Tampere University

Jouni Iiskola

BUILDING PARIS

A Geocritical Approach to Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* and George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*

Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences
Master's Thesis
April 2021

ABSTRACT

Jouni Iiskola: Building Paris: A Geocritical Approach to Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* and George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*
Master's Thesis
Tampere University
Master's Program in English Language and Literature
April 2021

In this thesis, I will examine how Paris is represented in Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* (1964) and George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933). Both of the books are autobiographical accounts of the authors' experiences in Paris during the 1920s, but the way the city is represented in them differs significantly. Hemingway's Paris is a Paris of young love, quaint little cafes, and the expatriate artist community written from the perspective of the late 1950s, while Orwell's Paris is one of dirty buildings, meaningless suffering, and people trying to survive in miserable conditions written in the context of the Great Depression. The aim of this paper is to explore differences and similarities in these representations and suggest possible reasons for them. The main theoretical method of analysis is geocriticism as it is presented by Bertrand Westphal in his book *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*. Using Westphal's categories, the analysis is divided into three sections that deal with the authors' different positioning in space, different ways of seeing the flow of time and their own temporal position in it, and how the authors' different yet similar cultural backgrounds affect the way they perceive and segment the city.

The main finding of the study is that even though the structural categories outlined above (space, time, and culture) do not determine the subject of observation in any ironclad manner, their effect is significant enough to produce almost completely different perception of the Parisian city space for the authors. In alignment with geocritical method's main precepts, the study could be further expanded by the addition of new and different viewpoints on Paris like minority perspectives, women's voices, different time periods, or alternative media formats.

Keywords: George Orwell, Ernest Hemingway, Bertrand Westphal, Paris, geocriticism, 1920s, spatial studies, comparative studies, Down and Out in Paris and London, A Movable Feast

The originality of this thesis has been checked using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

TIIVISTELMÄ

Jouni Iiskola: Building Paris: A Geocritical Approach to Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* and George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*
Pro gradu -tutkielma
Tampereen yliopisto
Englannin kielen, kirjallisuuden ja kääntämisen tutkinto-ohjelma
Huhtikuu 2021

Tutkielma tarkastelee, kuinka Pariisi esitetään Ernest Hemingwayn kirjassa *Nuoruuteni Pariisi* (1964) ja George Orwellin kirjassa *Puilla paljailla Pariisissa ja Lontoossa* (1933). Molemmat teokset ovat omaelämäkerrallisia kuvauksia kirjailijoiden kokemuksista Pariisissa 1920-luvulla, mutta heidän tapansa esittää kaupunki kirjoituksissaan eroavat huomattavasti toisistaan. Hemingwayn Pariisi on 1950-luvun lopulla kirjoitettu nuoren rakkauden, pienten kahviloiden ja emigranteista koostuvan taitelijayhteisön kaupunki, kun taas Orwellin Pariisi on likaisten rakennusten, tarpeettoman kärsimyksen ja surkeissa oloissa elävien ihmisten kaupunki, jonka kuvaus on kirjoitettu 1930-luvun laman kontekstissa. Tämän opinnäytetyön päämäärä on tarkastella yhtäläisyyksiä ja eroavaisuuksia näissä kaupunkia kuvaavissa representaatioissa sekä pohtia mahdollisia syitä niille. Olennaisin käytetty teoreettinen metodi on Bertrand Westphalin kirjassaan *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces* esittämä geokritiikki. Westphalin asettamia kategorioita käyttäen tutkielman analyysi on jaettu kolmeen osioon, joissa käsitellään erikseen Orwellin ja Hemingwayn erilaista sijoittumista tilassa, heidän eri tapojaan suhtautua ajan kulkuun sekä omaan sijaintiinsa ajassa ja heidän yhtä aikaa sekä erilaisen että samanlaisen kulttuuritaustansa vaikutusta kaupunkikuvan syntyyn.

Tutkimuksen olennaisin tulos on, että vaikka edellä mainitut kategoriat (tila, aika ja kulttuuri) eivät väistämättömällä tavalla määrääkään kirjailijoiden esittämien representaatioiden luonnetta, niiden vaikutus on kuitenkin riittävän suuri tuottamaan lähes täysin erilaiset kaupunkikuvat. Geokriittisen lähestymistavan metodologiaa seuraamalla tutkimusta olisi mahdollista jatkaa tuomalla mukaan uusia Pariisin kuvauksia esimerkiksi vähemmistöjen perspektiivien, naisten näkökulmien, toisten aikakausien tai eri mediaformaattien muodossa.

Avainsanat: George Orwell, Ernest Hemingway, Bertrand Westphal, Pariisi, geokritiikki, 1920-luku, tilan tutkimus, komparatiivinen tutkimus, Nuoruuteni Pariisi, Puilla paljailla Pariisissa ja Lontoossa

Tämän julkaisun alkuperäisyys on tarkastettu Turnitin OriginalCheck-ohjelmalla.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Geocriticism 6
  2.1 General precepts 6
  2.2 Transgression and the state of transgressivity 7
  2.3 Spatiotemporality and the stratigraphic vision 8
  2.4 Allogenous viewpoint and the ethnotype 10
3. Dirt and the gutter 14
  3.1 Disgust 14
  3.2 Objects out of place 16
  3.3 Contamination and the abject 18
  3.4. People out of place 22
4. Spatiotemporality and the city space 27
  4.1 Temporal rhythm and being lost 27
  4.2 Nostalgia and reification 32
    4.2.1 Personal nostalgia 32
    4.2.2 Structural nostalgia 35
  4.3 Cognitive mapping 38
5. Allogenous viewpoint and the international dimension 44
  5.1 Ethnotyping the world 44
  5.2 Orientalism and the Western viewpoint 49
    5.2.1 Cultural Orientalism 49
    5.2.2 Racial Orientalism 54
6. Conclusion 59
Works cited 62

1. Introduction

Giving a short overview of the study of space in literary and cultural studies, Krisztina Sărdi states that spatiality has re-emerged as a point of significant interest during the last few decades, and with the rise of postmodernism during the post-World War II era literary scholarship has turned its attention more intensively towards such things as space and geography in what has since come to be termed as the spatial turn (18). Space has, of course, always existed in the physical sense and later also as an object of study, but its pre-eminence in critical thought has been waxing and waning from the early modern period to the present. However, if the 19th century was dominated by history and the temporal side of things, the balance has indeed shifted in recent decades more towards greater equilibrium with the reweighting of spatial concerns (Tally, *Spatiality*, 11-12, 17). This spatial turn has brought to the fore some new theoretical questions, and as David Harvey writes, “How we represent space and time in theory matters, because it affects how we and others interpret and then act with respect to the world” (205).

Indeed, one such question would be what exactly is the relationship between the referent and its representation? If indeed “[t]he phrase ‘representation of reality’ might be used to describe the goals of both literature and cartography” (Tally, *Spatiality*, 59), then how does this representation happen and what is the relationship between it and the “real” world? The old idea of the text straightforwardly mirroring what it describes seems by now hopelessly inadequate and outdated, but so does the simplified post-modernist view of texts simply referring to other texts with no concrete link to the “real” world. This paper will approach the question of referentiality through a method of *geocriticism* as it is presented by Bertrand Westphal in his book *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*. Westphal writes:

> The first premise of geocritical theory states that time and space share a common plan, subject to an entirely oscillatory logic whereby the fragmentary ceases to be oriented to a coherent whole. Postmodern temporality is characterized by isotropy, which is the scientific name of this systemic indeterminacy, and this isotropy is then extended to the spatial representation. […] The second premise of geocriticism is that the relationship between the representation of space and real space is indeterminate. Rather than considering a spatial or spatiotemporal representation as not "real," we view every representation (whether literary, iconographic, etc.) as referring to a broadly imagined reality that, in and through its extreme extension, is subject to a weak ontology. From these two premises, we understand that space cannot be understood except in its heterogeneity. (37)

Thus, the relationship between the referent and the representation is ambivalent: the referent affects how we imagine the world and how we imagine the world affects how we act upon the referent. Together these contribute to both how the world is imagined in our minds and how it comes into being in the physical sense. The heterogeneity of possible ways to imagine, perceive, and represent the referent means that "[g]eocritical analysis involves the confrontation of several optics that correct, nourish, and mutually enrich each other. Writing of space may always be singular, but the geocritical representation emerges from a spectrum of individual representations as rich and varied as possible" (Westphal, 113). As such, in the geocritical approach there is always more than one viewpoint present, which allows us to get closer to the essence of that particular space even if its absolute capture will at the same time remain impossible due to the near infinite possible ways of viewing and describing it.

Geocriticism is also always specifically a spatially focused method of analysis. Summarizing Westphal, Robert T. Tally Jr. writes that instead of focusing on a particular author or a text the geocritic should "focus instead on the geographical locus itself" around which the analysis is centered and that "[t]his means establishing in advance a particular place to be studied, such as a neighbourhood, a city, a region, or even a country, and then gathering and reading texts that in some way represent it" (*Spatiality,* 141-42). Following these principles, this paper will employ the

geocritical method in a study of Paris as it is represented in Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* and George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*. Westphal asks "[w]hat, indeed, is a place like Paris? A real city, certainly […]. But Paris is also a city that one *thinks* and that one *builds* according to one's readings, without necessarily having traveled there. […] There is the 'image' of Paris that conveys a common culture, that one retains even while sitting at home elsewhere; then there is the city 'in itself,' the 'real' city" (149-50). The French capital is indeed a city with a certain stereotypical image and is "generally regarded as the city of arts, love and lights" (17) as Sărdi puts it in her essay. However, even though *A Movable Feast* and *Down and Out* are both autobiographical accounts of the authors' experiences in Paris during the 1920s, they provide very different pictures of the city, and the choice of this geographical focus and these particular authors will allow us to see how even the same space with a rather distinct and well-established virtual image can still seem almost completely different depending on the viewpoint. As such, the study questions can be formulated as follows:

1) How is Paris represented in Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* and George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London*?
2) What kinds of differences and similarities are found in these representations? What might be the reasons for these?

This study is, of course, rather limited in scope, but the point here is to see how structural differences and similarities in viewpoint manifest themselves in the text and how even something as basic as perception of space can indeed vary along these trajectories. The paper is then not so much interested in individual quirks or randomly appearing elements but in how such structural considerations (or something similar to them) would in a context appropriate form actually come into play with regard to every possible viewpoint. Regarding its own structure, the paper will employ in its analysis a bottom-up approach to the city by starting from the gutter (chapter 3), then

proceeding towards the street level (chapter 4), and finally considering the more national and international aspects of Paris (chapter 5).

In chapter 2, we will take a closer look at the specific geocritical concepts that will be used in our analysis. After introduction, the chapter will divide into three sections that present different theoretical facets of geocriticism, which will also roughly correspond in their usage to the three following analytical chapters. Thus, in chapter 3 we will be focusing on the spatial concept of *transgression* and the way Orwell and Hemingway position themselves in the city. Each chapter will also draw on some theoretical elements outside of geocriticism, and in chapter 3 the main auxiliary concept is dirt as interpreted through Mary Douglas' sociological approach focusing on placement in a system and Julia Kristeva's psychologically oriented approach and theory of the abject. The result is that while both Hemingway and Orwell come from similar middleclass backgrounds, as narrators they position themselves in opposite places. As such, Hemingway's narrative ends up reinforcing the stable, traditional image of Paris from above while Orwell is specifically trying to undermine that picture and produces a much darker and dirtier counterimage from below.

In chapter 4, our focus will shift more towards the effects of time with the geocritical concept of *spatiotemporality* that denotes the idea of time and space always becoming intertwined in any literary representation. The main way this manifests in our primary sources is through the temporal distance the authors have from the era they are describing, and while Orwell put his text together in 1930, Hemingway did so only during the late 1950s. Drawing on Frederic Jameson's ideas as he presents them in *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* the analysis shows that the difference in temporal distance works in two different ways. Firstly, it filters experience through personal nostalgia and the emotional connection to the events that changes its nature as time passes. Secondly, it represents the past through structural nostalgia, which denotes the idea that the concepts through which the 1920s were collectively remembered and imagined

into existence were different in the late 1950s than they were in 1930. As a result, the chaos and uncertainty of the Great Depression era project themselves unto Orwell's map of Paris, while the much more stable period of the late 1950s produces a much more coherent and harmonious picture in Hemingway's description.

In chapter 5, we move on to Westphal's categorization of the different points of view regarding whether the author is insider, outsider, or something in between in relation to the surrounding culture. As an American and a Briton, Hemingway and Orwell would fall into the last of these categories in Paris with their point of view thus being *allogenous* in nature. The chapter will cover how this difference in national backgrounds affects the authors' views but also how hailing from the same general Western cultural sphere affects their narratives. The latter task will also employ Edward Said's concept of *Orientalism* as it is presented in his book with the same name to assist the analysis with the conclusion being that for both Orwell and Hemingway there is a principal division between the East and the West working in the background even if the racially based Orientalism of the 1930s changes into a more culturally based one by the late 1950s. In the concluding chapter, we will produce a brief summary of the results and also some thoughts on what they might mean with regards to the authors studied here and also spatiality studies in general.

2. Geocriticism

2.1 General precepts

In an essay on geocriticism, Peta Mitchell and Jane Stadler state that given "the long history of critical spatial analysis, the term geocriticism is a surprisingly recent coining, arising out of the work of Bertrand Westphal (2007) and Robert T. Tally Jr. (2008)" (54). Westphal and Tally, however, define the term somewhat differently from each other, with Tally explaining geocriticism as a "critical framework that focuses on the spatial representations within the texts [that] would also explore the overlapping territories of actual, physical geography and an author's or character's cognitive mapping in the literary text" ("Geocriticism and Classic American Literature", 4). This is going to be the general theoretical point of view here: to see how Orwell and Hemingway map the physical and socio-cultural spaces of Paris and how crossing different boundaries can make even the same spaces seem almost completely different.

However, for a more concrete approach in terms of methodology, we will turn to Westphal, for whom geocriticism is always a dialectical method. The point of view of a single author or cultural collective – what Westphal calls "egocentered approach" (111) – is abandoned in favor of several different points of view:

> The different aspects of geocriticism are contained *in nuce* in the premises of spatiotemporality, transgressivity, and referentiality. The specificity of geocriticism lies in the attention it pays to a place. The study of the viewpoint of an author or of a series of authors, which inevitably posits a form of identity, will be superseded in favor of examining a multiplicity of heterogeneous points of view, which all converge in a given place, the primum mobile of the analysis. A multifocal dynamic would be required for this analysis. Without hesitation, I would say that multifocalization is the chief characteristic of geocriticism. (Westphal, 122)

The goal of such an approach is to determine "common space, born from and touching upon different points of view" and thus "come closer to the essential identity of the referenced space"

(114). As such, Westphal's geocriticism aims to explore the interface between different representations of a given referential space. While absolute objectivity is, of course, an impossibility, this approach seeks to "transcend the limited (subjective, ethnocentric, self-interested) perspectives of individual authors and the interpretive communities to which they belong" (Prieto, 21), thus producing fuller and more nuanced picture of the space under study. This is the approach I will be using in this paper, and more specific concepts derived from it will be detailed below.

2.2 Transgression and the state of transgressivity

The first geocritical analytical concepts taken up here will be transgression and what Westphal calls a state of transgressivity. He writes about the former in the following manner:

> [S]pace could be examined from a sociopoetic point of view. One would then determine the rules and identify the threshold, the space of movement beyond which would constitute transgression, and one would determine the manner in which these rules would be applied, disregarded, or violated. There are several codes governing the limits: the code of hospitality is one of them. The intersection, or contact zone between social actors, is regulated by explicit rules. These rules assume a shared rhythm, a spatiotemporal correlation. In the absence of a common rhythm, transgression is inevitable. In certain cases, transgression is massive, becoming a deliberate intrusion – hence war, a vast state transgression. Transgression is disparate, perhaps by definition. But it also meets a minimum set of defining criteria. Hence, there can be no transgression without the contravention of a code or rite. (43)

Thus, what Westphal is saying here is that there are certain cultural codes of conduct structuring behavior that people are expected to follow and when they either voluntarily or involuntarily fail to do so it results in a transgression; but that transgression on its own is just an isolated event. However, "[w]hen it is deemed permanent, transgression is not the result of isolated and spontaneous action; it becomes a state" (46). As such, in a state of transgressivity, contravention of the prevailing order becomes the norm, a continuous challenge to the status quo.

To elaborate further on the matter, we can think about it in terms of what Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari have named *smooth space* and *striated space*. Summarizing their

thoughts briefly, Tally writes that striated space is characterized by segmentation, ordering, measurement, and attempts to impose stability, while smooth space is characterized by fluidity of movement and border-crossings (*Spatiality*, 136). However, in the real world these spaces always exist as some kind of hybrids and are less in direct opposition. Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari write that "smooth spaces are not in themselves liberatory. But the struggle is changed or displaced in them, and life reconstitutes its stakes, confronts new obstacles, invents new paces, switches adversaries. Never believe smooth space will suffice to save us" (500). Thus, while the striated space is the space occupied by the state apparatus and the dominant culture, the smooth space slipping away from that control is not necessarily freer in any real sense, it just functions according to different rules. The picture of Paris that Hemingway presents in *A Movable Feast* is one of people knowing their place, straight lines, regimentation, and clarity. The picture in *Down and Out*, on the other hand, is one of creeping chaos, strange behaviors, unfathomable conditions, and aimlessness. The first space is striated, the second one is smooth. The first one notes an occasional transgression; the second is in a state of transgressivity. However, concepts focused more on the spatial side of things like transgression and the state of transgressivity are not alone sufficient for a geocritical approach since space never exists on its own but instead is always also affected by considerations of time through the effects of temporal distance and different temporal rhythms that exist. As such, we will next turn to concepts oriented more towards temporality in order to see how space and time blend together in any narrative.

2.3 Spatiotemporality and the stratigraphic vision

In his 1937 essay "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel", Mikhail Bakhtin wrote on the idea of how time and space are represented in literary artistic works with the help of the concept of chronotope. He defined chronotope by saying that "[w]hat counts for us is the fact that it expresses the inseparability of space and time […]. In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal

indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history" (84). Bakhtin then goes on to give examples of different chronotopes, but what is important for our purposes here is the idea of time and space fusing together in literary representations and that a representation of space is also intrinsically linked to representation of time.

Westphal calls this fusion of time and space spatiotemporality and makes it one of the main features of geocriticism:

> The impact of the temporal factor on the reading of space also depends on the relativity of points of view. Each individual adheres to his or her own temporal regime or to one that is specific to a group or culture […]. The diversity of temporalities that we perceive synchronously in several different spaces, even in a single space, is also expressed in diachrony. Space is located at the intersection of the moment and duration; its apparent surface rests on the strata of compacted time arranged over an extended duration and reactivated at any time. This present time of space includes a past that flows according to a stratigraphic logic. Examining the impact of time on the perception of space is therefore another aspect of geocriticism. (137)

Thus, perception of space is dependent on the observing individual's or group's own location in time and space, and because "space only exists in its temporal strata, geocriticism will have an archaeological – or better, stratigraphic – vocation" (122). The notion of archeological or stratigraphic vocation for geocriticism is also expressed by Tally, who writes that even though the idea of spatial perception changing through history might seem strange to common sense (people have always had eyes), nonetheless, "the historical record discloses that people of different cultures and at different times have indeed perceived space differently" (*Spatiality*, 17-18).

In order to reach the stratigraphic position and to maintain multifocality, texts in a geocritical study should come from different eras since descriptions of the same space from different eras provide different viewpoints. This is, of course, what we have here: Orwell's

description comes from the early 1930s while Hemingway's comes from the late 1950s, and both authors end up reflecting the context of their own time back into the 1920s, affecting the kind Paris they produce in their narratives. As a result, the much more stable period of Hemingway produces a much more stable city with a nostalgic tinge in its description, while the economic collapse and political instability of Orwell's era make his description much more disjointed and chaotic. That being said, as much as there are differences, there also might be some overarching structural similarities present in the authors' narratives. To investigate further this interplay of similarity and difference, we need to expand our interrogation of the Parisian city space to cover the shared yet different cultural backgrounds of the authors and see how it affects the representations they produce.

2.4 Allogenous viewpoint and the ethnotype

To systematize his approach in terms of relating the studied authors' cultural background to their surrounding culture Westphal sets up three categories for geocritical analysis. The first one is the endogenous point of view, which is characteristic to those who know the space they are describing intimately. The second is the exogenous point of view, which is characteristic to those who are almost completely foreign to the space they are describing. Finally, the allogenous point of view is somewhere between these two poles and characteristic to those who are somewhat familiar with the space they are describing but nonetheless remain foreigners in view of the natives (128). Following geocriticism's main principle of multifocalization, the texts under study thus should belong to different categories in this classification, which seems to present us with a problem: both Hemingway and Orwell could be described as people with middle-class background hailing from the general Western cultural area, which would make their descriptions of Paris both fall into the allogenous category. Antoine Eche, however, points out how this does not have to be a problem:

> [I]t is possible to maintain a geocentered approach through the study of varied media such as poetry, travel writing, and cartography as long as they belong to different and identified cultural subbodies. […] Visually speaking, for instance, it is evident that seventeenth-century Dutch painting style differs from the French style of the same period. The question of the referent, among many other things (including the historical development of painting and of its techniques), is crucial here, as those painters would be used to a certain way of looking at space […] a certain light, a different architecture, a certain use of space, and so on. If we had two of these painters to represent the same scene, the result would certainly be different, not just for egotistical reasons but also for cultural ones. (92)

Thus, he is making the case that geocritical method is compatible with works coming from just the allogenous category as long as they adhere to the rule of emerging from different cultural sub-categories. This will allow for two different national viewpoints, even if they are under the general umbrella of Western culture, and Orwell’s British/European viewpoint provides for a different Paris than Hemingway’s American perspective does.

Indeed, as Benedict Anderson already wrote in his *Imagined Communities* in 1983, “The reality is quite plain: the 'end of the era of nationalism,' so long prophesied, is not remotely in sight. Indeed, nation-ness is the most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time” (3). Thus, it might actually be unwise to try to downplay the significance of nation as a concept when analyzing developments in the 20th century, and in terms of geocriticism Westphal writes on the matter this way:

> The monolithic conception of space and its inhabitants is a breeding ground of the stereotype, whereby all definitions are made to square with a collectively fixed scheme. When space is reduced to a particular “territory,” which embodies the spatialization of a political-institutional ensemble held to homogeneity, or to a “nation,” which is a historicization of the ensemble, it is inevitably governed by stereotyping. The territory-nation seems to obey a *logic of belonging* that paradoxically legitimizes exclusion. Indeed, instead of stereotyping, one might be allowed to speak of *ethnotyping*, that is to say, the stereotypical representation of people categorized according to a series of xenotypes, cast in bronze for all time. Under this type of discourse or *doxa*, which piggybacks onto an immutable time, this space is set in a discursive register that is also the register of the stereotype. […] Nationalism and ethnotyping often go together because the nationalist desire, manifest or

> not, sustains selected ethnotypes. The ethnotype reinforces a desirable self-identity (an ameliorative ethnotype) in opposition to neighboring entities, regarded as irrevocably *other* (a pejorative ethnotype). (144)

As such, the idea of the nation generates inside/outside dynamics that in turn produce national stereotypes (the ethnotype), but which particular stereotypes come to be chosen depends on the point of view of the observer. This is already a useful concept for our study, but if we also expand it a little further, we might actually be able to put geocriticism as a methodological approach to a more general test of validity here. That is, if the authors' national background will generate some structural differences as Eche suggested, then the overarching Western cultural background should produce structural similarities in their point of view as well. This approach will be based on Edward Said's concept of Orientalism on which Robert Young writes that "Said's *Orientalism* is directed against the hierarchical dualism of 'West' and 'East'" (141) and that "Orientalism did not just misrepresent the Orient, but also articulated an internal dislocation within Western culture, a culture which consistently fantasizes itself as constituting some kind of integral totality" (139). Thus, both West and East (or Occident and Orient) are semi-imaginary concepts in the sense that they denote a supposed unity where there is actually a large amount of heterogeneity present. Orwell and Hemingway, of course, fall specifically to the anglophone part of the Western cultural area and the West in this paper will be considered roughly as consisting of Western Europe and the North America, but what is actually of greater importance for our analysis is the above-mentioned idea of hierarchical dualism. That is, even if the West and the East are semi-fictional concepts, the divide still has actual effects in the real world and something perceived as Oriental will receive a special form of treatment in Western perception simply by the virtue of falling to that side of the duality. If this is indeed the case, it will allow us to posit more firmly that the observations detailed in this study are not the result of random chance or authorial whim but actually flow from more general

structural reasons and that geocriticism's multifocal approach is indeed essential in attempting to come closer to the identity of any referenced space.

3. Dirt and the gutter

We will begin our exploration of Paris by taking on a spatially oriented way of reading *A Movable Feast* and *Down and Out*. This approach takes us to the dirt and the muck at the very bottom of the city and introduces some of the basic ways Orwell and Hemingway structure and categorize their surroundings especially with regards to what they view as the proper order of things in the world. The main geocritical concept to be used for analysis in this chapter is transgression, though this will be supplemented by other theoretical tools as necessary. As such, we will begin by looking at how dirt and disgust are intrinsically connected and then proceed to define dirt as a concept with help from both Mary Douglas' sociological approach based on systemic ordering and classification of matter and Julia Kristeva's psychological approach based on her theory of the abject. Finally, with these considerations in mind we will take a look at how the authors' own positioning affects their way of seeing Paris as a city and consider possible spatially focused reasons why Orwell's map is to a large extent characterized by chaos and instability while Hemingway's is much more stable and easily legible.

3.1 Disgust

In her book, *Literature of Waste*, Susan Signe Morrison writes that "[t]hose who cannot acquire goods inevitably find that they will be perceived of as waste themselves. Those called 'white trash' threaten from within […]. On the margins of society, 'social trash' like 'bums, gypsies, hobos, loiterers, floppers, moochers, and so on' threaten social stability from without" (68). Patrick Turmel, on the other hand, observes that one of the defining features of a city as public space is the accumulation of unintended consequences that individual actions produce there, and as a result of the public nature of urban space it will always also consist of such things as meetings between strangers from various backgrounds, conflicting attitudes and atmospheres, trash and garbage

thrown on to the streets, sharing of limited spaces, and so on (151). He then goes on to make the case that such externalities – both positive and negative – are an integral part of what makes city a city and that attempting to eliminate them altogether is thus an impossibility. What is important for us here are the negative externalities that these authors point to or more precisely the fact that cities as large congestions of people tend to produce gigantic amounts of what is considered waste and that at the bottom of any society we usually find the gutter, a place where undesirable objects and matter dwell together with undesirable groups and individuals.

But what is waste exactly and why is something considered to be dirty? One qualification would be that it provokes a feeling of disgust through at least one of our senses, or as William Ian Miller puts it, "Disgust and contempt motivate and sustain the low ranking of things, people, and actions deemed disgusting and contemptible" (xiv). As such, we have a self-reinforcing cycle where low rank of things (dirt/waste) provokes disgust and the feeling of disgust assigns these things their low status. This also means that once something gets labeled as dirt it is difficult for it to become labeled anything else ever again. In any case, with this link to disgust in mind let us take a look at Hemingway's and Orwell's general view of Paris presented on the opening pages of their respective books, starting with the latter's description of the street running past the apartment he was renting:

> Quarrels, and the desolate cries of street hawkers, and the shouts of children chasing orange-peel over the cobbles, and at night loud singing and the sour reek of the refuse-carts, made up the atmosphere of the street. It was a very narrow street – a ravine of tall, leprous houses, lurching towards one another in queer attitudes, as though they had all been frozen in the act of collapse. (5)

Here, on the other hand, is Hemingway's description of the street in front of the hotel where he held his working quarters[1]:

[1] The Hemingways seem to have been renting two apartments while they stayed in Paris: one where Ernest worked on his writing and another where he stayed with his family (Tavernier-Courbin, 387).

> All of the sadness of the city came suddenly with the cold rains of winter, and there were no more tops to the high white houses as you walked but only the wet blackness of the street and the closed doors of the small shops, the herb sellers, the stationery and the newspaper shops, and the midwife – second class – and the hotel where Verlaine had died where I had a room on the top floor where I worked. (4)

One might think that the authors are here describing two different districts of Paris, but they are not, and the locations under consideration are actually only a few blocks apart.[2] What Orwell describes in his vision is obviously connected to unsanitary living with its leprous houses and reeking refuse-carts, and this sets the stage for his Paris as being a rather revolting place full of unseemly sights and unpleasant experiences. Hemingway's description, on the other hand, while not being exactly full of wonder with its references to wet blackness and dead people[3], is not something we would consider as disgusting; in some ways gloomy, yes, but not disgusting. This difference between Hemingway's artistic or poetic approach to the city space and Orwell's focus on the gruesome and the disgusting not only sets the tone for the starting pages but in fact runs through their whole writing here. However, in order to probe the possible sources for this difference, we need to further expand our consideration of how things become dirty.

3.2 Objects out of place

The self-reinforcing cycle of disgust and low status is not enough to explain dirt as a category here since we need to determine how something came to be classified as dirty in the first place. When considering our ideas about dirt, we should note that a good deal of it has to do with the target's

---

[2] For fear of getting into trouble, Orwell changed the names of many places in *Down and Out*, but the street where he held his quarters was rue du Pot de Fer (Taylor, 94). Rue Descartes, where Hemingway had his writing studio, is only a few hundred meters away. Hemingway's wife of his Paris years, Hadley, actually points to rue Mouffetard as the location of the studio, but this would simply bring it even closer to Orwell's place (Tavernier-Courbin, 387).

[3] Paul Verlaine was a French poet who lived in the 19th century. This is just one example of Hemingway associating Paris with art and culture and bringing up a sense of significance in terms of cultural history to the environment that is much more lacking in Orwell, who is, of course, specifically working against the traditional artistic image of the city.

placement in a specific order of things. Mary Douglas explains this in her seminal work on the matter, *Purity and Danger*, in the following manner:

> If we can abstract pathogenicity and hygiene from our notion of dirt, we are left with the old definition of dirt as matter out of place. This is a very suggestive approach. It implies two conditions: a set of ordered relations and a contravention of that order. Dirt then, is never a unique, isolated event. Where there is dirt there is system. Dirt is the by-product of a systematic ordering and classification of matter, in so far as ordering involves rejecting inappropriate elements. […] It is a relative idea. (36)

Thus, an important step in understanding dirt is understanding it as something out of place: food on a plate is not dirty, but spattered on the floor it is; a hair attached to the head is not dirty, but in a bowl of soup it is; outdoor things on the yard are not dirty, but laying in the living room they are; and so forth. As such, spaces that conform to our ideas of the proper order are pure, while spaces that contradict these notions are dirty, and what is considered to be the proper order is a relative idea, determined by societal and cultural factors.

To take some simple examples to relate this aspect of dirt to our primary texts, let us first consider a passage from Hemingway where he writes that "[f]or luck you carried a horse chestnut and a rabbit's foot in your right pocket. The fur had been worn off the rabbit's foot long ago and the bones and the sinews were polished by wear" (91). In most cases, carrying around a piece of desiccated animal carcass in your pocket would at best mark you out as a rather strange person, at worst someone who is disgusting and possibly even dangerous. However, an exception to this general rule is provided by the cultural convention regarding a particular piece of rabbit's husk as being somehow able to bring its carrier luck. As such, proper order is maintained, and no reaction of disgust or revulsion is evoked. Similar matter-specific examples of classification and ordering are easy to find in Orwell, though mostly provided from the opposite perspective. Here is his description of the food preservation methods employed by Auberge de Jehan Cottard, a particularly poorly managed restaurant where he worked later during his stay in Paris: "There was

no larder. Our substitute for one was a half-roofed shed in the yard, with a tree growing in the middle of it. The meat, vegetables and so forth lay there on the bare earth, raided by rats and cats" (95). Stored in a proper place, food would not usually evoke reactions of disgust, but placed on the bare earth alongside cats and rats it immediately takes on the property of being repulsive. For both Orwell and Hemingway, the order of things is an important consideration.

3.3 Contamination and the abject

The sociological approach of systemic inclusion and exclusion presented by Douglas, however, does seem to have a certain problem with scope. That is, while being out of place might be a necessary qualification for anything to be labeled as dirt, it is also easy to think of examples where being out of place does not lead to being labeled as dirt. For example, a chair belongs by the table and not in the middle of the room but being in the middle of the room does not on its own make the chair or the room dirty. As such, we will need to add another factor into something being out of place and its capacity to provoke disgust. For this factor, let us turn to Julia Kristeva's psychoanalytical approach to the matter and her theory of the abject.

For Kristeva, the abject is something that is not part of the subject, but at the same time it still contains traces of the subject, making it impossible to classify it as pure object either. This liminal status gives the abject its power to elicit disgust and horror and as Kristeva explains, "The 'unconscious' contents remain here excluded but in strange fashion: not radically enough to allow for a secure differentiation between subject and object, and yet clearly enough for a defensive position to be established […]. As if the fundamental opposition were between I and Other or, in more archaic fashion, between Inside and Outside" (5). About food she specifically writes, "Loathing an item of food, a piece of filth, waste, or dung. The spasms and vomiting that protect me. The repugnance, the retching that thrusts me to the side and turns me away from defilement, sewage, and muck […]. Food loathing is perhaps the most elementary and most archaic form of abjection"

(2). Food is, of course, something that is outside the body, but at the same time it is something that the body needs in order to sustain itself, which also gives it the power to infect and contaminate the "I" unless handled in a way that keeps it (ritually) pure. Thus, in the above-mentioned example from Orwell not only is the food placed improperly in a particular order of things, this improper placement also puts it in a position where it is vulnerable to contamination and reminds the viewer of its status as the abject, something between I and Other, eliciting a reaction of disgust.

Similar observations, though again in reverse, could be made about Hemingway's rabbit's foot and its status as part of a cadaver that is no longer considered to be part of a cadaver. Kristeva explains the matter this way:

> The corpse (or cadaver: *cadere*, to fall), that which has irremediably come a cropper, is cesspool, and death; […]. [R]efuse and corpses *show me* what I permanently thrust aside in order to live. These body fluids, this defilement, this shit are what life withstands, hardly and with difficulty, on the part of death. There, I am at the border of my condition as a living being. My body extricates itself, as being alive, from that border. Such wastes drop so that I might live, until, from loss to loss, nothing remains in me and my entire body falls beyond the limit – cadere, cadaver. (3)

Thus, a corpse as the abject is a reminder of what "I" must also one day become that not only holds the power to physically contaminate the body but also has the force to psychologically infect the mind with this fundamentally disturbing thought. However, the rabbit's foot has gone through a process that has changed its status from a piece of cadaver to an item that brings luck. This process has not only removed the physical contaminants (flesh that might rot and so on) but also mental associations with death and mortality (reclassification into a luck charm). As a result, it has squarely left the category of the abject and become an object instead, provoking no reaction of disgust.

It should be noted that despite the above-mentioned physical elements, both contamination and purification are also to a large extent ritualistic categories. Miller relates a concrete example of this by referring to Charles Darwin's account of his experiences in Tierra del

Fuego, where a naked native used his finger to touch some of the food that Darwin was eating. Darwin felt disgusted by the action even though he at the same time noted that the native's hands did not seem to be dirty (2-3). This is relevant because from Darwin's perspective the sense of disgust does not appear to be here related to fears of physical transmission of contaminants but instead to a category mismatch. While he specifically notes that the native's hands are clean, in Darwin's world naked people[4] categorically do not belong next to food and can make it dirty no matter how clean they themselves are because they are transgressing against a cultural code. From the native's point of view, this would, of course, be an absurd notion because his cultural code dictates nakedness as the norm instead.

To further demonstrate the extent of the ritualistic aspect here, let us again compare some passages from Orwell and Hemingway. Here is Orwell working as a *plongeur* (dishwasher) in a large Parisian hotel[5] and describing how food in the hotel and restaurant industry is being handled behind closed doors:

> Dirtiness is inherent in hotels and restaurants, because sound food is sacrificed to punctuality and smartness. The hotel employee is too busy getting food ready to remember that it is meant to be eaten. […] A customer orders, for example, a piece of toast. Somebody, pressed with work in a cellar deep underground, has to prepare it. How can he stop and say to himself, 'This toast is to be eaten – I must make it eatable'? All he knows is that it must look right and must be ready in three minutes. Some large drops of sweat fall from his forehead on to the toast. Why should he worry? Presently the toast falls among the filthy sawdust on the floor. Why trouble to make a new piece? It is much quicker to wipe the sawdust off. On the way upstairs the toast falls again, butter side down. Another wipe is all it needs. And so with everything. (72)

[4] This could alternatively be read as Darwin thinking that nonwhite people do not belong next to food and can contaminate it by their dirty presence, but the point remains the same, and in both cases there is a category mismatch based on cultural convention.

[5] Orwell's "Hôtel X" has variously been identified as either the Lotti or the Crillon, both respectable and ostensibly high-quality establishments (Taylor, 98).

Orwell's employee status allows him to a certain degree bypass the façade that his hotel presents to the outside world. This perspective also allows him a more general insight into the industry as a whole, making him realize that appearances are often considered to be much more important than anything else and that behind those appearances reality can be something very different. The physical aspect of purity here seems to have become subordinate to the ritualistic appearance of purity.

Hemingway, on the other hand, recounts numerous visits to Parisian restaurants from the point of view of a customer and always considers the food to be good and the visits pleasant. Here he is describing a visit to Michaud's, another high-end restaurant in Paris,

> We stood outside of Michaud's restaurant reading the posted menu. Michaud's was crowded and we waited for people to come out, watching the tables where people already had their coffee. We were hungry again from walking and Michaud's was an exciting and expensive restaurant for us. […] It was a wonderful meal at Michaud's after we got in. (56-57)

As Orwell points out, the greatest chance for unsanitary violations towards the food came with a large crowd and the associated rush, which means there is a decent chance Hemingway's meal got at least some kind of questionable treatment. Indeed, Orwell details several different practices in the restaurant industry – like cooks and waiters fondling steaks with their fingers, licking gravy from the said fingers, and then fondling the stakes again (71-72) – that would turn a "wonderful" meal into a disgusting one if only they were witnessed by the customer (but, of course, they are not). The point is that there is often no practical way of actually determining if something might contain elements that we would label as contaminating in the physical sense. Of course, a smell of rot or a spot of mold might give us a hint that something is wrong but more often than not when making these determinations we rely on such things as the "smartness" of a hotel, which in reality is a guarantee of nothing. Instead, "smartness" is a symbolically constructed order that in a certain culture signifies quality and cleanliness and helps us to expel the abject out of the reach of our

senses so that it cannot harry us and contaminate our thoughts. Thus, we can now define dirt as something that is outside the accepted order in a specific system but also as something that provokes a feeling of uneasiness on a psychological level as a result of forcing us to confront things we do not want to confront, its mere existence raising the specter of contamination in some form.

3.4. People out of place

The idea of dirt as matter out of place raises an important additional question: do people out of place also become dirty? According to Douglas, the answer is yes, and she relates as an example a case from Hinduism where Havik Brahmin can become contaminated by sitting in the same row on a dinner table with someone from a different caste (35). Miller also points out that people who we even do not consider initially to be disgusting can become so by moving their bodies into spaces where they are not supposed to be, for example, by putting forth unwanted sexual advances through touching (65). This is fundamentally important and explains to a large degree the structural nature of different imagery regarding dirt found in Orwell and Hemingway. Consider first this scene from *A Movable Feast*:

> Travel writers wrote about the men fishing in the Seine as though they were crazy and never caught anything; but it was serious and productive fishing. […] With the fishermen and the life on the river, the beautiful barges with their own life on board, the tugs with their smoke-stacks that folded back to pass under the bridges, pulling a tow of barges, the great elms on the stone banks of the river, the plane trees and in some places the poplars, I could never be lonely along the river (44-45).

What we have here are working class people laboring in an environment that is full of the kind of contaminants we would usually mark as making you physically dirty, like mud, slime, fish entrails, and so on. However, there is no sense of disgust or filth in Hemingway's description, and the scene could be, in fact, described as beautifully poetic instead. Here, on the other hand, is his take on a café standing by the Place de la Contrescarpe that was frequented by the lower classes:

> [T]he Café des Amateurs was crowded and the windows misted over from the heat and the smoke inside. It was a sad, evilly run café where the drunkards of the quarter crowded together and I kept away from it because of the smell of dirty bodies and the sour smell of drunkenness. The men and women who frequented the Amateurs stayed drunk all of the time, or all of the time they could afford it […]. The Café des Amateurs was the cesspool of the rue Mouffetard […] and its yellowed poster stating the terms and penalties of the law against public drunkenness was as flyblown and disregarded as its clients were constant and ill-smelling. (3-4)

Hemingway grew up in a conservative suburb of Oak Park in Chicago, and his fundamentally middle-class conceptions on life and the proper order of things are visible here (Hutchisson, 6). Thus, while many occupations do involve tasks that make their performers physically dirty, this is just considered to be an unfortunate side-effect of how a proper society is run. As it is a case of necessity, the lower-class people or their dirty bodies performing these jobs provoke no reaction of disapproval or threat of contamination, especially when viewed from an appropriate distance. All this, however, changes when considering the scene at Café des Amateurs. With regards to maintaining the prevailing social order and the associated middle-class conceptions, there is no need for these people to be dirty, and they are, in fact, transgressing outside the acceptable boundaries allotted to them in an act that takes place on two levels. First, they are occupying the field of vision of a more sophisticated observer. Second, while doing so, they are not engaged in any function deemed appropriate to them by that observer. The positioning has also changed from the safely distant on the river to threateningly close at the café that forces the viewer to confront the abject. As Kristeva puts it, “A massive and sudden emergence of uncanniness, which, familiar as it might have been in an opaque and forgotten life, now harries me as radically separate, loathsome. Not me. Not that. But not nothing, either” (2). Combined, these factors provoke a reaction of disapproval and disgust.

It should be noted that from this perspective it is also irrelevant whether or not the people at Café des Amateurs or any such place have the means or the time to keep themselves looking and smelling clean – Orwell, for example, describes people at Parisian restaurants working

sixty to hundred hours a week on incredibly low wages (69) – because the standards they are supposed to follow are set by other groups, and since in technical terms they have the possibility of looking proper on their free time, they should do so. This is also important for understanding Orwell and the way he presents the city: just like Hemingway, Orwell actually comes from a middle-class background and has the matching sensibilities.[6] Just to pick another example of his descriptions, here is how he presents some of the lower-class people living in the hotel where he was lodging:

> Some of the lodgers in our hotel lived lives that were curious beyond words. There were the Rougiers, for instance, an old, ragged, dwarfish couple […]. The Rougiers earned about a hundred francs a week, and by strict economy managed to be always half starved and half drunk. The filth of their room was such that one could smell it on the floor below. According to Madame F., neither of the Rougiers had taken off their clothes for four years. (7)

Just like his descriptions concerning the architecture of the city space, the main defining features here also seem to be connected to unsanitary living and general uncleanliness. In Orwell's writing, this form of representation is indeed the standard, not the exception, and there are very few romantic or poetic depictions of the city or its inhabitants in the book. So, why is his narrative of Paris such an unremitting sequence of bodily fluids, squalor, and disgusting habits, while Hemingway presents a much more sanitized version?

The reason is that from the perspective of inside/outside dynamic their roles as narrators are actually reversed. In Hemingway's book, he is ultimately observing the city from a middle-class vantage point and regards people transgressing against that order as being out of place.[7] As such, his position is quite well summarized by these lines from *A Movable Feast* describing a trip to the horse races, "So we went out by the train from the Gare du Nord through the dirtiest

[6] Taylor writes that even though "[p]rone to portraying himself as rather a rebel, Orwell remained inextricably welded to the upper-middle-class value system he had grown up with" (153).

[7] Arriving in Paris, Hemingway and his wife had a comfortable income of $3000 per year between them and no compelling reason to take up residence in a working-class district of the Latin Quarter. The reason they did so anyway was that Hemingway considered this to be the way an impoverished artist was supposed to live (Hutchisson, 46).

and saddest part of town and walked from the siding to the oasis of the track. It was early and we sat on my raincoat on the fresh cropped grass and had our lunch and drank from the wine bottle" (51). Getting only the occasional glimpse at the underclass and their living conditions is, of course, in part due to intentional design of the city. With the effects of the industrial revolution, the city space itself also experienced something of a revolution, and in contrast to the more spontaneous or "organic" growth patterns of the old mercantile or administrative cities the industrial city was much more thoroughly planned in its nature. Part of this planning included concentric zonation according to class status of the inhabitants with some protected routes running through, thus giving way to the kind of brief experience that Hemingway describes (Soja, 82). Again, in the case of old cities like Paris the description presented above is perhaps bit of a simplification due to sizeable amount of preindustrial infrastructure present, but the general principle holds, and the abject is here quickly brushed aside, only occasionally raising its head to bring forth a moment of discomfort.

However, in Orwell's case the people he is describing actually are in places that society deems appropriate for them, and it is Orwell who is transgressing outside the boundaries that are supposed to confine him by descending among the lower orders. This does not mean that he is not disgusted – for he is and cannot get away from his own sensibilities – but in terms of narrative this arrangement means that his transgression transforms into Westphal's state of transgressivity, where transgression against the conventional norms becomes permanent and is meant to disturb the dominant equilibrium by continuously forcing the reader to confront the abject in form of the lower classes and their miserable living conditions that are normally supposed to stay out of sight so as not to disturb us and contaminate either our minds or our bodies with their presence.

Thus, where Hemingway's map of Paris displays spots of disorder and chaos occasionally intruding onto the otherwise harmonious picture, Orwell's map presents disorder as the norm that maybe has an occasional spot of harmony. This, of course, also speaks to the general

image the respective authors are trying to convey with regards to Paris and what they are trying to do with their narrative: several decades removed from his subject period, Hemingway is trying to preserve a traditional – even nostalgic – image of Paris in the 1920s as The City of Light embodied in the expatriate art community while Orwell is specifically trying to subvert this sort of imagery by presenting a non-conventional counter image that is tied to the pressing concerns of the time when he was writing.[8] This point also presents us with the next topic for discussion. The spatial dimensions explored in this chapter are an important step in understanding how Orwell and Hemingway proceed in their respective approaches to the city, but in order to get a fuller understanding of the matter we must next move onwards to the temporal aspect.

[8] Both of these pictures actually seem to hold some degree of merit. Describing Paris as it was in the early decades of the twentieth century, Brooke L. Blower writes on the city as a center of industry, arts, transportation, and the French government that also consisted of such things as mansard rooftops and the occasional medieval courtyard. Apparently, there were over 87000 trees and approximately 8000 benches in the city, and the café terraces covered about 67000 square meters of sidewalk (4). However, she also describes nearby factories polluting the city's air, belligerent drunks urinating in plain sight, ancient cesspool tanks standing in street corners, gutters getting clogged with garbage, and oozing gas meters that sometimes exploded. In 1927 alone, inhabitants of the metropolis apparently threw a little over 700000 tons of trash onto to the city's streets (9).

4. Spatiotemporality and the city space

In this chapter, we will start moving away from the gutter and more towards the city's main street level and even into some of the private spaces that Orwell and Hemingway describe in their accounts. The focus will be on temporal aspects of their narratives, and the main analytical tool to be used is Westphal's spatiotemporality with its idea of time and space actually always fusing together in any literary representation. We will begin by briefly looking at how time can seem to be moving at different paces even inside the same spatial location depending on your viewpoint, but majority of the chapter will concern itself with the temporal separation of Hemingway and Orwell from the era they are describing and how both of them actually end up reflecting their own time period back onto the 1920s in their representations of Paris. The main component of this process is split into two categories: personal nostalgia and structural nostalgia, where the former is tied to personal experiences that an individual has had in his life while the latter is about collective ways of framing past eras from the point of view of the author's era. The most important auxiliary analytical tool in sorting out these processes and how they manifest here is Fredric Jameson's cognitive mapping and ideas related to it.

4.1 Temporal rhythm and being lost

As was briefly mentioned in the previous chapter, the industrial era brought forth a greater need for detailed city planning as opposed to the more spontaneous growth patterns of the previous eras. However, in any old city the planning always takes place in the context of already existing urban spaces, leading to the intermingling of past and present. Manuel Castells writes in *The City and the Grass Roots* regarding spatial forms that "[t]hey will express and implement the power relationships of the state in an [sic] historically defined society. […] And the work of such contradictory historical process on the space will be accomplished on already inherited spatial form, the product of former

history and the support of new interests, projects, protests, and dreams" (quoted in Soja, 95). Thus, the city space and its representations are affected by spatiotemporality on several different levels. Any city is a combination of relics (buildings, statues, signs, streets, and so on) hailing from different eras and coming together at any particular present to form the whole. Any representation of a city is also temporally bound, both with regards to the era that is being described and the era the representation's author is living in. People's lives could also be said to proceed on different temporal rhythms, producing different perceptions. As such, space should always be thought and examined with its connection to time in mind and as Karsten Harries puts it, "any view that understands architecture as the art of establishing place by the construction of boundaries in space is inevitably one-sided. While dwelling requires the establishment of place, place must also be understood temporally" (223).

Of the different aspects mentioned above, let us first consider the idea of time proceeding on different temporal rhythms inside the same space. In Orwell, this manifests on two levels, the first of which can again be demonstrated by his work at the Hôtel X as a *plongeur*:

> The thing that would astonish anyone coming for the first time into the service quarters of a hotel would be the fearful noise and disorder during the rush hours. […] Hotel work is not particularly hard, but by its nature it comes in rushes and cannot be economized. You cannot, for instance, grill a steak two hours before it is wanted; you have to wait till the last moment, by which time a mass of other work has accumulated, and then do it all together, in frantic haste. (67)

The description here is defined not only by the feeling of hurry and disorder that Orwell expresses but also by the disjointed way time proceeds: it seems to move forward in sequences of chaos and relative calm. Let us then again compare this to Hemingway's experience as he is sitting on the dining room side in a similar establishment:

> After writing a story I was always empty and both sad and happy, as though I had made love, and I was sure this was a very good story although I would not know truly how good until I read it over the next day. As I ate the oysters

> with their strong taste of the sea and their faint metallic taste that the cold white wine washed away, leaving only the sea taste and the succulent texture, and as I drank their cold liquid from each shell and washed it down with the crisp taste of the wine, I lost the empty feeling and began to be happy and to make plans. (6)

This scene in contrast is much more defined by tranquility and a flow of time that remains steady throughout. It should also be noted that Hemingway and Orwell are here in essence separated only by one door. However, this door seems to indeed make the difference between a space of frantic haste and chaos and a space so relaxing you feel like you had just made love. In fact, Orwell describes the effect of this door in his book by saying that it "is an instructive sight to see a waiter going into a hotel dining-room. As he passes the door a sudden change comes over him. The set of his shoulders alters; all the dirt and hurry and irritation have dropped off in an instant. He glides over the carpet, with a solemn priest-like air" (61). As such, one of the reasons for the different perceptions of time here is, of course, the fact that Hemingway and Orwell are performing different roles in the restaurant: one is a customer and the other is an employee, one is there to relax and enjoy himself while the other is there to work. As Westphal writes on the topic, "If we attribute a polychronic valence to the world, we perceive at the same present in its asynchrony […] The moment experienced by an individual does not have the same force as the same moment experienced by his neighbor" (141-42). The perception of time depends on the function that the perceiver is performing in the space in question and can cause matters to proceed at different paces.

However, this also relates to a general theme that was already brought up in the previous chapter, that is, the juxtaposition between order and chaos. Margaret Cohen writes that "the representation of space always entails the representation of time and that time and space are intrinsically connected, both as literary and conceptual structures" (647). If space and time are indeed inherently connected, then spatial representation might also tell us something about the temporal experience of the author and how the journey through space is also reflected as a journey

through time. Here is Orwell describing his travels as an unemployed man looking for work on the streets of Paris with his friend Boris, “We went to the Hôtel Scribe and waited an hour on the pavement, hoping that the manager would come out, but he never did. Then we dragged ourselves down to the rue du Commerce, only to find that the new restaurant, which was being redecorated, was shut up and the *patron* away. It was now night. We had walked fourteen kilometres” (28). A little later he writes that “[w]e again failed to find work the next day, and it was three weeks before the luck changed. […] Day after day Boris and I went up and down Paris, drifting at two miles an hour through the crowds, bored and hungry, and finding nothing. One day, I remember, we crossed the Seine eleven times. We loitered for hours outside service doorways” (29). Orwell does not here or really anywhere else in his book draw a clearly traceable course of his apparently extensive wanderings through the city. Instead, his rather haphazard journeys only produce the occasional mention of a landmark and often end up also accomplishing very little if anything of note. Thus, the main themes in these passages both in physical and temporal sense seem to be futility, uncertainty, aimlessness, and also the relative sparsity of clear signposts to map the journey.

Hemingway, on the other hand, navigates the streets of Paris quite consistently in this manner: “I walked down past the Lycėe Henri Quatre and the ancient church of St.-Ėtienne-du-Mont and the windswept Place du Panthėon and cut in for shelter to the right and finally came out on the lee side of the Boulevard St.-Michel and worked on down it past the Cluny and the Boulevard St.-Germain until I came to a good café that I knew on the Place St.-Michel” (5). Here is another similar segment, though they are quite representative of the book in general:

> By this time I had paid the check and gone out and turned to the right and crossed the rue de Rennes so that I would not go to the Deux-Magots for coffee and was walking up the rue Bonaparte on the shortest way home. What did I know best that I had not written about and lost? What did I know about truly and care for the most? There was no choice at all. There was only the choice of streets to take you back fastest to where you worked. I went

> up Bonaparte to Guynemer, then to the rue d'Assas, up the rue Notre-Dame-des-Champs to the Closerie des Lilas. (76)

Here the journey is marked not only by a good amount of certainty and determination but also a rather fastidious way of mapping the route that was used to get to the destination. Writing on James Joyce's *Ulysses*, Eric Bulson states that the incessant torrent of accurately named topographical signposts in the novel actually serves more to overwhelm and estrange the readers than to help them construct a coherent or unified picture of the surroundings so that "the city emerges as a collection of offhand references as though Joyce were recounting the entire novel to a born and bred Dubliner with a good sense of direction" (115). Thus, it is possible to produce disorientation and disjointedness through fastidious and accurate naming practices, but I would argue that this is not the case here. Though Hemingway generates a lot more named references to topographical signposts than Orwell, the practice is still not excessive and is simply meant to render Paris as a legible space where the author's journey can be traced. Orwell's wanderings, on the other hand, are mostly untraceable, and perhaps even more importantly they are characterized by futility and being without any meaningful direction – both the past and the future are uncertain. Indeed, a companion theme in *Down and Out* to straightforward chaos is the rather pervasive sense of being lost.

Regarding this, Bulson makes another point in his book that is more applicable to our texts and says that "[w]hen we are too familiar with a place, we stop seeing it, but when we lose direction the 'signboards and street names, passersby, roofs, kiosks, or bars' become present in the landscape. The once static image in our mind shatters, forcing us to look up and around" (109). Later writing on the concept of drifting, he states that "[i]t is a form of willful disorientation experienced at street level in which the individual actively frees his or her mind from prescribed ways of seeing, feeling, and imagining urban space" (121). So, what Bulson is saying here is that becoming too familiar with a space freezes the image of that space in our minds, but deliberately becoming lost

there can again shatter that static image and change our perspective. This is undoubtedly partly what is going on in *Down and Out* and is, of course, connected to the themes of transgression and state of transgressivity from the last chapter: Orwell on purpose puts himself in positions he is unfamiliar with, which disorients him and not only destabilizes his perception of space but also of time and how it proceeds, whether in the hectic chaos of the hotel kitchen or in the ultimately futile wanderings through the Parisian streets as an unemployed man. Hemingway does none of this and instead generally remains within his own comfort zone. As a result, his flow of time also remains stable and no temporal or spatial disorientation occurs.

The analysis in this chapter thus far has mostly been based on the notion of how different locations in space can affect the perception of time and the way it proceeds. However, while Orwell and Hemingway do describe the same era and the same city, as authors they are actually separated by several decades with Orwell producing the final version of his text in 1930 while Hemingway did so only in 1960. To more thoroughly discover why in Orwell's text both time and space are more chaotic than in Hemingway's, we next need to turn to exploring how distance in time affects perception of space and also the perception of time itself. For the passage of time will generate nostalgia, and nostalgia will alter people's perspectives. This not only happens on a personal level, where we have an emotional connection to the matter, but also on the collective level, where the changing social circumstances will change the way the past is viewed and is remembered into existence. Both of these forms affect the kind of Paris Orwell and Hemingway end up producing in their writing.

4.2 Nostalgia and reification

4.2.1 Personal nostalgia

The *Oxford Advanced American Dictionary* defines nostalgia as "a feeling of sadness mixed with pleasure when you think of happy times in the past". Merriam-Webster gives the description as "a

wistful or excessively sentimental yearning for return to or of some past period or irrecoverable condition". These common use definitions describe what might be called personal nostalgia, and it can be defined as excessively sentimental affection for some time or place in your personal past with a tinge of sadness perhaps also mixed in. It should also be noted that personal nostalgia has certain time constraints: you do not feel personal nostalgia for what happened yesterday or last week – you simply remember it – nor do you feel it for the bronze age because you have no personal experience of that period. When exactly simple memory transforms into personal nostalgia is not written in stone, but the difference should be kept in mind, nonetheless.

To demonstrate the effects of personal nostalgia on our primary texts, let us start with a passage from *A Movable Feast,* where Hemingway describes coming back to their room with his first wife, Hadley, and the following night they spend together:

> [W]hen we had finished and there was no question of hunger any more the feeling that had been like hunger when we were on the bridge was still there when we caught the bus home. It was there when we came in the room and after we had gone to bed and made love in the dark it was there. When I woke with the windows open and the moonlight on the roofs of the tall houses, it was there. I put my face away from the moonlight into the shadow but I could not sleep and lay awake thinking about it. We had both wakened twice in the night and my wife slept sweetly now with the moonlight on her face. I had to try to think it out and I was too stupid. Life had seemed so simple that morning when I had wakened and found the false spring and heard the pipes of the man with his herd of goats and gone out and bought the racing paper. But Paris was a very old city and we were young and nothing was simple there, not even poverty, nor sudden money, nor the moonlight, nor right and wrong nor the breathing of someone who lay beside you in the moonlight. (57-58)

The romanticized picture of the moonlit room, sweetly sleeping wife on the bed, hunger for something that is in the end undefinable, and bittersweet youthful problems make the scene distinctly nostalgic in the personal sense. The "man with his herd of goats" refers back to an earlier scene in the book where a goatherd travels around the streets of Paris selling milk fresh from his goats and seems to bring even a sense of pastoral imagery to the picture (49-50). As Hutchisson

writes on Hemingway's Paris years, "It is true that he later painted a much more positive portrait of life there in *A Moveable Feast*, but that book, written in his declining years, was something of a wish-fulfillment fantasy, as numerous scholars have shown. Mellowed by nostalgia, the book idealizes and romanticizes the City of Light" (89). Thus, even though Hemingway frames these passages as something he felt at the time,[9] what he is actually describing is a much later reconstruction heavily colored by nostalgia from a man in his waning years.

Here, on the other hand, is Orwell's description of the room where Boris was lodging: "The room was an attic, ten feet square, lighted only by a skylight, its sole furniture a narrow iron bedstead, a chair, and a washhand-stand with one game leg. A long S-shaped chain of bugs marched slowly across the wall above the bed. Boris was lying asleep, naked, his large belly making a mound under the grimy sheet. His chest was spotted with insect bites" (25). It would be difficult to describe this scene as anything approaching personal nostalgia, and there is no bittersweet yearning for the bug-infested room or its low-quality furniture. Of course, Hemingway is describing an intimate scene with his wife and his writing style is simply different, but one of the reasons for the differences in the passages is the authors' temporal separation from the events: while two years has not transformed memory into personal nostalgia for Orwell, three decades has done so for Hemingway. Indeed, as Taylor points out regarding Orwell's time in Paris, "[t]owards the end of his life the memories hardened into a desperate nostalgia. 'I wish I were with you in Paris,' he wrote to a young woman friend working there in 1948 […]. 'It's lucky for you you're too young to have seen it in the 'twenties,' he wrote the same friend; 'it always seemed a bit ghostlike after that, even before the war'" (101). Thus, while Orwell's memories of Paris also transformed into personal nostalgia later in his life, none of this is yet visible in *Down and Out*. That, however, does not mean that his narrative

[9] He uses the same technique throughout his book.

is not affected by the passage of time as such, for both Orwell and Hemingway are still subject to their own specific historical situations which condition their writing through what this paper has termed structural nostalgia.

4.2.2 Structural nostalgia

Georges Poulet writes that the “specific objective of history is to put in place a continuity among different moments of time, to show some rational principle according to which they relate to one another” (quoted in Westphal, 16). As such, while personal nostalgia and the selective memory it brings about might explain why specific scenes are represented in the way they are in *A Movable Feast* and *Down and Out*, it would be hasty to assign structural differences in spatiotemporality between the books just to its presence (or lack thereof). Instead, we need to look at the historical context of the authors more generally in order to understand how they made sense of the world at their particular point in time and according to what principle they made the different moments of time connect to each other. To begin this process, Fredric Jameson and his book *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* provide some useful insight. In the following passages, Jameson is writing specifically about what he calls nostalgia film, but I would say his words are also applicable to other forms of art and can shed light on our material too:

> Nostalgia films restructure the whole issue of pastiche and project it onto a collective and social level, where the desperate attempt to appropriate a missing past is now refracted through the iron law of fashion change and the emergent ideology of the generation. […] [T]he nostalgia film was never a matter of some old-fashioned "representation" of historical content, but instead approached the "past" through stylistic connotation, conveying "pastness" by the glossy qualities of the image, and "1930s-ness" or "1950s-ness" by the attributes of fashion. (19)

If applied to the artistic realm generally, this would mean that a work of art depicting some past era does not present that era as it actually existed but instead by selecting certain characteristics that have since come to signify that time, which are then refracted through the ideological lens of the

present. This is what might be called structural nostalgia: selective memory on the collective or social level.

The process through which structural nostalgia comes about is reification, about which Georg Lukacs, building on the work of Karl Marx, stated that it is a phenomenon where matters that are in their essence human relations take on phantom objectivity and come to be thought of as things. This phantom objectivity is then so firmly planted into our thoughts and becomes seemingly so rational that it serves to hide the original essence of the matter under discussion, that is, the fact that it is indeed a relationship between humans (83). Jameson further clarifies the matter:

> Historicity is, in fact, neither a representation of the past nor a representation of the future (although its various forms use such representations): it can first and foremost be defined as a perception of the present as history; that is, as a relationship to the present which somehow defamiliarizes it and allows us that distance from immediacy which is at length characterized as a historical perspective. […] [W]hat is at stake is essentially a process of reification whereby we draw back from our immersion in the here and now (not yet identified as a "present") and grasp it as a kind of thing – not merely a "present" but a present that can be dated and called the eighties or the fifties. (284)

Thus, reification is a process, where human relations take on characteristics of objects and subsequently come to be viewed as natural phenomena instead of what they actually are: human relations that are dictated by humans. This also applies to time periods (which are set and defined by humans), where certain characteristics are selected as stand-ins and come to represent the era in question as supposedly objective descriptors. Part of this process is inevitable (without condensing something as vast as a time period into some kind of graspable form it would be impossible to discuss it at all), but what characteristics come to be selected depends on historical perspective and the needs of the era that is doing the selecting. For example, even though the 1950s in the United States have come to be defined by such things as suburban culture, economic stability,

nationalistic patriotism, and the American Dream that is not how the era was viewed in the 1960s, nor is that the way it will likely be viewed a hundred years from now.

Something like this is going on in *A Movable Feast* and *Down and Out*, and it is again part of the reason why Hemingway's Paris is defined by romantic little cafes, struggling artists trying to produce art, moonlit lovers sleeping in their bed, and generally by an orderly world that makes sense and why Orwell's Paris is defined by buildings frozen in the act of collapse, poverty-stricken people struggling to survive, bug-infested men sleeping in their grimy sheets, and generally by a world of chaos full of meaningless drudgery. That is, defining characteristics of the mental image of the 1920s are different based on whether the era is viewed from the early 1930s or the late 1950s. However, we have yet to explore the specifics on why these particular aspects have come to be selected into Orwell's narrative and are absent in Hemingway's and vice versa. Again, there are likely to be personal reasons involved, like Orwell's macabre fascination with grotesquery[10] or Hemingway's lifelong struggles with his romantic relationships[11], but in order to discover structural reasons for the different imagery on temporal level, we will next turn to Jameson's theory of cognitive mapping, which will also explain why being lost here is not just a matter of purposefully putting oneself into unfamiliar physical spaces but instead refers to a much more fundamental feeling of disconnect with the surrounding reality. As Kevin Lynch puts it, "The very word 'lost' in our language means much more than simple geographical uncertainty; it carries overtones of utter disaster" (4).

[10] Apparently, Orwell had a personal "fear of dirt and sweat" and part of the reason why he would take his excursions into the lower-class world was "to see how far he could push himself" so as to try and overcome that fear (Taylor, 110).
[11] Hemingway would go on to cheat on his first wife, Hadley, in the late 1920s and would eventually divorce her for another woman, Pauline Pfeiffer, whom he would also later divorce for yet another woman. Hemingway's guilt over the treatment of his first wife may have colored his presentation of her and their relationship in *A Movable Feast* (Hutchisson, 85-86).

4.3 Cognitive mapping

Discussing what he means by the term cognitive mapping, Fredric Jameson states that it can "be characterized as something of a synthesis between Althusser and Kevin Lynch" (415). Here is what he writes on Lynch:

> Lynch taught us that the alienated city is above all a space in which people are unable to map (in their minds) either their own positions or the urban totality in which they find themselves: grids such as those of Jersey City, in which none of the traditional markers (monuments, nodes, natural boundaries, built perspectives) obtain, are the most obvious examples. Disalienation in the traditional city, then, involves the practical reconquest of a sense of place and the construction or reconstruction of an articulated ensemble which can be retained in memory and which the individual subject can map and remap along the moments of mobile, alternative trajectories. Lynch's own work is limited by the deliberate restriction of his topic to the problems of city form as such; yet it becomes extraordinarily suggestive when projected outward onto some of the larger national and global spaces we have touched on here. (51)

This last point is where Jameson brings in Louis Althusser's ideas and his definition of ideology as "the representation of the subject's imaginary relationship to his or her real conditions of existence" (51). For Althusser, ideology is thus something that mediates between the world and the individual, making the former comprehensible to the latter. This notion then allows Jameson to project Lynch's ideas about mental positioning in the city space onto a much wider stage, where ideology gives individuals the ability to situate themselves in a global totality – this is the essence of cognitive mapping. It should be noted that while Jameson generally refers to cognitive mapping in the context of postmodernism, he also provides examples from history of similar practices that precede what he considers to be the postmodern period, and for the purposes of this paper cognitive mapping is not taken to be a uniquely postmodern phenomenon.

In any case, this helps us to further understand the source of the differences between Orwell and Hemingway for as Westphal states: "All literature is destined to reflect the major preoccupations of the epoch, whatever the conditions" (84). The major preoccupations of the epoch

were very much different in the early 1930s than they were in the late 1950s,[12] and both Hemingway and Orwell are reflecting the cultural and societal context of their own era back onto the 1920s in their writing.[13] Jameson elaborates further:

> The Althusserian formula, in other words, designates a gap, a rift, between existential experience and scientific knowledge. Ideology has then the function of somehow inventing a way of articulating those two distinct dimensions with each other. What a historicist view of this definition would want to add is that such coordination, the production of functioning and living ideologies, is distinct in different historical situations, and, above all, that there may be historical situations in which it is not possible at all. (53)

As such, for cognitive mapping to be possible at all, there needs to be a certain level of correspondence between the ideological precepts that the society is built upon and the actual world as it really exists because otherwise it would be impossible for the ideology to explain the lived experience in a believable way and situate the individual into a meaningful whole in the world. This is one of the major underlying themes affecting our primary texts: in 1930, capitalism as an organizing principle and ideology of the industrialized countries had just suffered a catastrophic collapse in the form of the Great Depression, while by the late 1950s it had again quite successfully reinvented itself.[14] As such, at Orwell's point in time capitalism's ability as an ideology[15] to perform

---

[12] The 1930s were, of course, time of the Great Depression and the resulting economic hardship that followed with radical rightwing movements on the rise; by the 1950s concerns had turned to such things as internal and external fear of Communism, possibility of a nuclear war, and problems of decolonization.

[13] Hutchisson rather directly makes this point by writing on *A Movable Feast* that "[m]uch of the recollection is distorted. Looking back on those long-ago years, the Hemingway writing the memoir is not the early master but an old impostor, projecting his tastes, interests, and views of the 1950s onto the 1920s" (235).

[14] Bresser-Pereira writes on the topic by stating that the approximately thirty years that followed after the Second World War were for the capitalist countries a period of economic stability and expanding growth that was also to an extent shared among the population in a manner that reduced inequality. This was especially the case with Western European countries but Japan and the United States also experienced similar developmental trajectories and during this period the latter reached its peak hegemonical position in world affairs. The transformation that took place in these countries was, however, not away from capitalism as such but instead from "the liberal-democratic state to a social democratic state" (2-3).

[15] Capitalism here is treated as a set of social relations that can be reinterpreted differently according to a particular set of ideological beliefs (for example to support either liberal democracy or fascism), but also as an ideological position in itself denoting a preferred type of *dominant* ownership structure in a society. Regarding the latter case, in capitalism this means ownership by the capitalist owner class, in a Soviet-style communism it means state ownership, while in an anarchist system it would mean the co-op owned by the workers. Incidentally, all the forms mentioned above

the function of making the world comprehensible has severely weakened since all the traditional markers and assumptions have just been swept away, while from Hemingway's point of view all that was just a momentary deviation, and everything makes sense again. As a result, one of these situations allows successful cognitive mapping to take place, the other does not.

In the early portions of *Down and Out* when he was still wandering on the Parisian streets looking for work, Orwell writes that "when you are approaching poverty, you make one discovery which outweighs some of the others. You discover boredom and mean complications and the beginnings of hunger, but you also discover the great redeeming feature of poverty: the fact that it annihilates the future" (18-19). Orwell is here making the old case that once you have lost everything then there is nothing more you can lose. As unemployment soared and millions were being thrown into poverty, this would have reflected the mood of many others in the early 1930s, and even if neither the future nor the past was completely lost both of them suddenly at the very least seemed exceedingly uncertain. This, of course, no longer means being lost in the way Bulson meant it (getting lost on purpose), but it is in line with the way Lynch uses the term in his book (evoking utter disaster).

However, here one might make the case that all this actually changes when Orwell gets employed as a *plongeur* at the Hôtel X and later at the Auberge de Jehan Cottard, for even though the work has low pay and long hours, it still provides at least a sense of order and brings some kind of stable rhythm to his life. This leads us to further consider the meaning of being lost, for it also conveys the idea of futility, and Orwell writes a rather lengthy analysis on the usefulness of the *plongeur's* work:

> [I]t is strange that thousands of people in a great modern city should spend their waking hours swabbing dishes in hot dens underground […] At this moment there are men with university degrees scrubbing dishes in Paris for

---

manifested during the Spanish civil war (1936-39) with Orwell recounting some of the process from his perspective in *Homage to Catalonia*.

> ten or fifteen hours a day. One cannot say that it is mere idleness on their part, for an idle man cannot be a plongeur […]. The question is, why does this slavery continue? People have a way of taking it for granted that all work is done for a sound purpose. They see somebody else doing a disagreeable job, and think that they have solved things by saying that the job is necessary. […] I believe it is the same with a plongeur. He earns his bread in the sweat of his brow, but it does not follow that he is doing anything useful; he may be only supplying a luxury which, very often, is not a luxury […] For, after all, where is the real need of big hotels and smart restaurants? They are supposed to provide luxury, but in reality they provide only a cheap, shoddy imitation of it. […] Essentially, a 'smart' hotel is a place where a hundred people toil like devils in order that two hundred may pay through the nose for things they do not really want. (103-6)

A system that directs thousands of people (even those with university degrees) into almost completely useless work is hard to reconcile with anything approaching rational organization of the world. This is a picture of Jameson's moment in history where the prevailing ideology is incapable of mapping the world in a sensible way, and it seeps into everything in Orwell's book, producing a persistent feeling of collapse, futility, and generally being lost. The hardship and the suffering seem not only excessive (comparable to slavery in Orwell's thoughts) but also essentially pointless with no contribution to anything conceivably better being created as a result. The situation cannot be seen as any sort stable equilibrium, and as Westphal writes, "instability is the distinct feature of a unity formerly taken for granted. No representation can define space in a static condition. Entropy appears to be overtaking all levels of existence" (45).

Hemingway, on the other hand, quite specifically makes the case that he is not lost. Recounting an encounter with Gertrude Stein, he begins by writing that "[i]t was when we had come back from Canada and were living in the rue Notre-Dame-des-Champs and Miss Stein and I were still good friends that Miss Stein made the remark about the lost generation. […] 'That's what you are. That's what you all are,' Miss Stein said. 'All of you young people who served in the war. You are a lost generation'" (29). A little later, Hemingway then reflects on her words this way:

> I thought of Miss Stein and Sherwood Anderson and egotism and mental laziness versus discipline and I thought who is calling who a lost generation? […] But the hell with her lost-generation talk and all the dirty, easy labels. When I got home and into the courtyard and upstairs and saw my wife and my son and his cat, F. puss, all of them happy and a fire in the fireplace, I said to my wife, "You know, Gertrude is nice, anyway." "Of course, Tatie." "But she talks a lot of rot sometimes". (30-31)

Despite being labeled as part of the lost generation, Hemingway does not consider himself as having been lost. Again, these passages might be colored by personal reasons and Hemingway's later need to put down Stein,[16] but they also reflect how the 1920s looked from the perspective of the late 1950s: capitalism is again capable of explaining the world in a meaningful way and what happened in between can be regarded as a deviation. His map is clear and legible. The entropy is gone and what have come to be reified as stand-ins characterizing the era and Paris as it stood back then are the small cafes, the expatriate artists, the blending of modernity into medieval relics like roaming goatherds, and so on. The struggles of the period and also what came afterwards have arranged themselves into a meaningful narrative that justifies the hardship and the suffering and leads to a better world: the Great Depression has been overcome, the Allies have defeated the Axis in World War II, and both the past and the present make sense again. It could be said that Hemingway's narrative proceeds from the point of a straight line, while Orwell's does so from what Westphal calls semantics of tempuscules that "proceed from the dynamic of the point and not from the dynamic of the line" (19) and thus open up the possibility of a radical change. That being said, while many things do indeed change, others also stay the same. Thus far we have examined how different spatial and temporal positioning produces difference in descriptions of the surrounding city space that

[16] Gertrude Stein was an American author and a notable figure among the circle of artists that made their home in Paris during the 1920s. Over twenty years Hemingway's senior, she was a major influence on him and part of the reason Hemingway gave up journalism and started focusing on fiction writing instead. However, eventually their relationship soured as Hemingway had a tendency to evaluate his friends based on the same excessively high standards as he applied to himself, and as a result those friends would be sooner or later found wanting in his mind. Hemingway also often felt the need to later publicly demean people he had fallen out with, and this was also the case with Stein (Hutchisson, (49-52).

Orwell and Hemingway provide. However, if geocriticism is a consistent approach, then not only should difference produce difference but similarity should also produce similarity. In the next chapter we will explore this dynamic more thoroughly.

5. Allogenous viewpoint and the international dimension

Whether as a gathering place for emigrant artists or as the center of a globe-spanning empire, Paris is undoubtedly an international city, where people from different parts of the world come together and different cultures either collide or coexist. In this chapter, our explorations will be focused more towards these wider international aspects of Paris to which Hemingway and Orwell both contribute by their mere presence. Indeed, the main approach here will be done through the geocritical concept of allogenous viewpoint, which describes a situation where the authors used in the study will come from a perspective of partial familiarity and partial unfamiliarity with regards to the surrounding culture. This, in turn, will allow us to do two things. Firstly, we will see how coming from different national backgrounds will affect the way Orwell and Hemingway describe and segment Paris and the people who live there. Secondly, we can see if the overall allogenous category of coming from the same Western cultural area will at the same time also generate some structural similarities. We will start exploring the first issue with help from Westphal's concept of ethnotype, while in the second part the most important auxiliary concept in use will be Edward Said's Orientalism.

5.1 Ethnotyping the world

Building on Benedict Anderson's idea of the nation as an imagined community, Homi K. Bhabha writes that the "emergence of the political 'rationality' of the nation as a form of narrative – textual strategies, metaphoric displacements, sub-texts and figurative strategems – has its own history. […] To encounter the nation *as it is written* displays a temporality of culture and social consciousness more in tune with the partial, overdetermined process by which textual meaning is produced through the articulation of difference in language" (2). Thus, according to Bhabha the nation is not only imagined into existence, it is narrated into existence through writing, and part of this narration

is the enunciation of difference, that is, pointing to what gives the nation its national character when compared to other nations. This is related to Westphal's idea of the ethnotype, which posits that nations come to be differentiated from each other through stereotypes attached to them but that the selection of which stereotypes will be used can vary based on who is doing the stereotyping. As such, let us start examining this enunciation of difference in our primary texts by seeing how the authors depict their hosts, the French.

For his part, Orwell has a lot to say about the national character of the French, and he is not very subtle about it. For example, in an episode where he is trying to pawn off overcoats owned by himself and Boris, Orwell writes that "[t]he receiver at the pawnshop, a nasty, sour-faced, interfering, little man — a typical French official — refused the coats on the ground that they were not wrapped up in anything" (37). After jumping through some hoops, he concludes the scene by saying that "after all our trouble, the receiver at the pawnshop again refused the overcoats. He told me (one could see his French soul revelling in the pedantry of it) that I had not sufficient papers of identification" (38). Regarding French architecture, a little earlier in the book Orwell writes that "[i]t was the first time that I had been in a French pawnshop. One went through grandiose stone portals (marked, of course, 'Liberté, Egatité, Fraternité' they write that even over the police stations in France) into a large, bare room" (19-20). He also writes that "[i]t is not a figure of speech, it is a mere statement of fact to say that a French cook will spit in the soup — that is, if he is not going to drink it himself" (71) and describing the Parisian subway in the morning Orwell concludes by saying that "[I] stood jammed in the swaying mass of passengers, nose to nose with some hideous French face, breathing sour wine and garlic" (80). Thus, in Orwell's narrative the French are represented as bureaucratic, ostentatious, haughty, and smelling of wine and garlic. Using Westphal's typology, this could be described as the pejorative ethnotype, that is, an image based on negative stereotypes attached to a nation that is meant to set it apart from the viewer.

Hemingway approaches the matter in a quite different way and actually makes little direct reference to any presumed qualities the French possess by the virtue of their nationality. However, in a typical scene describing the Parisian streets he writes that “there were always much nicer-looking people that I did not know that, in the evening with the lights just coming on, were hurrying to some place to drink together, to eat together, and then to make love. […] The big cafės were cheap then too, and all had good beer and the apėritifs cost reasonable prices” (100). There are many similar passages in Hemingway, associating Paris and the French with good food, good drink, and also often with love (making). However, the most dominant theme for Hemingway in this regard is art, and here, for example, he is describing his frequent visits to the Musėe du Luxemburg:

> I went there nearly every day for the Cėzannes and to see the Manets and the Monets and the other Impressionists that I had first come to know about in the Art Institute at Chicago. I was learning something from the painting of Cėzanne that made writing simple true sentences far from enough to make the stories have the dimensions that I was trying to put in them. I was learning very much from him but I was not articulate enough to explain it to anyone. (13)

The art here is considered to be so profound that Hemingway cannot even find the words to do it justice. In contrast, Orwell also refers to the French as artists but this is in connection to the cook who spits in the soup for “[h]e is an artist, but his art is not cleanliness” (71). What is notable here is, of course, that in associating the French with a passion for good food, drink, love, and art Hemingway comes much closer in his description to Westphal’s ameliorative ethnotype that is based on positive stereotypes and meant to reinforce desirable self-image. Indeed, Orwell writes that observing Frenchmen coming into the Auberge de Jehan Cottard and apparently enjoying the terrible food that was served there destroyed for him “the idea that Frenchmen know good food when they see it” (102). As such, the ameliorative ethnotype is in this case quite explicitly rejected, leaving only the pejorative to determine the subject.

Again, part of the difference here undoubtedly springs from the two authors simply having a different writing style, but it should also be noted that the historical relationship between the French and the British differs quite a bit from the historical relationship between the French and the Americans. Even though France and the United Kingdom fought on the same side during World War I, the traditional relationship between the countries had, of course, been one of rivalry or even straightforward antagonism.[17] Indeed, Orwell actually implies that this sort of view runs both ways and when he is applying for a job at the Hôtel X the assistant manager informs him that "[w]e will give you a permanent job if you like […]. The head waiter says he would enjoy calling an Englishman names" (53). The relationship between France and the United States was much more neutral and saddled with less historical baggage, thus lending itself more easily to adoption of the ameliorative ethnotype and resulting here in a different selection based on the difference in the authors' allogenous statuses.

Another way that the difference in national background manifests itself is in the way the authors indirectly narrate their own nation's ethnotypes into existence and reinforce them through attitudes shown towards specific concepts in their writing. Hemingway writes that "one who is doing his work and getting satisfaction from it is not the one the poverty bothers" (51) and follows this by saying that "[i]t was all part of the fight against poverty that you never win except by not spending" (51). On several occasions he also mentions the importance of discipline, which

[17] P. M. H. Bell writes on the relationship between the United Kingdom and France during the early part of the 20th century and states that there was a lot of mental baggage carried from the past between the countries. He traces the history of antagonism starting from as long ago as the Hundred Years' War and then goes on to list some of the more notable conflicts and rivalries between the two nations during the following centuries like the wars between Louis XIV and William III, struggles for control of North America in the 18th century, and, of course, the Napoleonic Wars (6). On the other hand, Jacques Portes writes on the relationship between the United States and France by painting a much more ambivalent picture. During their history, the countries have never really been the best of friends and have perhaps even been more often at odds than displayed straightforwardly amicable relations, but they also have never warred against each other and have in fact frequently been in an alliance with the French, for example, giving aid during the American War of Independence. Portes also states that even though the relationship was not particularly close (or hostile) during most of the 19th century, the countries, nevertheless, entered the 20th century respecting each other (37, 40).

usually translates into self-discipline as in this passage, “in that room I decided that I would write one story about each thing that I knew about. I was trying to do this all the time I was writing, and it was good and severe discipline” (12). Virtues of self-discipline and thrift or the idea that poverty is the result of laziness are quite American and can be traced all the way back to such foundational texts in American literature like Benjamin Franklin’s *Poor Richard’s Almanack*.

Orwell has a quite different take on these topics, and he further elaborates on life of the *plongeur* by saying that “[h]is work is servile and without art; he is paid just enough to keep him alive; his only holiday is the sack. He is cut off from marriage, or, if he marries, his wife must work too. Except by a lucky chance, he has no escape from this life, save into prison” (103-4). Instead of concluding that this results from the *plongeur’s* laziness, spending habits, or his lack of self-discipline, Orwell analyzes the matter in the following manner:

> A slave, Marcus Gato said, should be working when he is not sleeping. It does not matter whether his work is needed or not, he must work, because work in itself is good — for slaves, at least. This sentiment still survives, and it has piled up mountains of useless drudgery. I believe that this instinct to perpetuate useless work is, at bottom, simply fear of the mob. The mob (the thought runs) are such low animals that they would be dangerous if they had leisure; it is safer to keep them too busy to think. (106)

While this line of thinking might not be specifically British, it is generally more European, nonetheless. In the United States – at least after the natives had been pushed aside – it was much easier to think of the land as a clean slate where the weight of history did not bear down on you and where everyone was in essence master of their own destiny. In Europe, the old social institutions may have somewhat changed shape over the centuries, but it was much harder to think that they did not exist or that the prevailing situation was somehow neutral instead of resulting from historical arrangements and also being purposefully biased against certain groups of people. The result here is a different way of categorizing and segmenting their surroundings for the authors

and as Rebecca L. Walkowitz writes, “social norms are embedded in traditions of literary style and that literary style is embedded in the politics of national culture” (125).

However, there might be situations where the nation as an analytical category is not a particularly fitting one. As Ėdouard Glissant writes, “In this period identification is with a culture (conceived of as civilization), not yet with a nation. The pre-Christian West along with pre-Columbian America, Africa of the time of the great conquerors, and the Asian kingdoms all shared this mode of feeling” (13). Glissant is writing here specifically about antiquity, but the thought of culture/civilization as more relevant than the nation might be applicable to certain contexts in more modern times too. Indeed, we have thus far seen how the split inside the allogenous category between Hemingway’s American heritage and Orwell’s British one generates somewhat different ways of perceiving the world whether it is with regards to other nationalities or certain other concepts. However, the second half of this equation is that both of them, nonetheless, hail from the same general cultural area of Western civilization, and if the national separation produces some structural differences then the homogenizing force of this overarching category should produce some structural similarities and also possibly a different kind of spilt in the world. We will explore the matter further in the next section by looking how the authors portray some of the minority populations they encounter in their books.

5.2 Orientalism and the Western viewpoint

5.2.1 Cultural Orientalism

In 1978, Edward Said wrote in his *Orientalism* that “without examining Orientalism as a discourse one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage – and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period” (11). Said thus makes the case that “the Orient” as an object of knowing and understanding was produced over a

long period of time through Western dominated discourses and that these discourses then conditioned the ways in which it was possible to approach the subject in various different fields. He elaborates further:

> Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident." Thus a very large mass of writers, among whom are poets, novelists, philosophers, political theorists, economists, and imperial administrators, have accepted the basic distinction between East and West as the starting point for elaborate theories, epics, novels, epics, social descriptions and political accounts concerning the Orient, its people, customs, "mind," destiny, and so on. […] Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient – dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. (10-11)

The Orientalist view would then be a wider category here than Westphal's characterization of ethnotyping as, instead of positing a fundamental difference between nations, Orientalism sets up a dichotomy between the West and the Orient, the European and the non-European. However, just as the ethnotype has produced stereotypical images based on the nation, so has Orientalism produced its own variety of stereotypes regarding non-Europeans with the central component often being connected to relative exoticism. Regarding a seminar he held in Burundi, Westphal writes:

> I asked students to tell me what they saw through the open window of the classroom. They saw nothing "special"; for me, I could clearly make out a beautiful red flower, which seemed incongruous in a landscape marred by an insidious civil war. My vision was tinged with exoticism. If I wrote a travel narrative about Burundi, I probably would have made a big deal of the "originality" of the local flora. If the students had described the same space, they probably would have left out any mention of the flowers, which would probably have been considered too trivial or banal for inclusion. (136)

Thus, exoticism in this context would denote increasing distance from the norm as understood by a Western observer. Let us see if any imagery falling into such category makes its way into our primary texts.

In general terms, it should first be noted that the colonial Empire itself or its effects mostly hang in the background in both books. There are numerous mentions of produce coming from it like tobacco, tea, coffee, fruits, spices and various alcohols, and even though some of these might be considered as formative parts of identity of Paris as a city – the cafes would hardly be the same without the coffee – their colonial origin remains unmentioned and unacknowledged as do often the people who originally produced them. However, Hemingway does relate an encounter he had with an Algerian fire-eater:

> At the café I met a man who ate fire for a living and also bent coins which he held in his toothless jaws with his thumb and fore finger. His gums were sore but firm to the eye as he exhibited them and he said it was not a *métier*. I asked him to have a drink and he was pleased. He had a fine dark face that glowed and shone when he ate the fire. […] We ate very cheaply in an Algerian restaurant and I liked the food and the Algerian wine. The fire-eater was a nice man and it was interesting to see him eat, as he could chew with his gums as well as most people can with their teeth. […] He said he knew many stories, some of them more horrible and incredible that had ever been written. He could tell them to me and I would write them and then if they made any money I would give him whatever I thought fair. Better still we could go to North Africa together and he would take me to the country of the Blue Sultan where I could get stories such as no man had ever heard. I asked him what sort of stories and he said battles, executions, tortures, violations, fearful customs, unbelievable practices, debaucheries; anything I needed. (158-59)

Said notes an array of such ideas as "Oriental despotism, Oriental splendor, cruelt[y], [and] sensuality" (12) as some of the defining components of the Orient in Western imagination and the Orient itself as "a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, [and] remarkable experiences" (9). Hemingway did not support colonialism,[18] but the description above corresponds rather closely to many of the stereotypical traits Said suggests feature in Western depictions of the Orient. In fact, Hemingway's description here seems to correspond to what a literary representation of a man from the Orient would be *expected* to look and sound if one wanted

---

[18] Writing specifically about Britain, Hutchisson says that the "colonial presence around the world also struck Hemingway as callous and misguided" (189).

to convey that person's exoticism and difference from their daily experience to a Western audience. Of course, part of this is conveyed through speech Hemingway attributes to the fire-eater himself – the other part would be his glowing, dark face and the exotic abilities he possesses – but whether the speech's framing here actually comes from the Algerian or is Hemingway's later formulation reflecting his own views,[19] the notable thing is that this type of stereotypical representation of the Orient apparently survived to the late 1950s as legitimate enough for Hemingway to (re)produce it without any further comment. Other similar stereotypes did less well as we will see below.

Orwell also makes a couple of references to Arabs living among the minority groups of Paris and writes, for example, about the "mysterious feuds" (6) they conduct among themselves and their peculiar "power of working all day and drinking all night" (81). However, the depiction is not that much different from the numerous European minorities present, who are also often described as engaging in drinking and fighting even if they do so with little mystery or any additional powers, and Orwell really does not seem to be employing any particularly consistent typology here. An exception, however, is made for one group: the Jews. Here is Orwell's description of a Jewish shopkeeper, who bought and sold clothing:

> The shopman was a red-haired Jew, an extraordinary disagreeable man, who used to fall into furious rages at the sight of a client. From his manner one would have supposed that we had done him some injury by coming to him […] And he paid incredibly low prices. […] He always preferred to exchange rather than buy, and he had a trick of thrusting some useless article into one's hand and then pretending that one had accepted it. […] It would have been a pleasure to flatten the Jew's nose, if only one could have afforded it. (18)

[19] As Hutchisson writes, "The stories that Hemingway tells in the book are based lightly on fact but are heavily embellished by his imagination, reconstructing his life to fit the personal mythology that he had for years been constructing and re-creating as his own version of the past" (235). Thus, the likeliest scenario would probably be that something like this encounter did indeed happen but that the description presented here is also to some degree colored by Hemingway's own biases.

Regarding Jewish stereotypes, Louis Harap writes that the most prevalent and consistent aspect of the stereotype is obsession with money or some other form of connection to financial matters. However, he also mentions other traditional traits such the red hair or beard connected with medieval depictions of Judas Iscariot and a supposed vengeful nature of the Jews attributed to them through the figure of Shylock (7). As with Hemingway's Algerian, the disagreeable, greedy Jew presented here seems indeed more like a stock figure than a real person, and throughout his book Orwell has a tendency to refer to any Jewish characters in a similar, negatively tinted fashion. Indeed, commenting on these depictions Taylor writes that they are "the abstract conception of 'the Jew', a figure seen in terms of his Jewishness *and nothing more*" (197). As such, it could be argued that the city space and its population are segmented along the Orientalist dichotomy here too; the segmentation just takes a somewhat different form and the target shifts. As Robert Young writes:

> If Orientalism involves a science of inclusion and incorporation of the East by the West, then that inclusion produces its own disruption: the creation of the Orient, if it does not really represent the East, signifies the West's own dislocation from itself, something inside that is presented, narrativized, as being outside […]: in this context, the Jews come to represent the Orient within, uncannily appearing inside when they should have remained hidden, outside Europe. (139)

However, even if we accept Young's formulation of the Jews coming to represent the Oriental non-European within and consider both Hemingway's and Orwell's descriptions here springing essentially from the same source, that would still leave the question of exoticism. While certainly stereotypical, Orwell's representation of the Jew does not seem particularly exotic, that is to say, it does not seem to posit any extensively large cultural distance to the Western civilization that would then warrant the Orientalist outlook for singling him or any other Parisian Jew out. If we are to consider this a case of structural Orientalism similar to Hemingway's, we still need to explain the

source of the perceived distance especially since it seems to have disappeared by the time *A Movable Feast* was written.[20] We will probe the matter in the next section.

5.2.2 Racial Orientalism

In *Construction and Representation of Race*, Mervyn C. Alleyne analyzes how race and ethnicity have developed as categories of classification through history and how they shape our perception. Separating the cultural and biological components from each other, he writes:

> Racism intersects with ethnocentrism. Racism is the belief that phenotypical or alleged genotypical characteristics are inherently indicative of certain behaviours and abilities, and it leads to invidious distinctions based on a hierarchical order. Ethnocentrism is the belief in the superiority of one's own culture. It can be basic and harmless when it is simply the belief in the merits of one's own way of life and the equating of "foreign" with "not so good as ours". This is normal and common to all peoples […]. But ethnocentrism may lead to a hierarchical ordering, especially in the context of culture contact. (12)

Going on to consider the sources of how such hierarchical rankings between groups develop, he then points to the distance between the two cultural entities and states that behaviors and customs that are most distant are “likely to become ‘odd’, ‘weird’, ‘monstrous’, ‘deviant’, and the like” while “[t]here is likely to be more tolerance for those cultural forms that are different from one's own but not too distant from the accepted norm” (14). This is a plausible approximation and seems at least generally applicable to Hemingway’s case: even though many of the people he meets during the course of his book hail from numerous different national backgrounds, they are, nonetheless, culturally close enough to be defined as being part of the Western Us whereas the Algerian fire-eater falls to the side of the Oriental Other in this dichotomy and comes to be mainly defined by his exoticism.

[20] Hemingway introduces two Jewish characters by name – Gertrude Stein and a Bulgarian painter Jules Pascin – but in their descriptions there is nothing stereotypically Jewish. In fact, the only explicit reference to Jews or Jewishness can be found in his description of Stein, where he writes that she was “very big but not tall and was heavily built like a peasant woman. She had beautiful eyes and a strong German-Jewish face that also could have been Friulano” (14).

However, if the matter is considered in racial terms, there does not need to be a large cultural distance since the crucial difference is thought to be in the supposed genotypical traits. Jeremy Kaye writes that "[w]hile we think of Jewishness today predominantly as a religious or cultural identity, in the early part of the twentieth century it took on an ethno-racial character as well. In the 1920s, Jews were not considered 'white'; rather, they were of an inferior race, looked upon as 'oriental,' 'mongrel,' or 'off white' (340). Thus, if one were to think of the Jews as a different race, there is no longer any inherent contradiction in placing them on the non-Western side of the equation even in the absence of any particularly prominent cultural markers that would set them apart. While discussing assumed differences between the rich and the poor, Orwell writes that "[f]ear of the mob is a superstitious fear. It is based on the idea that there is some mysterious, fundamental difference between rich and poor, as though they were two different races, like Negroes and white men" (107). It is hard to interpret this in any other way than Orwell subscribing to the idea of fundamental difference existing between different races, and it would not be unreasonable to conclude that such considerations also affect his representation of the Jews – the Orientalist dichotomy is applied on racial terms instead, and the Jews' supposed racial non-Europeanness is what singles them out.

While it could thus be said that for both Hemingway and Orwell there is indeed an overarching mode of Orientalist thought hanging in the background that affects their respective views on Paris and how they structure the city in their narratives, the cultural side of the matter seems much more foregrounded in *A Movable Feast* than it is in *Down and Out* where the racial element instead seems stronger. Several possibilities suggest themselves as explanations for this and a difference in personality might again be considered as one of them. However, according to Kaye the upbringing Hemingway received in Oak Park molded his views into racist and anti-Semitic direction. Apparently, his anti-Semitic feeling also actually intensified during his Paris years and

numerous derogatory remarks regarding Jewish people can be found in his correspondence from that time period (341). As such, personal preference with regards to either race or Jewish people in general would not seem to play a deciding role here.

One might also consider the allogenous national background of the authors as a possible source of explanation. However, Jonathan D. Sarna and Jonathan Golden write that even though earlier scholarship often tended to conclude that the introduction of anti-Semitism into the United States was an alien phenomenon that only took place as late as the end of the 19th century, more recently scholars have instead asserted that various forms of anti-Semitism have actually been present in the country during its whole history and at no point were the American Jews really free of such discrimination (2). Writing on anti-Semitic tropes in American literature, Louis Harap also makes the case that such tropes do in fact go much further back in American history than what has been suggested by the idea of such views only appearing at the end of the 19th century. However, he also states that much of the anti-Semitic tropes in American literature were actually simply taken over from the English literary tradition of earlier times (4). Thus, there does not seem to have been any particularly large difference between the British and the American general national view on the matter either, and they in fact shared a good deal of common history with regards to how the Jewish people were represented in literature.

The likeliest reason for the authors' difference in this area is in fact rather straightforwardly suggested by Alleyne. He writes:

> [I]n the immediate post-World War II era, many people saw race and ethnicity as a tired old organizing principle, its worst manifestation, Nazism, having plunged the world into a terrible catastrophe from which it had only just emerged. Marxism began to assert itself as a theory of society and as an organizing principle that interpreted social dynamics in terms of class conflicts, and defined social progress partly as the suppression of unproductive ethnicities and the uniting of the oppressed classes of the world. […] And there was, even outside Marxism, the notion of the melting

> pot, a concept which the Americas was giving to the world as the final solution to ethnic/nationalistic conflict among humans and nations. (244)

The determining factor for the difference here seems to be temporal, with the dividing line running between pre-World War II era and post-World War II era. Indeed, Kaye writes that, "In 1951, Edmund Wilson sought permission from Hemingway to reprint some of their early correspondence. Fully aware of the post-Holocaust sensitivity toward anti-Semitism, Hemingway asked Wilson to 'change 'Jews' to 'New York people,'… [because] I did not mean to give any derogatory or anti-Semitic meaning as it would read today'" (344). Similarly, even with Orwell's longtime fascination with the issue, Taylor writes that "[i]n the remaining five years of his life there were no more references to 'the Jew'".[21] (199) As such, we might say that while Hemingway's more culturally based Orientalist viewpoint present in *A Movable Feast* survived World War II and was still considered to be a legitimate organizing principle of thought in 1960, Orwell's more racially based Orientalism from the 1930s fared much worse, resulting in its virtual disappearance from Hemingway's pages.

Westphal writes that "[f]or if the city of Paris is an 'object' actualized in the real world, its virtualities are not subsumed under the referent. Paris exists virtually in the proliferation of fictional representations by which it is apprehended. […] The literary *place* is a virtual world that interacts in a modular fashion with the world of reference. The degree of correlation between one and the other can vary from zero to infinity" (101). Indeed, as we have seen in this chapter, Paris of the 1920s could be produced according to different sets of national stereotypes depending on who was doing the stereotyping and it could be presented as more or less racially segmented city in accordance with a temporal change in perspective. Whether the picture is Hemingway's more traditional City of Lights or Orwell's grimier counter image, both of them hold some truth in them

---

[21] Orwell died on 21st of January, 1950 (Taylor, 418).

and together contribute to the way the city exists virtually in people's imaginations. However, as we have also seen these perspectives are to a certain degree homogenized and conditioned by circumstances that are beyond any individual author's control and that nobody can ultimately escape from their own culturally and historically molded viewpoint, which brings us back to the premises of any geocritical study – no one way of looking at space is ever really complete, and the only way to overcome this limitation is to add more perspectives. The present study has attempted to contribute to such an effort in the case of Paris in its own small way, but possibilities for expansionary undertakings even with regard to just this particular space are mainly limited by the scholar's own imagination with minority perspectives, different time periods, women's voices, media representations from alternative formats, and so on added into the mix. Each new perspective reveals something the others cannot, and each one will bring us closer to essential identity of the space in question even if that final point will forever remain out of reach as dictated by necessity of that selfsame process. As Hemingway writes on the last page of his book, "There is never any ending to Paris and the memory of each person who has lived in it differs from that of any other" (211).

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to examine through the lens of geocriticism how Paris is represented in Ernest Hemingway's *A Movable Feast* and George Orwell's *Down and Out in Paris and London* and what kind of differences and/or similarities these representations might have. In chapter 3, we saw how changing the author's physical position vis-à-vis their social position produces a different way of perceiving surroundings. In chapter 4, we examined what effects the passage of time and different temporal location has on perception of space. And in chapter 5, the focus was on how the national and also the general cultural background of the author conditions how the city and its population is segmented. Regarding the authors themselves, the main finding here is that while Hemingway's narrative mostly aims at preserving the traditional Paris of art, love, and small cafes, Orwell is specifically trying to undermine this picture by exposing the dark counter side that it has. As stated in chapter 3, both of these images also seem to have some empirical merit to them, and instead of one being true and the other untrue they are indeed the result of approaching the matter from different angles.

However, in terms of the three main thematical categories we have used (space, time, and culture) this differentiation happens in somewhat different ways. In the spatial realm, Orwell's whole book is in essence a transgression against the prevailing order and its cultural sensibilities that tries to unsettle the reader on purpose. Hemingway's narrative, on the other hand, mainly adopts that position occupied by the prevailing order and its cultural sensibilities while noting some transgressions against it. In temporal terms, Orwell's picture of Paris in the 1920s is unstable because his own moment in time is unstable, and it is unclear into which direction events are going to proceed which also makes the implications of the recent history unclear. By Hemingway's time, the societal situation has stabilized to a much larger degree, while the picture of the past has also more thoroughly fossilized into a particular form as the course of the events has become clear. Both

of these categories contribute to the image – counter image dynamic, but in the case of the cultural category this dichotomy is less clear. That is, both authors employ a set of cultural stereotypes that they reproduce in their writing, and even though the sets are different, they are still recognizable stereotypes. As function of the stereotype is to depict supposedly immutable or essential qualities of the stereotype's object, here the opposition is not so much between an established image versus a provocative counter image but one of two different established images. Thus, while the image – counter image dynamic emerges as the most prevalent feature when comparing the two books, it still does not straightforwardly play out on every level present in the narrative.

The differing writing styles that Orwell and Hemingway employ are partly connected to their personal preferences and individual quirks, and this paper has used the authors' biographical information to suggest possible explanations for specific passages when appropriate. However, the main approach has been to examine the structural features present in the different perspectives and compare how they affect the viewpoint. As such, from the point of view of spatiality studies on a more general level the main results of the study can be summarized thus: while personal idiosyncrasies undoubtedly play a role in shaping the authors' picture of Paris, there are structural categories working in the background (space, time, and culture) upon which the idiosyncrasies are built. These categories do not determine how the object is perceived in any ironclad manner, but they do influence it and are also in general beyond the author's individual control. As such, Paris of the 1920s cannot be written into existence using a perspective from the 1930s if one is already living in the 1950s nor can one change one's cultural or national background to something else, but at the same time all such different points of view contribute to how the city is imagined into existence and how it exists in its virtual form. This not only speaks for geocriticism's general usefulness as a method of spatial studies but also specifically for its multifocal approach because such an approach makes the obvious seem much less obvious, that is, instead of positing

one normative viewpoint the multiplication of viewpoints forces us to reconsider any fixed ways of seeing and confront their validity – Paris can be the city of arts, love, and light, but it is not so for everyone. Even something as fundamental as perception of space can indeed vary quite radically depending on the point of view that is used.

Works cited

Primary sources
Hemingway, Ernest. *A Movable Feast*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.
Orwell, George. *Down and Out in Paris and London*. Penguin Books, 1940.

Secondary sources
Alleyne, Mervyn C. *Construction and Representation of Race*. University of the West Indies Press, 2000.
Althusser, Louis. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Translated by Ben Brewster. Verso, 2014. libcom.org/files/louis-althusser-on-the-reproduction-of-capitalism.compressed.pdf. Accessed April 10, 2021.
Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition, Verso, 2006.
Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. University of Texas Press, 1981.
Bell, Philip Michael Hett. *France and Britain 1900-1940: Entente and Estrangement.* Routledge, 2013.
Bhabha, Homi K. "Introduction: Narrating the Nation". *Nation and Narration*. Edited by Homi K. Bhabha. Routledge, 1990.
Blower, Brooke L. *Becoming Americans in Paris: Transatlantic Politics and Culture Between the World Wars*. Oxford UP, 2011.
Bresser-Pereira, Luiz Carlos. "The Golden Age of Capitalism". 2020. www.bresserpereira.org.br/papers/2020/Chapter-5-The-Golden-Age-of-Capitalism.pdf
Bulson, Eric. *Novels, Maps, Modernity: The Spatial Imagination, 1850-2000*. Routledge, 2006.
Cohen, Margaret. "The Chronotopes of the Sea". *The Novel, Volume 2: Forms and Themes,* edited by Franco Moretti, Princeton UP, 2006, pp. 647-66.
Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press, 1987. libcom.org/files/A%20Thousand%20Plateaus.pdf. Accessed April 10, 2021.
Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge, 2002.
Eche, Antoine. "The Shores of Aphrodite's Island: Cyprus and European Travel Memory, 1600– 1700". Tally, 2011, pp. 91-106.
Glissant, Ėdouard. *Poetics of Relation*. Translated by Betsy Wing. The University of Michigan Press, 1997.
Harap, Louis. *The Image of the Jew in American Literature: From Early Republic to Mass Immigration.* 2nd edition, Syracuse UP, 2003.
Harries, Karsten. *The Ethical Function of Architecture*. The MIT Press, 1997.
Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Basil Blackwell, 1989.
Hutchisson, James M. *Ernest Hemingway: A New Life*. Penn State UP, 2016.
Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Verso, 1991.
Kaye, Jeremy. "Race and Ethnicity". *Ernest Hemingway in Context*. Edited by Suzanne Del Gizzo and Debra Moddelmog. Cambridge UP, 2013.
Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. Columbia UP, 1982.

Lukacs, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. The Merlin Press, 1971. https://monoskop.org/images/3/3b/Lukacs_Georg_History_and_Class_Consciousness_Studies_in_Marxist_Dialectics.pdf. Accessed April 10, 2021.

Lynch, Kevin. *The Image of the City*. The MIT Press, 1986.

Miller, William Ian. *The Anatomy of Disgust*. Harvard UP, 1997.

Mitchell, Peta and Jane Stadler. "Redrawing the Map: An Interdisciplinary Geocritical Approach to Australian Cultural Narratives". Tally, 2011, pp. 47-62.

Morrison, Susan Signe. *The Literature of Waste: Material Ecopoetics and Ethical Matter.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

"Nostalgia". *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nostalgia. Accessed April 10, 2021.

"Nostalgia". *Oxford Advanced American Dictionary*. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/american_english/nostalgia. Accessed April 10, 2021.

Portes, Jacques. "France and the United States". *France and the Americas: Culture, Politics, and History,* vol. 1, edited by Bill Marshall, ABC-CLIO, 2005, pp. 37-46.

Prieto, Eric. "Geocriticism, Geopoetics, Geophilosophy, and Beyond". Tally, 2011, pp. 13-28.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Routledga & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Sárdi, Krisztina. "'There's never any ending to Paris' Creating a Literary Myth: Geocritical Aspects of the Works of the Lost Generation". *Journal for Foreign Languages*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2015, pp. 17-26. Doi: 10.4312/vestnik.7.17-26

Sarna, Jonathan D., and Jonathan Golden. "The American Jewish Experience in the Twentieth Century: Antisemitism and Assimilation". *National Humanities Center.* nationalhumanitiescenter.org/tserve/twenty/tkeyinfo/jewishexp.htm. Accessed April 10, 2021.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions*. Blackwell, 2000.

Tally, Robert T. "Geocriticism and Classic American Literature". 2008. digital.library.txstate.edu/bitstream/handle/10877/3923/fulltext.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Accessed April 10, 2021.

Tally, Robert T., editor. *Geocritical Explorations: Space, Place, and Mapping in Literary and Cultural Studies*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Tally, Robert T. *Spatiality*. Routledge, 2013.

Tavernier-Courbin, Jacqueline. "Hemingway and Company". *Canadian Review of American Studies,* vol. 18, no. 3, 1987, pp. 383-92. Doi: 10.3138/CRAS-018-03-04.

Taylor, D. J. *Orwell*: *The Life*. Vintage, 2004.

Turmel, Patrick. *Rites of Way: The Politics and Poetics of Public Space*. Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2009.

Walkowitz, Rebecca L. "Virginia Woolf's Evasion: Critical Cosmopolitanism and British Modernism". *Bad Modernisms,* edited by Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, Duke University Press Books, 2006, pp. 119-44.

Westphal, Bertrand. *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*. Translated by Robert T. Tally. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Young, Robert. *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West.* Routledge, 1990.