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Abstract

On a literary walking tour, many emotional ‘states’ are experienced by participants. These states have multiple causes, products and consequences, influenced in part by the socio-spatial identities of participants, their own imagined versions of the novel, and the material and cultural geographies of the tour itself. The Literary Atlas project sought to examine these emotional states by conducting literary walking tours based on English-language novels set in Wales. This paper attunes to the emotional states experienced by participants on one of these tours, based on the locations in Malcolm Pryce’s Aberystwyth Mon Amour. The paper examines the ways in which these states cohere and collide to actively constitute the ongoing composition of the real-and-imagined worlds produced through this emergent literary geography.
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**Introduction**

This paper attunes to the emotional states experienced on literary tours. Following Anderson (2015), the paper interprets an emotional state as a temporary condition that joins us and defines our relations with the world. As Anderson has argued, the notion of the state is at once an experiential condition; it is physically sensed, affectively felt, psychologically considered, and cognitively reflected upon. However, the state is not simply human in a physical sense; it is also crucially defined by geographical place. The state is influenced by the environment that the individual experiences and contributes to, as well as the cultural customs and ideologies of that location. The notion of the state is of particular interest when considering tourism, and in this case, literary tourism. Tourism and its associated mobility involves the individual moving from one set of socio-spatial relations to another, and integral to this process is the individual adapting, orientating, and finding themselves within these new networks (see Oberg, 1960; Pizam, 1999; Robinson, 1999; Ward, Bochner, and Furnham 2001). This paper suggests that literary tourism offers a unique perspective to attune to the relational states associated with this mobility as it does not simply involve individuals moving from one set of socio-spatial relations to another, but rather involves individuals bringing three often separate worlds of experience into direct contact with one another, namely: their own socio-spatial identity; the version of the novel they have creatively imagined; and the geographies of the literary tour. By drawing on one example of the literary tour enacted by the *Literary Atlas* project – a walking tour based on the novel *Aberystwyth, Mon Amour* – it illustrates how the affective states associated with each aspect of the individuals’ lived experiences are brought into coincidence with another. It explores how this coincidence can lead to a strong sense of resonance but also in some cases a sense of rupture between real-and-imagined literary geographies. These affective states have the consequence of contextualising and giving definition to the participants and the practice itself.

In order to attune to the emotional states of literary tourism the paper employs a relational approach. Over recent years, relational approaches have offered new insights into the range of disciplines that constitute the arts, humanities, and social sciences. From studies of tourism, geography, and literature, relational thinking has changed how the world is understood and produced through practice. As Anderson and Saunders (2016) have summarised, relational approaches employ the orthodox, individualised categories of the modern – accepting that ‘things’, ‘objects’ or ‘components’ have significance in the western imagination – but argue that their meaning and definition are derived from their positioning
within broader sets of cultural, temporal, and spatial networks. Relational thinking therefore does not consider ‘things’, ‘objects’ or ‘components’ to be ‘a priori’ in the world, but rather considers their meaning and definition to be continually ephemeral, (re)composing, and emergent (see also Whatmore, 1999, p31-2). This paper seeks to apply relational thinking to the practice and critique of the literary tour. As we will see, literary tourism is often suggested as a practice that offers insight into the real or imagined places of literature (e.g. author’s birthplaces, or fictionalized versions of real life places, e.g. Thomas Hardy’s Wessex), using brochures, guides and cartography to offer metaphorical ‘keys’ or ‘passwords’ to understand the definitive truth behind the places of writing or setting. Relational approaches counter this passive ‘reading’ of literary tourism, and offer in its stead a creative, agential, co-production of literary places through practice. Literary tours, in this view, are not passwords to open up definitive and singular readings of any literary geography, but rather passports which invite the reader on a journey into an emergent world that they contribute to. This contribution is made through the coming together of the three worlds of experience that the literary tour explicitly calls forth. Namely, the socio-spatial identity of the participant; a version of the novel created through their own creative imagining; and the geographies of the literary tour. The following sections outline necessarily brief introductions to relationality and how they have influenced geography, literary studies, and tourism.

Relating to the spaces of literary tourism

Relationality has long been significant to the ways in which social science scholars understand and approach the world (see Doel 1999; Murdoch 2006). According to Jones (2009, p. 487), a relational approach insists that the world is constituted as “an open-ended, mobile, networked, and actor-centred geographic becoming”. In this ongoing constituting of the world (contrasted to a fixed modern constitution, seminally critiqued by Latour, 1993), components are defined by their ‘type of connection’ to other components, rather than being designated by any isolated properties or discrete capacities. In this view, the fixed independent chunks of the modern constitution no longer hold sway, these now give way to an inter dependent epistemology where things are always acting and being acted upon by everything else.

The relational approach has consequences for how human geographers understand the world. Drawing on representational approaches to culture, geographers continue to emphasise how all places are ‘relative and symbolic’ (Aitcheson, 1999) due to their
production through ideological discourse and material construction. In relational thinking, however, representational approaches are allied to theories of practice which sensitise scholars to the ways in which worlds are brought forth not simply through cognitive meaning and considered reflection, but also through impulsive and affective activities. As a consequence, the ‘conversations’ that come to construct place are no longer held solely by dominant ‘voices’ within any culture, but by a range of actors articulating and responding to a range of ‘voices’ (including non-verbal practices, bodily communications, physical interventions, creative imaginings, etc.) which co-produce places into being (see Anderson and Harrison, 2010). As a consequence of these contributions, multiple actors and voices no longer produce geographies that are solidified and singular, but rather dynamic and multiple (see Massey 2005, for a full review).

The relational approach can be identified not only in approaches to human geography, but also with respect to the other disciplines relevant to this paper: literary studies and tourism. In terms of literary studies, scholars have challenged the perceived stability and homogeneity of literature and the characters and places within them. Texts are no longer framed as fixed and singular, but have a variety of interpretations based on a rich amalgam of authorial intent and audience (re)interpretation. The reception of literature, its spaces, characters and plot, is widely recognized as being far from fixed or absolute, but rather as ‘phenomenal’ in nature – specific novels are configured as individually “contextualised and always emerging geographical event[s]” (Hones, 2008, p. 1301). Books are therefore rendered into being not simply by isolated authorial intent, but through the “complex production of meaning and effect [...] from the dynamic interaction” between a reader, their imagination, pre-existing knowledge, and the work of the author (Drucker 2008, cited in Barnes 2013, p. 166). In this approach, the reader is no longer positioned as a passive consumer of authorial purpose, but rather enjoys the agency to produce their/our own reading of any fiction (following Barthes, 1977; see also Cameron, 2012; Ljungberg, 2003; Piatti and Hurni, 2009). As a result, it is now understood that even when you and I open the same covers of a novel, we will both read (or to be specific, we will both co-produce with the author) a completely different book.

The relational approach also has consequences for the understanding and practice of tourism. Representational and modern approaches to tourism could be simplistically characterized though the creation of fixed, commoditized place ‘packages’ which can be ‘serially
reproduced’ by locals or tour companies (Richards and Wilson, 2006) for the consumption by an unthinking or inactive mass culture. In this view, “the tour brochure directs expectations, influences perceptions, and thereby provides a preconceived landscape for the tourist to ‘discover’” (Weightman 1987, p. 230, also cited in Pritchard and Morgan, 2001, p. 167). However, the relational approach suggests that this framing offers only a partial view of the ways in which places are produced and consumed. From a relational perspective, the practice of tourism cannot go out to discover a singular, authentic place revealed through insider knowledge, local guides, or expert insight, because such a definitive, discrete place does not exist. Rather tourism is a practice of co-constituting place in the moment, and understanding this practice requires sensitivity to the unique, emergent experiences which cannot be wholly programmed or predicted, and are co-produced by the coming together of discrete components which all have a degree of agency over the process and outcome.

The practice of ‘creative tourism’ (see Richards, 2011) seeks to actively cater for those who wish this form of relational engagement in their tourism experience. For those seeking to be part of bespoke, one-off encounters, creative tourism parallels the growth of what Pine & Gilmore identify as the ‘experience-’ and ‘creative- economy’ (1999), where tourism elides the differences between cultural heritage, skill-building, and performance, through providing the opportunity for individuals to actively contribute to experiential and affective encounters in spatially-relevant settings. Literary tourism is a good example of both increased sensitivity to the relational, and the rise of creative tourism itself. Conventionally, literary tourism has focused on quasi-educational visits to real places (including birthplaces of writers, their homes, and significant cultural sites in their lives), as well as places associated with fictional works (see Herbert, 1996; 2001; Robinson and Andersen, 2002; Watson, 2006). However, as many scholars have noted, the relations between ‘real’ places and ‘fictional’ places are not sharp or well-defined (see Soja, 1996; Reijnders, 2010; Anderson, 2014; Hones, 2014; Jiang and Xu, 2016) and due to the nature of positionality with respect to both place- and literary- co-production, relational approaches enable these complex coming together to be traced and understood in new and innovative ways (see below).

Relational approaches have thus taken hold in the array of disciplines that are the focus of this paper. In order to understand actor-centred understandings of a relational world, human
geography, literary studies, and tourism have sought to increasingly attune to the affective. Affect and emotions have been widely integrated into social sciences study in recent years (see, for example, Game and Metcalfe, 1996; Davidson, Bondi, and Smith, 2005), and much of this integration has borne the hallmarks of the modern constitution. For example, the Platonic distinction between body and mind has been widely retained, with affect precisely categorised as the biophysical process of sensing (i.e. the moment of feeling), and emotion defined as the subsequent cognitive representation of this corporeal process (see for example, Thien, 2005; Anderson and Harrison, 2006; 2010; Pile, 2009). In this framing, affect is interpreted as a sensation felt through the body, and emotion as the capturing of affect through linguistic representation (e.g. through the label of ‘love’, ‘empathy’, ‘hate’, or ‘compulsion’) (see Wetherell, 2012). However, it is possible to adopt relational approaches to the affective which identify ‘sensibilities’ emanating not from isolated bodies (or indeed minds), but through the interdependent coming together of a range of forces and processes (see also Anderson, 2009). The notion of the relational state is one example of this, referring to an experiential condition which is at once physically sensed, affectively felt, psychologically considered, and cognitively reflected upon. Indeed, the state is not simply human in a physical, limited, sense; it is also crucially defined by the geographical place in which that human is situated. The state is influenced by the environment that the individual experiences and contributes to, as well as the cultural customs and ideologies in which they find themselves. Indeed, this process of locating oneself within a set of socio-spatial relations is central to the process of developing and refining self-hood; it is these relational states that frame our socio-spatial identities, it is relational states that are the means through which individuals are joined to and define their relations with the world.

**When worlds collide…**

The importance of the relational state to socio-spatial identity is such that a number of studies have used the notion to track and trace how humans register changes in their social and geographical setting (see, for example, Barry, 2016). Anderson (2015) acknowledges, for example, how disorientation can be experienced as individuals exchange one set of socio-spatial relations for another (see also Reisinger and Turner, 2003; Hottola, 2004). In the case of literary tourism however, a different set of relations are brought into being. This paper argues that three aspects of lived experience are directly brought into coincidence with each other through the practice of literary tourism, namely; an individual’s socio-spatial identity; their version of the novel created through imaginative reading; and, the geographies
of the literary tour. Traditionally, the socio-spatial identity of an individual is produced through a range of physical and mental interactions (including, for example, daily physical exchanges, one-off significant experiences, and fantastical imaginings), which form the co-constitutive bond between a person and a place (see, for example, Casey, 2001; Sack, 1997). From a relational perspective, these bonds are registered in the individual as an affective ‘state’, for example one may feel a sense of ‘belonging’ or ‘home’ when in familiar places with appreciated customs, or strangeness when either in locations with alien cultural ‘traces’ (Anderson, 2015) or when familiar places are under threat from the same (see Tuan, 1977). This socio-spatial identity is actively employed in the second aspect of lived experiences that is of concern to us here, the relational reading of a novel. As we have seen above, a reader’s contribution to any text is vital in realising its potential (see Ljungberg 2003, p.174). The reader is therefore a key contributor to the creation of story, as Larsen points out:

“It is sometimes said that the reader meets the author halfway to the page, but I would say it is more like .0001% author, 99.999% reader’s architecture of imagination… the trick, of course, [lies with the author] knowing what details to include [to spark this construction process]” (2018, p.168).

If the reader’s imagination does the ‘heavy lifting’ in relation to building literary worlds, it does so triggered by the linguistic prompts offered by the author, and filtered by a reader’s socio-spatial identity. The author’s invitation to build collaborative worlds will only be taken up if the reader’s identity and imagination is captured by them, and the author’s words will be streamed through the reader’s own sense of geography, morality, and politics, to begin building the architecture of that world. The socio-spatial identity of the reader, and that reader’s ‘architecture of imagination’ is then brought into coincidence with the ‘real’ world through the literary tour. As seen above, the literary tour brings individuals into encounters with ‘real’ settings used in novels, and “promotes an interactive relationship between readers, authors, and places” (Gentile and Brown, 2015, p. 25). If we take the relational approach to literary tourism seriously then new questions are posed by the coincidence of these three worlds of lived experience. As Anderson and Saunders suggest, the relational approach requires us to engage in the process of:

“identifying the causes, products, and consequences of these many-to-many
relations [and] explore… how these different agents come to cast their spell over the ongoing composition of literature and place. [We must ask how] literary geographies… issue from the lived to the imagined world, and the imagined to the lived world, and how they circulate and transform one another[?]” (2015, p. 117).

This paper explores these ‘causes, products, and consequences of the many to many relations’ using the example of a literary tour based on the novel Aberystwyth, Mon Amour (Pryce, 2001). Through so doing, it attunes to the affective states that ‘circulate and transform one another’ as the lived worlds of experience coincide to create its relational literary geographies.

**Relational Methodology**

The literary tour based on the novel, Aberystwyth, Mon Amour was operationalised by the Literary Atlas project. Literary Atlas was developed through an Arts and Humanities Research Council grant, supported by Literature Wales, and run by the authors alongside scholars from Cardiff and Swansea University. Its primary purpose was to create an online cultural resource based on English language novels set in Wales (www.literaryatlas.wales). Drawing on the broader project which mapped over 570 novels (http://www.literaryatlas.wales/en/library/), it focused on 12 specific novels and undertook a range of innovative cartographies to depict their literary geographies not only on the Literary Atlas website but also in a series of exhibitions (http://www.literaryatlas.wales/en/art/exhibitions/). A specific part of this project involved running creative forms of literary tourism based on these 12 novels. Members of the public were recruited from direct invitations to reading clubs and creative writing groups, as well as open calls to public libraries. Participants had to be over 18, and reflecting the constituency of the majority of reading and writing groups involved, in practice the average age was over 40. Each event involved both locals based in close proximity to the setting of the novel, as well as those travelling up to 150 miles to participate. In the case of the Aberystwyth, Mon Amour tour, fifteen people participated. Nine were female, six male; ages ranged from six in the 25-40 age bracket, five between 41 and 59; and four over 60; eleven were local to the community (for a minimum of ten years), and four had travelled from South Wales to Aberystwyth for the first time for the event. All tours were conducted in English, although some of the participants were fluent in Welsh. Unlike other tours conducted by Literary Atlas, the issue of Welsh language did not arise in the context of Aberystwyth, Mon Amour.
As a consequence, this paper will not directly engage with the significant issue of Cymraeg and English co-existing in many places and plots in Welsh writing in English.

Each tour operationalised by Literary Atlas was explicitly set up as ‘creative’ in nature (following Richards, 2011); attendance was premised on having read the book which was the focus of the tour, but beyond this, there were no ‘experts’ formally designated, and the itinerary was loosely improvised around key geographical references and associated passages from the novel. This itinerary was open to change, depending on practicality of movement, time involved, and collective will. Most tours were based on foot, and operated in the talking whilst walking tradition (see Anderson, 2004; Pink, 2007, and more broadly, Sheller & Urry, 2006, Binnie at al 2007; de Certeau, 1984). In practice, this meant using the embodied art of walking to move through, “particular co-ingredient environments for recollection” (afer Anderson, 2004: 259). In the case of the literary tour, these ‘environments’ were the imagined novel and the spatial cultures of Aberystwyth itself, and cues from both the book, the participants, and the place were used to prompt ideas and feelings that had become part of individuals’ ‘architecture of imagination’. In short, physiological engagement with the ‘real’ world was used to bring the participant’s socio-spatial identities and imagined worlds of Aberystwyth, Mon Amour ‘into conversation’.

Participants carried micro- and smart-phones in order to record all encounters. Individuals were invited to take photos and make notes to simply record their interactions, post to social media, or as a memento for later discussion; and these were later shared with the Literary Atlas team Audio recordings were also taken by the Literary Atlas team (three were in attendance on this tour) using professional standard recording equipment with three-way external microphones. All recordings were later transcribed and thematically analysed. All participants on the tour were actively encouraged to engage in dialogue and share their impulses and reactions with each other – in short, share their relational states – prompted by the coming together of their identities, their books, and the places of the literary tour.

Walking into the worlds of Aberystwyth, Mon Amour

This paper is based on one illustrative example of these tours: the literary geographies of Aberystwyth, Mon Amour (2001). This novel was the first in a six-part series involving the fictional detective Louie Knight, authored by Malcolm Pryce. As the title suggests, the book was set in the relatively remote, mid-Wales seaside town of Aberystwyth, and juxtaposes
very British notions of seaside holidays – lost innocence, saucy postcards, and donkey rides – with characters and plots grafted from American crime thrillers in the genre typified by Raymond Chandler. In Pryce's words, "the concept [of the series] is basically a private eye from the American 1930s tradition, in Aberystwyth” (Pryce, in interview). This simple fish out of water premise combined with Pryce’s deep-rooted affection for the area to produce an invitation to readers to engage with what he describes as his “love poem to the town” (in interview).

The tour started at a key geographical location in the town of Aberystwyth itself, the Royal Pier. According to guidebooks (e.g. Lewis, 1967), the pier was built in 1865 and was originally 242 metres long; following construction it became the centrepiece of the town that marketed itself as ‘the Biarritz of Wales’. Due perhaps to the town’s relative inaccessibility, hopes of international glamour and wealth were not realised, and for Pryce, the pier symbolises the thwarted ambitions of those who inhabit his version of the town. As the following fantastical excerpt, read by the tour participants on the Aberystwyth prom, suggests:

“The mangled ironwork of Aberystwyth Pier points out across the waters of Cardigan Bay like a skeletal finger. In happier times it had been a brightly painted boulevard of kiosks and sideshows where the ladies and gentlemen of the day came to enjoy the restorative properties of the seaside air. Parasols were twirled, moustaches waxed and ships bound for Shanghai, Honolulu, Papeete and 'Frisco' could be embarked from the end of the jetty. But the intervening years had seen a sad, slow fall from grace. The ships had all been turned into garden sheds and the Pier now lay stunted and truncated like a bridge to the Promised Land that had run out of funds” (2001, p. 13).

Insert Figure 1 Royal Pier (Photo Literary Atlas)

Beyond the parodic musings of Pryce, in the present the Pier hosts a number of bars and cafes, but is dominated by an amusement arcade. Participants on the tour went in to the arcade to experience its atmosphere first hand:

M (Male) 1iii: Help yourself to the 2ps.
F (Female) 1: Oh, this is my idea of hell! [laughs]
For those on the tour, the experience of the physically real amusement arcade resonated strongly with the world that Pryce invited his readers into imagining; as the following excerpt goes some way to illustrate:

“Inside it was bedlam: a flashing labyrinth of fruit machines at which boys, who should have been in school, stood chewing like cows in the late-afternoon sun and examining the reels with the concentration of chess players. Sullen girls slouched next to them with heavy kohl-rimmed eyes like handmaidens from Egyptian tombs” (Pryce, 2001, p. 14).

Although in the moment of the tour, ruminant teenagers had yet to emerge, the maze of machines had direct parallels with the novel; the characters Pryce depicted inhabiting this space played to the cultural expectations of the tour participants, reinforcing their suspicions that although this wasn’t quite a den of iniquity, it was nevertheless a space that was more designed for holiday-makers, students, or youths seeking an escape from inclement weather or similar adolescence, rather than a place where they were supposed to feel at home. The tour participants could imagine that it was precisely the kind of place that ‘Calamity’ Jane, Louie Knight’s teenage sidekick would inhabit, as a tour conversation suggested:

M1: I quite like this idea of Louis’s meeting his… you know, his youthful sidekick here… Louis is this hard-boiled tough detective figure, who wouldn’t really fit in in this type of place….

F1: Yeah, meeting his sidekick here basically.

F2: Yeah, … in this rundown arcade [laughs] you know.

F1: Run down? It’s state-of-the-art! [laughter]

F3: Maybe so, I don’t know!

[over the music and sound of arcade machines]

F2: He’d have to bellow at her, he wouldn’t be able to just chat!
In the novel, the reader is invited to imagine the actual meeting between Louie and Calamity in the Pier arcade. Pryce sketched the meeting as follows:

“…At the far end of the room, next to a window looking out to a forlorn ocean, there was a player who differed from the rest. Dressed in school uniform, she looked about fifteen or sixteen years old, and had a turned-up nose, a mass of freckles, spiky blonde hair and a chocolate-rimmed mouth.

…

‘Wouldn't it be better to put some money in?’ [Louie Knight asked the girl] She answered mechanically without removing her gaze from the screen. ‘No point. This machine isn’t going to come up for another fifty games. Lady over there in the blue scarf is going to win this one’.

…The lady in the blue scarf shouted, ‘House!’

I looked at the kid with renewed respect. ‘Pretty good! What’s your name?’

‘Calamity Jane, what’s yours?’

‘Louie Knight.’


In the moment of the tour, there was considerable emotional and cognitive assonance between the ‘real’ place of the pier, and the relational space of the imagined pier that participants had conjured through their reading of the novel. Regardless of whether tour participants were experiencing Aberystwyth – and the Pier – for the first time, or whether they were long-standing inhabitants of the town, their cultural expectations of seaside amusement arcades, the version they conjured through their reading of the novel, and their experience on the tour, elided together to reinforce the compatibility of these different aspects of this relational literary geography. For these tour participants, the relationships between these different aspects were ‘plausible’, to use the phrase adopted by the author Phillip Pullman to describe the ‘trick’ he aims to pull off when aligning fictional and real places (2018). Although Louie and Calamity were an unlikely crime fighting duo, and Aberystwyth an unlikely place for Pryce to situate a criminal underworld (for more see below), the pier created a plausible platform on which these characters could meet and begin their professional relationship. Due to the polarising culture of the pier, Calamity appeared completely at home here, mastering the knowledge of the slot machines and out-tomboying the male teenagers with her smart quips and self-assurance. Yet whilst Calamity exhibited a
topophilia and sense of belonging in this setting (see Tuan, 1974), Louie – despite his seniority and experience - exhibited a relational topophobia, or out of placeness, in this site. For those on the tour, the place of the pier compounded the idea that one character possessed a sense of streetwise nous and youthful naiveté that would usefully combine with the other’s cynical logic and scepticism. Indeed, the juxtaposition between the two characters – itself reflecting genre tropes of odd couple detective ‘buddies’ – had the effect of reassuring participants that this strange territory was nevertheless oddly familiar, and this unlikely duo could form a sense of family which could hold them together as they began to track down the mafioso-druids running the town.

**Exit Pier right**
The tour exited the Pier and walked a few yards south along the Prom.

F1: Which building is that one there, then?
M1: That’s the Old College, that was the university building.
F1: Oh, it’s the old one, is it, yeah?
F2: These [buildings] are looking very grim and disrepaired, aren’t they?
F3: Yeah, but it is a fantastic location isn’t it? The views from these buildings are… phenomenal.
F2: On a day like this [warm Autumn sun], it’s just gorgeous.

*Insert Figure 3 Old College / Rock Factory (Photo Literary Atlas)*

For Pryce, the Old College sited Barnaby and Merlin’s pink-smoke belching Rock Factory. In it, the child genius Dai Brainbox perfected the art of inserting words into sticks of candy (commonly signaturing the holiday destination for tourists and visitors) and changing them as the candy is sucked away. As Pryce, through the character of Meirion, Aberystwyth’s crime reporter, narrates:

“You know, so it starts off saying Blackpool and then after a few mouthfuls it says Zanzibar or something. It's one of the last great challenges of the rock-maker's art. And he cracked it. Just like that. Sat down with a pen and paper and a set of log tables and worked it out. So then the management make him head of R&D and within a week - and the kid is still in school, don't forget, hasn't even done his O levels - within
a week he'd found a way of computer type-setting the letters. Saved a fortune: twenty old-timers were thrown out of work the same afternoon” (2001, p. 39).

On the tour, the place of the Old College / Rock Factory prompts and provokes the participants to share their own knowledge about the building, and the other locations it springs to mind.

F1: It’s became one of the old university buildings, and it was built in a time when show was everything, you know?

F2: It reminds me of the banks, the old banks in Cardiff Bay, you know, in Mount Stuart Square in the docks. Those type of stately buildings that were built when there was obviously money around

F1: It was built as a hotel when the railway came but it just never, you know, fulfilled its ambition, there just weren’t enough people coming and so then it went over to the university.

Into this discussion about the broader diaspora of buildings and histories that the place of the Old College / Rock Factory suggested, the following passage from a later novel in the series *Don’t Cry for Me Aberystwyth* was introduced:

“It was a lovely building, but architecturally it was the equivalent of a kid in a fancy-dress costumier’s who tries on everything at the same time. It had Rhineland castle and gothic turrets, battlements and mosaics, statues and garrets. It would have been absurd but for the warm yellow stone from which it was constructed. It soothed the incongruity and lent it a strange beauty. You could forgive a lot of architectural sins with stone like that” (2007, p. 105).

This passage – although morphing the real building into a Rock Factory – was nevertheless engaged with by those on the tour as a form of guide book, prompting reflection and a fresh gaze on the actual architecture of the building itself.

F1: At first glance I thought, oh look, a big grand 19th century building. But actually, you know, what he’s saying… he’s kind of… it’s kind of a criticism of the of the architects that would have designed this, you know, trying to
build something grandiose but ending up mashing lots of different designs into one. But I really wouldn’t have thought about that by just looking at it, you know, without reading the passage in front of it, does that make sense?

M1: Yes, yes it does.

F2: It’s brought it to our attention, you know, we’re looking for the detail.

M1: [The design] it’s harking back to gothic… it’s fantasy, isn’t it? Fantasy [laughs].

F3: It is a bit of a… yeah, maybe a bit of a folly, yeah.

F2: Yeah, folly, yeah, like Castell Coch [just north of Cardiff], perhaps.

F3: Yes, yes, it’s a mixture of styles.

For those on this literary tour, the ‘real’ world of Aberystwyth and the fictional world sketched by Pryce had again resonantly coincided at the Old College / Rock Factory. So much so, that the novel itself has functioned as a something more than an invitation into building an imagined world, but as a parodic form of ‘documentary’ source (Brosseau, 1994, p. 333). Here the tour participants consumed the meeting between fiction and materiality ‘unproblematically’ (see Sharp, 2000, p.327, see also Hones, 2008), the architectural history of the building as depicted by Pryce had functioned akin to a “valuable storehouse of vivid depictions of landscapes and life” (Meinig 1983, p. 316, also cited in Sharp, 2000, p.327), which was interpreted as (more or less) authentic and ‘real’. In this way, this meeting of fiction and reality, starting at the Pier, and now extended to the Old College, had created a coming together that was more powerful and affective than either world in isolation. In Pocock’s words, a different ‘truth’ was emerging:

“the truth of fiction [merged with reality offered] a truth beyond mere facts. Fictive reality [was beginning to] transcend or contain more truth than the physical or everyday reality” (Pocock 1981, p.11, cited in Sharp, 2000, p. 328).

As a result of engaging with the literary geographies of Aberystwyth, Mon Amour in practice, it was making less sense for the tour participants to retain the ‘big dichotomy’ (after Soja, 1996) of ‘imaginative space’ on one hand and ‘real space’ on the other, and rather entertain a relational “complex of multiple imaginations and realities” that were conjoined through their activities (after Reijnders, 2010, p. 41). The participants continued their journey into what for
them was becoming a ‘real-and-imagined’ world (Soja, 1996) as they walked to the end of the Old College / Rock Factory.

Insert Figure 4 Archimedes (Photo Literary Atlas)

F1: Does anyone know who that actually is, ‘cause I…
F2: It’s Archimedes.
F1: Well, he’s pondering something and if he’s not working out how many grains of sand there are in the world, it’s taken him a long time because he’s grown a beard, hasn’t he?
M1: Are you googling now who it is?
F2: I am [laughter].

[quoting] “At the same time, the south range was rebuilt as a science block so that was after it was made into the university. Rebuilt as a science block in a more plain, gothic style, with a circular tower at its end bearing a mosaic triptych by CF Voysey showing Archimedes being presented with models of modern technology, a steam locomotive and a steam ship with its sails also set. Two gargoyles above a door show science defeating error and light overcoming darkness”.

F1: Oh… [laughter].
F2: So, it’s… yeah.
F1: I fancy going finding those gargoyles.

Insert Figure 5 Gargoyles (Photo Literary Atlas)

Entering into the real-and-imagined world that was being created through the practice of the literary tour, the participants actively sought to create connections between the novel and the material geographies around them, using their imagination to build links to other places as well as extend their knowledge of this world through their own insights, remembered fragments, and through internet encyclopaedia. This knowledge was communicated and shared, with an element of enthusiasm and wit, which appeared to mimic the tongue-in-cheek atmosphere prompted by Pryce in his novel.

M1: Can you imagine this building as a rock foundry, with ‘criminal’ links?
F1: No! [laughter].
F2: You’d have to make a lot of money out of rock, wouldn’t you, to be able to afford it.
F3: Ah, but this was special rock, isn’t it? Dai Brainbox’s special rock, and they’re probably supplying every rock emporium in the country!
M2: There was one of those things when I lived here, I loved that juxtaposition [of crime in this quiet, friendly town] because, you know, the biggest headline in the Cambrian News was ‘someone left their shed open’… you know! [laughter].
F3: I know, I know!
M2: And you’re thinking yeah, and they’re supposed to be this kind of underworld… come on! Of all the places in the world, this is the least likely place to have that! So the clear kind of obvious [juxtaposition]… is actually why it kind of works [laughs]
F3: Mm. My favourite local news headline was ‘Cat flap Slightly Damaged’ [laughter] That’s how exciting our news gets [laughs].
F4: My favourite is, ‘Father of Ten Shot, Mistaken for Rabbit.’
F1: Oh no… [laughs], oh God.

The discussion prompted by engagement with the Old College / Rock Factory led the tour participants into reflecting on the personality of the town that Pryce had captured in his choice of words for the novel. For some on the tour the unlikely juxtapositions in the novel (of Calamity and Louie; of Rock Factory in a university building; of mafioso druids in a quiet seaside town) were certainly outlandish, yet they were so unlikely that they allowed themselves to be charmed into believing their plausibility. For some, it was nature of the town itself that allowed the acceptance of this flight of fancy:

M1: I thought when I first started reading it, I read the back and I thought, how the heck is that [gumshoe thriller] going to work in Aberystwyth? It’s like a sort of detective thing from the 40s, what…?! but [in the end] the dialogue and everything just caught my imagination.
M1: Yeah … it shouldn’t work…
M2: And it wouldn’t… it wouldn’t work anywhere else I don’t think [laughs].
Other authors have remarked upon the capacity of Aberystwyth to spark the imagination, as the novelists Niall Griffiths and then Fflur Dafydd state:

“There's a strange draw to the place; get off the train and you can't go any further. Stand on the promenade and the next landmass is Ireland and, after that, America. Mountains pile up behind you and you feel that you can't go back into their bulwark mass but the sea, there, in front of you, is a blue world of possibility. And between that and the giant rocks is this small, intriguing town, its lanes and alleys and doorways a jumbled alphabet waiting to be re-assembled” (Griffiths, 2008, p.11-12).

“with the world turned on its head at this strange angle, you know you're in Aberystwyth” (Dafydd, 2008, p.62)

The relational space created by the tour allowed many of its participants to be lured further into the real-and-imagined world of Aberystwyth, Mon Amour, fuelled by their own identities, their imaginative reading, and the material geography of the town itself. However, despite the attraction of these imaginative musings on a recreational sunny day – along with the capacity for ‘group think’ on such an inherently collaborative event (see Cline, 1990) – others on the tour remained reluctant to forgive the creative interpretations of the town which they found in the novel.

F1: There seems to be a bit of a split here - we didn’t really like the book, our reading group really hated it. I just found it really wrong.
F2: Really, I’ve read every single book in the series!
F1: Mm, I’m amazed, I’m absolutely amazed.

“Let’s be clear about it then: Aberystwyth … was no Babylon” (Pryce, 2001, p. 1)
Despite affective and cognitive assonance between many of the locations in the novel and Aberystwyth itself, some of the local tour participants explained how the more creative interpretations that the author prompted them to imagine simply didn’t resonate with their experience and knowledge of the town. These invitations ranged from geographical inaccuracies - as the following two examples illustrate:

Example 1
F1: There were some beautiful descriptions, like when he goes over…
F2: Yes, going over to Borth, over the old road, yes.
F1: The only problem there, he said that the fields were dotted with cows. Now, I would argue with that. I think the fields are dotted with sheep [laughter].

Example 2
F3: The museum…It’s not where it is and it doesn’t have a whatever the flying fortress or whatever the airplane was… the bomber was parked outside…
F4: Oh yes, that’s right. That’s a bit weird isn’t it, having a bomber… did we ever have a bomber?
F3: Was it… a Lancaster, wasn’t it? A Lancaster bomber parked outside… you think, what? [laughs].

…to the author stretching poetic interpretation too far in encouraging a particular criminal view of the town:

F3: I always felt like Aberystwyth is a little bit like an island.
F4: Yes, you’re isolated here, yeah.
F3: Yes, you know, it made it much more of a community.
F2: We used to say the ‘Aberystwyth bubble’.
F3: Yes, so much so that that I almost couldn’t read the book anymore ‘cause it [the criminal depiction] is just so wrong.
F4: Yeah, it really put me off.
F3: I mean, poor Aberystwyth, it’s a terrible advertisement really. It seems to be the crime centre of Wales!

Unlike the world suggested by Malcolm Pryce, for these local, middle class tour participants Aberystwyth was a form of ‘Babylon’ (see above), from their positionality and based on their experiences of the town, they found it impossible to fully imagine their place rife with criminality, albeit of an absurd variety¹. At a superficial level, this could appear to be an

¹ From the broader Literary Atlas project, it is clear that not all inhabitants, readers and writers of Aberystwyth shared this particular idyllic view of the town (see for example, http://www.literaryatlas.wales/en/novels/sheepshagger/)
arcane position to take, with the refusal to contemplate the presence of cattle in the
countryside a small and somewhat pedantic ‘hill to die on’. However, this view nevertheless
represents the affective power not simply of an individual’s connection to place, but also its
fragility. These participants’ connection to the cultural and physical landscape of the town –
what they termed the Aberystwyth ‘bubble’ – was so defining of them and valuable to them
that they were unwilling and unable to risk its puncturing; as was suggested on the tour:

F3:  It’s your imagination, isn’t it, you’ve got to create that. And if you’ve already
got [another version of] it there, it’s harder for you to create it, isn’t it, in a
different way?
F4:  If it doesn’t fit, it’s not going to go…
F3:  I think if you’re more acquainted and familiar with a place, then you have a
stronger image of that place in your head and it’s much harder to revise, you
know? And I think that is… that is partly what it’s about, you know? It
contradicts that… you know, the experience you have of a place.

For these individuals therefore, Aberystwyth, Mon Amour and the tour through its literary
geographies wasn’t simply a neutral passport to an imaginary world (although they were able
to understand that it could simply be this), it was also a form of existential threat to their
place in the world. They not only wished for this fragile set of person-place relations to
remain undisturbed, they were also compelled to articulate their affinity and loyalty to the
place under the ‘threat’ that the novel and tour posed. In a similar way that tour participants
had themselves experienced at the Old College / Rock Factory, these individuals were
concerned that the book may be taken by some to be a ‘documentary’ resource, and lead to a
significant misinterpretation of the town that they were a part of. With this in their minds,
Pryce’s invitation to collaborate on an alternative imagining of Aberystwyth was
problematic:

F4:  Dylan Thomas wrote about Laugharne, but he [gave] the village another name,
so he could do what he liked. If you’re going to call it Aberystwyth, I think
you do… should have a bit of respect for the location, really. But that’s my
personal view.
F5:  I’m just so torn by it because yeah, parts that I really dislike because like you
say, I found them very unfair to the town. There were some parts that I really
like. I knew it was going to be very surreal, it wasn’t serious, as such, and although I kind of forgave that, I’m very much torn. … I’m just very divided.

For these participants the coming together of their worlds of lived experience – their socio-spatial identity, their imagined world of the novel, and the material geographies of Aberystwyth – led not to complementarity and resonance, but conflict and rupture. In real time they experienced how this coming together had the potential to cause a ‘tear’ in their understanding of the world, and their own place within it. Encountering other participants’ willingness to engage in interpretative flights of fancy did little to ameliorate their feelings, and indeed compounded them. They felt required to re-assert these identities and retain their bearings before these literary geographies threatened to ‘divide’ their worlds in two.

**Conclusion: Attuning to the affective**

This paper has attuned to the emotional states experienced on literary tours. Adopting a relational approach to literary tourism, it has sought to explore ‘how the real and imagined come together and move apart’ (Anderson and Saunders, 2016) through the practice of a walking tour based on the locations of Aberystwyth, Mon Amour. It has demonstrated how three worlds of lived experience – participants’ socio-spatial identity, individuals’ creative imagining of the novel, and the geographies of material places – coincide together in an emergent practice which has consequences not only for our understanding of literary tourism, but also for the capacity of its affects to contextualise and define person-place relations more broadly.

The paper has shown how the ‘many to many relations’ that coincide to produce a literary tour affects its participants. Following Cameron (2012, p. 581) it emphasises how “stories do not simply represent… they affect, they move”, and encountering stories in the material places in which they are set act to compound these affects. Through prompting local knowledges and encouraging the articulation of co-ingredient affiliations to different locations, alliances can be formed between a participant’s creative imaginings of a novel and the material geographies of a place. When personal imaginings are shared with others whose own identities and interpretations complement their own, then the literary tour can act to alter the affective and cognitive map of these participants, eroding the apparent distinctions between these different worlds so much so that they emerge together; where the real, or the imagined, are no longer fixed and immovable entities, but rather now categories that we
‘fondly imagine’ to be not only mutually informing, but also mutable to their core (Pullman, 2018, p.12).

The ability of the literary tour to affect the emotional ‘maps’ of participants is such that, following Battista et al (2005, p. 439), the creative imaginings of each reader and their own socio-spatial identities can be ‘wobbled’ out of their fixed and separate planes. This may produce a resonant coincidence of real-and-imagined experience, but it may also threaten rupture. Where there is a lack of congruence between the three worlds of experience within any participant – or indeed between participants on a tour – it is possible for individuals to sense the novel-as-passport as a threat, seeking to counter its affects in case they risk destabilising their place in the world.

In this way, the emergent geographies of the literary tour are not always coherent and agreed, the potential for dissolution and disagreement are inherent within their composition. Attuning to the affects of the literary tour suggest that the strengths and persistence of these emotional attachments – to individual’s own identities, imaginings and material places – are not lightweight and trivial sutures, but come to define not only their place in the world, but also their world itself. As such, the ability of the participants to retain their cohesiveness as a group – however temporarily – in the face of difference and disagreement says much for their willingness to contextualise their own imaginings, and ultimately tolerate others’, in a world of relational multiplicity.

These issues raise the potential for exploring the affective potential of literary tourism further, as well as the emphasising the need to trace the literary geographies brought into being through this practice. Attuning to the affective in literary tourism requires a sensitivity to the ways in which different aspects of lived experience are called forth and interact to create that literary geography. What other personal links, insights, and lenses are used to co-produce the real-and-imagined places of the tour, how are these shared and communicated, and how are they received by other tour participants? What other forms of local knowledge, borne of particular experiences, coincide with broader cultural assumptions and literary knowledges (e.g. expertise in genre, other novels set in proximate locations, or author positionalities and interests) to transform the complex assemblies that come to define the literary tour? In sum, and to use Hones’ terms (2014: 67), this paper suggests it is necessary to trace further the ‘intra-textual’ geographies of literary tours (i.e. how different ‘real-and-imagined’ places
within the covers of the book are connected by participants), their ‘inter-textual’ geographies (in other words, the ways these relational spaces cohere or contradict similar locations in other published novels), as well as their ‘extra-textual’ affects, i.e. how the encounters on the literary tour can not only play “a major role in how that place is experienced” by participants, but also potentially have “literal, physical impact on a place” through their successful iteration. Exploring these issues further can offer insights into the role of literary geography in enhancing interest in reading, local histories, and walking, as well as providing parameters through which locations can be successfully marketed for creative tourism practices.
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Figure 1 Royal Pier, Aberystwyth (Literary Atlas).

Figure 2 Amusement Arcade, Royal Pier (Literary Atlas).

Figure 4. The Old College / Rock Factory (Literary Atlas).
Figure 4. Archimedes on The Old College / Rock Factory (Literary Atlas).

Figure 5 Old College / Rock Factory gargoyles (Literary Atlas).
With respect to the geographical area focused on in this paper, Literature Wales have undertaken this type of quasi-educational literary tour in the past, including, for example, ‘The Wild West’ tour of Aberystwyth, including the work of Cynan Jones, Niall Griffiths and Samantha Wynne Rhydderch (see Literature Wales, 2013). It is also important to note that Literature Wales were a ‘project partner’ in the Literary Atlas project.

Although during the tour Pryce’s own connection with Aberystwyth was discussed, his actual places of writing were not. The author’s (fantastical?) admission that “the first draft of [Aberystwyth, Mon Amour] was finished on board a cargo ship off the coast of Guyana” (2001: 247) was therefore not drawn into the assembly of locations, ideas, and states of this tour’s literary geographies.

In each transcribed excerpt, each participant response is coded from 1, to note the range of difference voices contributing.