuelle Peraldo (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016) 1–19; Anders Engberg-Pedersen, 'Introduction: Estranging the Map: On Literature and Cartography', in *Literature and Cartography: Theories, Histories, Genres*, ed. Anders Engberg-Pedersen (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2017), 14–32.

Any similarity between Engberg-Pedersen's position and my own may be in part because they are both implicitly aligned with that of Christian Jacob. In his monumental study *The Sovereign Map*, Jacob approaches the map as:

a dynamic process whose effects, power and meanings are to be found at the crossroads of production and reception, of encoding and decoding, of intentions and expectations.⁵

The need for a multiple approach is fully articulated by Jacob:

From this double evolution, historical and theoretical, we can see that the map has become an opaque object that calls attention to itself. Representational strategies are now considered, with the result that maps have lost their 'innocence'. (6)

Although it is not his primary focus, Jacob's discussion of imaginary maps in terms not only of the gaze but also the non-referentiality of fictional mapping is worth consideration (272–95) and he helpfully suggests that 'cartographical fiction probably constitutes a good point of departure for the study of mechanisms of authority that belong to maps . . . and the social convention that grounds their referential links' (272).

Emerging out of such positions, *Reading and Mapping Fiction* could be understood to participate in a second phase for the field that involves a more dynamic model able to both analyse and critique the map in relation to the text and to adapt cartographic concepts more broadly to the interpretation of literary forms and narrative structures. Two recent publications draw close to this one. The first is John Wyatt's *Imaginary, Historical and Actual Maps in Literature* (2013).⁶ This offers a thorough and comprehensive survey of a wide range of maps from the medieval period onward, including real-world mapping of the Lake District and the Ordnance Survey as well as covering most famous authorial map-makers. The book is divided into three parts: the first covering books of distant lands; the second, maps made in a literary context; the third considering how social change affects the map, particularly in city spaces. For the most part, however, Wyatt's work functions uncritically at a level of information and description, rather than analysis, and does not seek to advance a critical argument.

⁵ Christian Jacob, *The Sovereign Map: Theoretical Approaches in Cartography throughout History*, ed. Edward H. Dahl, trans. Tom Conley (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), xv.

⁶ John Wyatt, *The Use of Imaginary, Historical and Actual Maps in Literature* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2013).

The second study is Christina Ljungberg's *Creative Dynamics* (2012).⁷ Ljungberg approaches the study of literary maps from a similar starting point to my own – with an interest in how such maps are *read* – and, superficially, the contents of my study partly overlap with hers. Ljungberg's interest is in the connection between 'thinking cartographically' and 'thinking diagrammatically and reading diagrammatically' (1). Thus, her focus is also on the dynamic between visual and verbal forms of interpretation. She asserts:

The insertion of spatial diagrams into the verbal text produces a creative interplay between the verbal and the visual narrative which is generated by the juxtaposition of the two media. Shifting between them [are] attentive readers . . . (3)

We are both interested in the same performative relationship at the heart of a text – the relationship between reading and mapping. However, it is worth noting that her book is published in a series entitled 'Iconicity in Language and Literature' and, as this implies, is strongly informed by Peircean semiotics. In contrast, it might be said that my primary interest is in the literary work as a totality and in the complex interactions between the meaning of the text and of the image working together for the reading of literature. Where Ljungberg's focus is 'on the processes involving diagrammatic thought' (3), mine is centred on developing an integrated literary-critical method of interpretation for the experience of full spatial and material meanings in the text.

* * *

It is necessary to consider the nature and function of a map for a work of literature. We can start quite simply by asking: what is a map? The *OED* defines it as:

a drawing or other representation of the earth's surface or a part of it made on a flat surface showing the distribution of physical or geographical features . . . also a plan of the format or layout of something, as a route, a building, etc.⁸

A second influential definition, in the 'Preface' to the first volume of the *History of Cartography* edited by Harley and Woodward, offers an

entirely new definition of 'map', one that is neither too restrictive nor yet so general as to be meaningless. What has eventually emerged is a simple formulation: Maps

⁷ Christina Ljungberg, *Creative Dynamics: Diagrammatic Strategies in Narrative* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012).

⁸ Oxford English Dictionary Online: www.oed.com.ezproxy.lanacs.ac.uk/view/Entry/113853. Accessed 17 April 2019.

are graphic representations that facilitate a spatial understanding of things, concepts, conditions, processes, or events in the human world.⁹

Finally, Christian Jacob builds upon the findings of critical cartography to assert that:

A map is defined perhaps less by formal traits than by the particular conditions of its production and reception . . . [I]n a problematic mixture, it combines the transparency of referential illusion with the opacity of a medium that materializes the geographic image. (21)¹⁰

What all these descriptions make clear is that the term ‘map’ can essentially cover any visual attempt to represent relative or absolute relations in space. This study will assume such a broad definition in its use of the term.

For *literary* mapping, secondary activities implicit in map-reading are likely to include: viewing the world from multiple perspectives; the relative situating of objects in space; the unfolding of a route; the locating of the self in relation to other people and places; a sense of ‘mapping things out’ (in relation to the fictional world, movements of characters or the literary work). How then can we describe a *literary* map? I would define it as:

a representation of spatial relations between places, people or objects (real or imagined) that corresponds *visually* to the world that the text purports to represent *verbally*.

Such a map is authorial if it appears at the time of first publication, but there may also be post-authorial maps created subsequently over time, and certain texts (e.g. Dante’s *Inferno*) seem to demand and generate such maps. For the purposes of this study, my focus is primarily on *fictional* maps.

Recent critics have attempted to determine a range of map-types for literature that allow for the relationship between verbal, visual and material elements.¹¹

⁹ J. B. Harley and David Woodward, ‘Preface’, in *History of Cartography, Vol. 1. Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), xvi.

¹⁰ Jacob gives a full answer to the question ‘What is a Map?’ in his first chapter (*The Sovereign Map*, 11–102).

¹¹ See also Tania Rossetto’s summary of different kinds of literary cartography in ‘Theorizing Maps with Literature’, *Progress in Human Geography* 38 (2014): 513–30; 515–16; and Ryan’s taxonomy of narrative cartography (referenced in Rossetto as well): Marie-Laure Ryan, ‘Toward a Visual Narratology’, in *What is Narratology? Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*, ed. T. Kindt and H. H. Muller (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter and Co., 2003), 333–64.

Robert Stockhammer (as summarised by Ryan, Foote and Azaryahu) identifies four kinds of relationship:

1. Map precedes the text.
2. Author draws maps during writing.
3. Publisher puts a map in second or third edition.
4. Map is drawn by readers and critics.¹²

These are fairly broad categories, centred upon the relative temporality of map production and authorship – although the question of *when* the map was produced *does* bear directly upon meaning. For example, the primary concern of this study is with the integration of meaning across and between visual and verbal forms, with the result that the focus is primarily on authorial (or authorially approved) maps that appear alongside the text from the first edition onward. Such maps are likely to be more fully integrated with the spatial dimensions of the work than a later post-authorial map.

A second, more comprehensive, categorisation is given by Matthew Graves who distinguishes between:

Para-textual maps: the frontispiece or appended map as an ideographic emblem which prefigures the text

Intra-textual maps: maps which are embedded in the narrative, intradiegetic place-markers

Intertextual maps: which refer to an external geography, referential or imaginary

Logo-textual maps: word maps or narrated maps that are pure text, bereft of graphic form.¹³

Graves's categories are of considerable relevance since they are centred upon the problematic nature of representation and reference and include both paratext and visual/verbal forms. His inclusion of verbal descriptions as 'language constructions whose spatial extension is left to the imagination of the reader' is directly relevant to the last two chapters of this book.¹⁴

¹² Marie-Laure Ryan, Kenneth Foote and Maoz Azaryahu, *Narrating Space / Spatializing Narrative: Where Narrative Theory and Geography Meet* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2016), 59. From Robert Stockhammer, *Kartierung der Erde, Macht und Lust in Karten und Literatur* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2007), 63.

¹³ Matthew Graves, 'Maps and Texts: Reading Literary Maps – The Case of *The Riddle of the Sands*', *Trans* 16.9.6 (July 2006), Internet-Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften (Knowledge Networking in Cultural Studies): www.inst.at/trans/16Nr/09_6/graves16.htm. Graves has 'Intertextual' as a subcategory within 'Intratextual' but they seem to me to be distinct.

¹⁴ Graves, 'Maps and Texts'.

Finally, Marie-Laure Ryan in ‘Toward a Visual Narratology’ provides a full attempt to define and classify different kinds of space relevant to the generation of ‘concrete visual maps’ (335) as an integral part of the text. She denotes: the space of production; the represented space of the text; spatial form; the space of the reader; the material place and space of the book (335). Ryan then classifies maps (in a way that can be cross-referenced to these spaces) as either: internal – ‘designed by an author or illustrator as part of the interface between the text and the reader’ (336) – or external: ‘designed by readers . . . usually critics’ and ‘in rare cases . . . also . . . drawn by authors themselves as an aide to the imagination’ (336). Such a division loosely corresponds to that between writerly/readerly maps and partly anticipates the primary division between inward-facing or outward-facing maps positioned on the threshold of the paratext, as discussed below.

It is essential to consider what might be unique about *maps for literature* as opposed to any other kind of map. As this study will go on to illustrate, there are three primary characteristics that I would identify as fundamental to the literary map: the expository nature of the map/text relationship; the map as a spatial visualisation of a sequential narrative; the double-facedness of the map.¹⁵ I want to dwell a little more on each of these here. A map is a thing of use; what appears on (and is left off) a map – and thus what we understand a map to be – is determined by anticipated audience and function. For *literary* maps, the existence of a map *alongside* a text naturally leads to the assumption that its main purpose (or use value) is one of visual elucidation of spatial elements in the written text. As such it is highly likely to be considered as secondary to the text and expository in nature.

Mark Monmonier’s account of just such a relationship for maps in academic texts in *Mapping It Out* proves helpful.¹⁶ The purpose of exposition is to explain or describe something more clearly; so the presentation of a map alongside a text in a scholarly work (for example, maps of battlefields, or naval battles, in a history text) operates fairly straightforwardly as a visual aid that clarifies a verbal account centred upon multiple complex movements in relation to a core event. In considering the power

¹⁵ A fictional map is also a literary map, but a literary map need not be fictional. Since my main focus is on fictional maps, I use both terms more or less interchangeably.

¹⁶ Mark Monmonier, *Mapping It Out: Expository Cartography for the Humanities and Social Sciences* (Chicago, IL, and London: University of Chicago Press, 1997). Monmonier’s book is primarily intended as a bridge between cartography and those working in the humanities who seek to develop visual and spatial approaches.

of the expository map, Monmonier discusses the way in which the linguistic code of the map (words and font types), provides ‘a needed link between the cartographic symbols and the natural language of authors and readers’ (93). Monmonier argues that when a map and text occur alongside each other, the words on the map have a particular function:

Words that reflect the author’s ideas and terminology are needed to tie the map to the written text and to integrate the structurally diverse realms of cartographic and literary representation. (93)

This suggests that, in terms of the system of codes on the literary map, the linguistic code is likely to be of heightened importance. It is worth remembering, then, that we do always *literally* ‘read’ the map. A closely related issue is the way in which the map functions in relation to narrative, but also displays narrative elements itself. Monmonier states that: ‘By organizing information chronologically as well as spatially, maps can support a variety of historical narratives addressing long or short periods of time’ (204). The fictional map often *does* attempt to do this in a highly distinctive way, by giving far more text than would ordinarily appear on a map, often added into the boxes intended for the ‘Title’ or ‘Key’ but also linking to major events in the narrative on the map itself.¹⁷ Text on the map describes dramatic events within the narrative and so ties together the hermeneutic codes of map and text as the simultaneity of the map anticipates and stimulates interest in the temporal unfolding of the story. The literary map thus raises questions that *only* the text (and a rereading of the map in the light of the text) can resolve – thus establishing a dynamic temporal relationship between the simultaneity of the map and the sequentiality of the narrative.

Monmonier also makes the important point that the expository map is easily overlooked in favour of the text so that: ‘the first goal of integrative cartography is to get the reader to look at the map’ (242). Literary mapping is a particular form of ‘integrative cartography’ (242) but achieving these goals is not always straightforward, so that a range of explicit and implicit tactics are employed. For maps in academic writing, to ensure that the map fulfils its primary purpose as a thing of use, Monmonier advises that a text needs to explicitly direct its readers towards the map: ‘Expository cartography works best when the author tells the reader to look at the map’ (94). In literary mapping, for certain genres in which the map is presented as

¹⁷ See for example the endpaper map for Arthur Ransome, *We Didn’t Mean to Go to Sea* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937).

part of an apparatus around the text, there is no difficulty with a similar use of explicit instructions by means of footnotes or direction within the text.¹⁸ Elsewhere, readerly use of the map is less directly indicated by proxy (e.g. Jim Hawkins pores over the map of Treasure Island in anticipation of journeying there and so raises anticipation in the reader).

The expository nature of the literary map directly relates to a *second* major feature, mentioned above: its identity as the *spatialisation* of a *sequential* narrative. Historically, a comparable relationship between visual and verbal representational forms finds its starting point in the classical debate initiated by Horace's *Ars Poetica*. As part of an attempt to accord poetry the same degree of careful analysis as the visual arts, Horace makes the famous statement *ut pictura poeisis* ('as is painting so is poetry').¹⁹ From such a perspective, the shared goal of literature and visual art is understood to be representation through imitation of nature (*mimesis*) so that ideas of equivalence underpin aesthetic principles right through to the mid-eighteenth century. A major intervention occurs with Lessing's 'Laocoon: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry' (1766) in which he asserts a *distinction* between the two art forms on the grounds of time and space:

there is this essential difference between them: one is a visible progressive action, the various parts of which follow one another in time; the other is a visible stationary action, the development of whose parts take place in space.²⁰

Lessing goes on to develop a full account of this distinction, affirming that 'succession in time is the province of the poet, co-existence in space that of the artist' (109). This position opens the way for a larger shift from a mimetic to an expressive aesthetics with a consequent redetermining of the visual/verbal relationship analogically in the Romantic period and beyond. Visual and verbal forms of representation are no longer understood to be directly equivalent but now work in a comparable, but fundamentally different way (with the space/time distinction as a key element of that difference).

¹⁸ E.g. in travel writing. For an example within fictional maps, see Erskine Childers's *The Riddle of the Sands: A Record of Secret Service Recently Achieved* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1903). The reader is repeatedly directed back to the maps at the front of the book by means of footnotes or references within the text.

¹⁹ Horace: *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, trans. H. R. Fairclough (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1936), 2.

²⁰ Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry* (1766), trans. Edward Allen McCormick (Baltimore, MD, and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 90.