Chapter Two

Reconfigured Self in Travel

As her time at Florence drew to its close she was only at ease amongst those to whom she felt indifferent. […] Italians are born knowing the way. It would seem that the whole earth lay before them. […] She thanked him with real pleasure. In the company of this common man the world was beautiful and direct. For the first time she felt the influence of Spring. His arm swept the horizon gracefully; violets, like other things, existed in great profusion there. *(A Room with a View)* 75-77

I. Introduction

*A Room with a View* is a novel that investigates how the intoxicating scenery and enlightening culture of Italy stimulates and influences the protagonist, Lucy, to explore her repressed self during the travel. As England is basically conservative and sedentary, Italy by contrast is a place where passion and freedom is pervasive and irresistible. The correlation between space and the subjects is interwoven so that travelers who enter this space will be influenced as well. Lucy’s experience in Italy is a new and refreshing journey that motivates her to reconsider her original life style and values. The intermingled spatiality, from Florence to London, urban to the suburban, along with the interaction of the involved subjects, brings unexpected changes to Lucy.

This chapter aims to inspect the interactive correlation between space and reconfigured self in light of Deleuze and Guattari’s nomadology and Islam’s nomadic travel. Their spatial concept and travel theory bridge the crucial connection between space and the involved subjects, which leads to ceaseless becoming-other in one’s
self-reconfiguration. In the novel, Lucy’s experiences both in Italy and England brings her to acknowledge the diverse life styles and values in both countries. By applying the theory of the nomadic traveler, this chapter intends to analyze how the influence of becoming is embodied by Lucy in *A Room with a View*. This chapter will mainly be divided into four sections. The second section will elaborate on early concept of space and Deleuze and Guattari’s argument regarding the characteristics of sedentary space and nomadic space. The third section will further explicate the traits of sedentary and nomadic travelers Islam proposes and explains how Lucy crosses the boundary as a nomadic traveler. The fourth section distinguishes Deleuze’s issue of becoming-woman from feminists’ critiques and argument, and the last section deals with Lucy’s spatial becoming from the English spatiality to Italian spatiality and her position as a nomadic traveler in-between.

II. Space and Nomadology

According to Western epistemology, space is an *a priori* existence that is “passively given to the knowing vision and to the introspection of the subject” (Islam 12). Henri Lefebvre also points out that “the word ‘space’ had a strictly geometrical meaning: the idea it evoked was simply of an empty area” and that “‘social space’ would have sounded strange” during that time (1). The discourse of space becomes an opposition between “the status of space and the status of the subject” (Lefebvre 4). Nevertheless, this early concept is altered and refuted by Lefebvre, who maintains that “*(social) space is a (social) product*” that serves as “a tool of thought and of action”

---

1 In *A Room with a View*, the behaviors and decisions of the characters are highly related to space. Deleuze and Guattari’s becoming theory accentuate the concept of becoming-molecular, which obscures the necessity of identity. The case on Lucy’s becoming is much aroused by spatial influence. By associating spatiality to her becoming, Lucy’s becoming-traveler de facto indicates her spatial becoming as a result of her travel experiences.

2 Please also see the reference “The discourse of nomadology” by Stephen Muecke. This article gives a clear manifestation on Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of nomadology, illustrating two kinds of science: “the sovereign science (the science of state) and the nomadic science (the war machine)” (1165, emphasis original).
(26, emphasis original). In addition, space can also present “means of control […] of domination, [and] of power” (Lefebvre 26). From this perspective, space should no longer be only rendered as a container, but is endowed with social meanings.

In *Deleuze and Space*, Bauchanan and Lambert contend that “space itself is never neutral to the particular assemblage in which it appears or that produces it as its ‘a priori’ condition” (5). Bauchanan and Lambert also point out, both Lefebvre and Heidegger⁢ argue that not only “space affect[s] individuals,” but “the individual is essential to the constitution of place” as well (3). Accordingly, space is more likely to be considered as the result and the production of human behaviors and activities rather than an independent and objective existence. Deleuze and Guattari inherit this spatial concept and maintain that human activities are decisive to the development of space. They propounds two types of activities, the rival relation between the State apparatus and the war machine. Rejecting the stabilized forms and norms, Deleuze and Guattari develop the idea of nomadology, which is the study that centers on analyses of the nomads.

Derived from the oppositions in military battles, the nomads function as the war machine that is “exterior to the State apparatus and distinct from the military institution” in that they appropriate the absolute power that the State apparatus holds (Deleuze and Guattari 380). Since the State apparatus represents stability and authority to consolidate its sovereignty, the nomad science “is continually barred, inhibited, or banned by the demands and conditions of State science,” for its fluid nature intimidates the sedentary structure of the State apparatus (362). The State

---

⁢ In his *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre contends that space is neither a pre-existing production nor an objective vessel, but will always be reconstructed, changed, and reproduced according to human activities and historical development. He thus demonstrates three categories of space to illustrate how space is highly correlated with human reproduction. By elaborating the three categories of spatial division, Lefebvre intends to explicate that space in fact serves as an active locus of social relations. On the other hand, Heidegger also argues that man is a place-being in that our lives are always place-oriented. Both of them endorse the concept that space and the individual is definitely interactive and essential to each other.
always establishes the image of order by “sedentarizing laboring power, regulating the movement of the flow of labor” and takes over the power to master everything under control (368). From the standpoint of the State, the war machine is positioned as an enemy, and its image often “appears in a negative form: stupidity, deformity, madness, illegitimacy, usurpation, sin” (354). Even though the two entities are clearly demarcated, Deleuze and Guattari point out that the State apparatus and the war machine coexist in pair and mix together, which indicates that the boundary between the two is still moveable.⁴

Deleuze and Guattari further give the explanation of the game Chess and Go to illustrate the discrepancies between the State and the nomad, the sedentary space and the nomadic space. Chess, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is “a game of State; or of the court,” in which their movements are coded and regulated (352). Structural and institutional, Chess has “an internal nature and intrinsic properties” (352). In other words, Chess is a matter of striated space, “arranging a closed space for oneself,” hence “of going from one point to another, of occupying the maximum number of squares with the minimum number of pieces” (353). In Chess, the route of each piece is assigned and fixed. Go pieces, by contrast, are “elements of a nonsubjectified machine assemblage with no intrinsic properties, only situational ones” (353). Whereas Chess is an institutionalized war, Go is “a war without battle lines […] arraying oneself in an open space,” and “maintain[s] the possibility of springing up at any point” (353). Unlike the systematical Chess, Go is much more free in that its movement pinpoints no specific destination, and its departure and arrival is uncertain. Accordingly, “the smooth space of Go” is against “the striated space of Chess,” since

⁴ Mueck in his “The discourse of nomadology” analyzes that “the opposition between the State and the war machine is not one which is sustained by any political, moral or cultural opposition” (1178). His analysis resonates with Deleuze, who asserts that the relation of State and the nomad is not absolute, but mobile.
the former one shatters the boundary and territory\(^5\) and the latter one only “codes and
decodes” (353).

As aforementioned, the State apparatus and nomads respectively refer to the
sedentary and the nomadic space and its characteristics are explored and distinguished
from three perspectives, point, line and space. Similar to Chess, the space of the State
is striated “by walls, enclosures, and roads between enclosures” (Deleuze and Guattari
381). The sedentary will build fences and fortresses to consolidate its territory,
meanwhile settling fixed boundary to maintain its distance from the nomads. In the
striated space, the movement of the sedentary is delimited, for its function is to
“parcel out a closed space to people” and to “assign each person a share and regulate
the communication between shares” (380, emphasis original). With fixed paths, the
sedentary follows the rigid lines and only moves from points to points. Since laws and
regulations confine the actions of the sedentary, people living within the State only
possess limited freedom. In so doing, the State ensures its stabilized power and
sovereignty. The structure of the striated sedentary space bears the similarity to the
arborescent structure of the tree, for it “centers around organs of power” (358).
Consequently, sedentary space is homogeneous in that elements lack multiplicities.
Just as Chess, each piece belongs to a certain quality, “a knight remains a knight, a
pawn a pawn, a bishop a bishop […] endowed with relative power” (352). Every
movement and action is rule-bound, which suggests that possibilities are excluded in
sedentary space.

Compared with the binding sedentary space, nomadic space on the contrary
allows more freedom. By “distrib[ing] people (or animals) in an open space,”

---

\(^5\) In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari explain that the game of Go “consolidate[s] the
territory by the construction of a second, adjacent territory” and “shatter[s] [the] territory from within”
(353). Obviously, both Chess and Go have their rules and space, yet the space in Chess is codified
while in Go is boundless. Therefore, in Go, the pieces are able to either re-establish or eradicate the
boundary freely whereas in Chess, other possible routes and directions are limited by the rules.
nomadic space corresponds to the game of Go, which “marked only by ‘traits’ that are
effaced and displaced with the trajectory” (Deleuze and Guattari 381). Constituted by
supple lines, nomadic space is smooth and fluid without fences and enclosures. That
is to say, nomadic space interconnects various types of points and vectors,
unrestrained by the codified rules. Therefore, “homogeneous space is in no way a
smooth space,” it is heterogeneous (370). Deleuze and Guattari then relate this idea of
variety and diversity to the concept of *rhizome*,⁶ which is “a concept that ‘maps’ a
process of networked, relational and transversal thought, and a way of being without
‘tracing’ the construction of that map as a fixed entity” (Colman 231). In contrast to
the arborescent structure of the sedentary space, rhizomes “have no hierarchical
order” and “function as an open-ended productive configuration” (Colman 232).
While the tree-like arborescent structure is stabilized by fixed points and positions,
the rhizomatic structure indicates heterogeneous multiplicities with lines of flight, and
“any part within a rhizome may be connected to another part, forming a milieu that is
decentered” (Colman 232). Rhizomes “has no middle: no trunk […] no end: no
leaves” and “there is no particular shape it has to take and no particular territory to
which it is to bound” (May 134). Boundless and changeable, in nomadic space,
hierarchy does not exist. Instead, supple lines always lead to unexpected
transformations.

Since lines of flight in nomadic space bring upon multiplicities and possibilities,
obviously nomadic space suggests the idea of boundary-crossing, which denotes the
theory of becoming. Given the fact that the nomadic are inclined to break through the
boundary, the subject will be able to encounter the other in different areas. In this
respect, the process of becoming eliminates the boundary and ventures into a

---

⁶ Rhizome is a fundamental and important concept in Deleuze’s theory. To understand more details,
please also see the reference *Deleuze and Guattari* by Ronald Bogue.
complete new place. The process of becoming-other, as Deleuze and Guattari propose, in fact is a process of transformation. Becoming begins with the deconstruction of stabilized power, order and molar identity, an escape route into a minority. Since “all becoming is becoming-minoritarian,” Deleuze and Guattari point out that “there is no becoming-man because man is the molar entity par excellence” (291, 292). Yet Deleuze and Guattari emphasize that the meaning of majority is not defined by quantity, but “a state of domination” (291). Colebook also explains that “man is ‘majoritarian’ not because he outnumbers other beings, but because any being can be included within the measure of man” (139, emphasis original). Accordingly, by shedding the molar shell, “becoming-minoritarian rends [the subject] from his major identity” (291). Kaplan also agrees that his advocacy of “a process of ‘becoming-minor’ depends on upon the erasure of the site of their own subject positions” (86). Therefore, all becomings “are already molecular,” realigning the original molar unities, such as sex, race, nation, and class (272). By departing from norms and rules, the subject undergoes the process of becoming-molecular.

Nonetheless, becoming-other does not equal being-other. In the course of becoming, the subject is unavoidably influenced by the encountered ones and goes through transformations. Even so, becoming-other is “not imitating, or identifying with something” (Deleuze and Guattari 239). It is “a space of transformational encounter” and “a dynamic in-between” (Massumi 106). Whereas the molarity points to the polarized binary opposition, the process of becoming-molecular moves the subject beyond one’s original confined identity and subjectivity. Becoming is defined not by the produced identity but by its capacity to undergo the transformation. The

---

7 Deleuze and Guattari illustrate that the meaning of majority is more likely to be determined by its power rather than the actual quantity. They note, “the majority in a government presupposes the right to vote, and not only is established among those who possess that right but is exercised over those who do not, however great their numbers” (291, emphasis added). In this sense, man undoubtedly is the majority and women, plants and children are relatively the minority.
subject can no longer return to the molar identity, but incessantly becoming-molecular (-woman, animal, other). Once the transformation is made, the process is irreversible.

The line of becoming process is without return, and it is “the opposite of arborescence” and “break[s] away from arborescence” (Deleuze and Guattari 294). Hence, Deleuze and Guattari contend that “[b]ecoming is an antimemory in that memory inevitably reminds the subject of the history (294, emphasis original). For Deleuze and Guattari, recollection is not the goal or pursuit for becoming, for “molecular memory” always links to “a majoritarian or molar system,” rebuilding the boundary and fence again (294). Memory serves as “a punctual system” that “refers simultaneously to the horizontal line of the flow of time […] and the vertical line of the order line” (294-295). Since becoming is a ceaseless ongoing process, it is impossible to coexist with retrospective memory or ensure a result. In this respect, becoming bears another characteristic, only an intermezzo and middle, “produc[ing] nothing other than itself” (238). A line of becoming “passes between points,” thus never coming to a terminal ending or specific result (293). But no matter how the change turns out, the subject will not be aware of its becoming, for the process is unconscious. Becoming only occurs when the subject does not notice one’s transformation.

III. Sedentary vs. Nomadic

Since the relation between space and the individual is influential and interactive, the genre of travel narrative “unfolds the event of trekking space” by demonstrating the movement and actions happening between spatial locations: “leaving one spatial marker and arriving at another” (Islam 5). Syed Manzurul Islam hence asserts that travel and space are highly connected:

The presumed departure and arrival, in the very process of [the traveler’s] movement, paradoxically stages the threshold to be crossed, and enacts
‘the between’ that divides and joins spatial locations. If we were to explicate further the anatomy of a traveler, we could say that it is precisely in the very process of negotiating ‘the between,’ traversing threshold and crossing boundary, that s/he makes her/himself a traveler.

Islam points out that a genuine traveler negotiates the in-between in one’s journey. The travel discourse explores how the subject deals with the relation between the same and the other while moving between different spatial locations. Yet, not all of the travelers are able to cross the boundary to accept and embrace the other. Just as Islam describes, the types of travelers vary, “each taking shape along the marks of the boundaries and thresholds they trace; and some, on account of the rigidity of their boundaries and the trap of their petrified thresholds, never manage to travel at all” (5).

Islam as a result extends the idea of the sedentary and the nomadic into travel theory, proposing that there are actually two kinds of travelers, sedentary travelers and nomadic travelers to elucidate two modes of travelers.

Just as the nomads that always eradicate the demarcation, and always boldly step forward to the unknown area, nomadic travelers similarly eliminate the boundary during the journey. Islam argues that the differences between a sedentary traveler and a nomadic traveler “lie between movement and speed” (56). He further elaborates that a sedentary traveler resembles “a commercial traveler, a geographer or a conquistador,” that takes all sorts of routes during the journey (56). He maintains that the sedentary travelers move in space, [and] arrive at a different place. Yet bound by the pre-set goals they never leave the point of departure: they move folded in the inside. They might travel in the fastest possible vehicle and cover a thousand miles yet they remain where they are, because they are on a
rigid line which keeps them grounded in the enclosure of their home.

Despite so many rituals of departure, they cannot really depart. (56)

Sedentary travelers are “densely coded” in striated and enclosed space with movements. In lack of the intensity of speed that nomadic travelers have, sedentary travelers “move with one’s body: moved body” (Islam 58-59). Their travel routes may as well be extensive, yet are only fixed departures on the rigid lines. As Deleuze and Guattari depict, sedentary travelers bring “portable territory” with them (320).

Following the guidelines and instructions, sedentary travelers are like tourists that trace the geographical map, which in fact is an immobile travel. This mode of traveler “remain[s] the same” (59). The portable territory will “guard against the speed and the intensity of the molecular and the chaos of the outside,” thus pulling the sedentary travelers folded in the inside (59). Unable to get across the rigid boundary, sedentary travelers, as Islam maintains, are not genuine travelers accordingly.

On the other hand, nomadic travelers travel on the supple lines in the smooth space with the intensity of speed, which “is a question of becoming” (Islam 56). Deleuze and Guattari explicate that movement and speed differ in that the former one “designates the relative character of a body considered as ‘one’” whereas the latter one “constitutes the absolute character of a body whose irreducible parts (atoms) occupy a smooth space in the manner of a vortex, with the possibility of springing up at any point” (381, emphasis original). Since the supple line “does not possess the dimension or the border of a territory,” with vector of lines, nomadic travelers freely cross over the boundary and encounter the other (Islam 60). They travel with their “moving body” and “take flight to the outside, to the other” (Islam 59). Islam thus manifests that for nomadic travelers,

[e]very Voyage is intensive, and occurs in relation to thresholds of intensity between which it evolves or that it crosses. […] [Supple line] is
a line of direction that ultimately takes one beyond the threshold, to the line of flight, towards becoming-other. It has no beginning nor any end—only the circulation in the middle, dwelling in the multiplicity of the in-between, given to the event, chance and encounter. (60)

Accordingly, the nomadic traveler will not be confined to the delimitation, but will always encounter the other during the journey, whereas the sedentary travelers merely reconsolidate one’s territory and standpoint in every voyage. The nomadic traveler “opens to unconventional spatial orientations” and “make[s] new connections in keeping with the movement of life as it unfolds” (Lorraine 160). With one’s moving body, the nomadic traveler initiates the process to becoming-other.

Becoming-other is not a one way transformation. Islam claims that nomadic travelers “affect other bodies and [are] affected by other bodies,” which infer that the process of becoming is interactive. As the subject encounters the other and becomes the other, the other will become something else as well, thus establishing intersubjectivity. This also resonates with Deleuze and Guattari’s idea, “becoming is always double” (305). Unlike sedentary travelers, who persist in certain values and point of views, nomadic travelers are willing to accept cultural differences, meanwhile giving respect and understanding to different cultures. Instead of critical judgment or value imposition, the nomadic traveler will unconsciously adjust to the other and reconstruct one’s values. In the course of becoming, both subjects will regain a new and integrated self, yet not necessarily a regressive or progressive one, for “becoming is not an evolution” (Deleuze and Guattari 238). For Deleuze and Guattari, the lines of flight that nomadic travelers take is “not necessarily creative,” and that not “smooth spaces are always better than segmented or striated ones” (33). The point is that a nomadic traveler will always reconfigure oneself. Positioned in-between, the nomadic traveler forms a new nomadic self, which transforms in every encountering-other, and
goes through ceaseless becoming-other in every journey.

IV. Becoming-woman, Becoming-traveler

Deleuze and Guattari argue that becoming is a fluid process that continually transforms. Rather than a product, an outcome, becoming “is the very dynamism of change, situated between heterogeneous terms and tending towards no particular goal or end-state” (Stagoll 21). Besides, becoming does not merely indicate simple changes or growth. Becoming is “involutionary” rather than evolutionary, “form[ing] a block that runs its own line ‘between’ the terms in play and beneath assignable relations” (Deleuze and Guattari 239). Though transformation is ascertained, Deleuze and Guattari further highlight that “becomings are molecular,” and particularly maintain that “all becomings begin with and pass through becoming-woman” (275, 277). Hence, becoming-woman is the crucial point in order for the subject to becoming-other and “becoming-imperceptible” (279). His emphasis thus arouses the concern from feminists, doubting whether Deleuze and Guattari privilege man as a molarity and women as minority. Feminists contend that Deleuze and Guattari still develop their argument on the basis of masculine perspectives, and “manifestly [are] not neutral with respect to the specificity of female experience […] and their use of the metaphor of woman, or becoming-woman” (Grosz 1441). Feminists give their suspicions, pointing out that Deleuze and Guattari are merely appropriating the metaphor of becoming-woman to neutralize and de-politicize the self-interrogation and definition for women. In so doing, feminists “render women’s becoming-woman, their subversions, and their minoritarian and marginal struggles subordinate to a movement toward imperceptibility, which could […] amount to a political obliteration or marginalization of women’s struggles” (Grosz 1462). Feminists’ accusation and suspicion ostensibly question Deleuze and Guattari technically utilize the metaphor “at the expense of women’s exclusion” (Grosz 1443).
If becoming-woman is “the first and necessary step towards attaining a desirable state of ‘imperceptibility,’ for becoming-imperceptible is “the immanent end of becoming,” then Deleuze and Guattari must explain the signification of their formulations (Flieger 40). Deleuze and Guattari firstly explicate that molar entity is, for example, the woman as defined by her form, endowed with organs and functions and assigned as a subject. Becoming-woman is not imitating this entity or even transforming oneself into it. […] but emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a microfemininity […] that produce in us a molecular woman, create the molecular woman. (275)

Therefore, their intention is not to merely discern the molar from the minor, but to concern its transformation into microfemininity, the becoming-molecular. While feminists are skeptical about whether the becoming theory reinforces the binary opposition between man and woman, or prioritizing man over woman, Deleuze and Guattari clarify that their point is to impel the subject “to be like everyone else”(40). Though their appeal seemingly calls attention to equality, Deleuze and Guattari in reality are not concerned with feminists’ practical goal, not to “carve out a singular identity with something like full rights” (Flieger 40). Deleuze and Guattari do not aim to focus on identity politics, given the fact that identity inevitably territorializes and implies “a struggle for […] centrality of position, pride of place,” which contradicts with the appeal of becoming (Flieger 40).

As a matter of fact, Deleuze and Guattari propose the concept of becoming theory with a view to “escap[ing] from the systems of binary polarization” (Grosz 1460). They not only observe the opposition between the molar and the molecular, they in the mean time also argue that “becoming is the breakdown of all identities, molar and molecular, majoritarian and minoritarian” (Grosz 1460). Their becoming
theory is an alternative that “advertised not as a model of identity but as a way to conceive of individuality free from the confines of Identity […] to think difference in itself, without any reference to the Same” (Miller 1115). As a result, the process of becoming deconstructs the molar structure and territory. Instead of marking the division between genders, Deleuze and Guattari de facto aim to settle their becoming theory on the basis of transcending the concept of territory reconsolidation. For them, the establishment and development of becoming-woman is a step to “the creation of a nomadic line, a line of becoming-imperceptible,” which “disaggregates the molar structures” (Grosz 1457). Becoming-woman should be understood as “a way of […] transformative possibilities […] in which identity escapes from the codes which constitute the subject” as a result (Driscoll 75). Deleuze and Guattari oppose the molarity due to its characteristics in hierarchy construction and order, in pursuit of a fluidity in-between. Becoming-woman should be viewed in this transcendental perspective, “a way of understanding transformative power of desire of the subject,” rather than to categorize becoming-woman as “a macro-political’ project concerning female subjects” (Driscoll 1476, Flieger 41). The issue of becoming-woman calls for constant heterogeneous multiplicities, which implicates the process that “continually transform[s] itself into a string of other multiplicities” (A Thousand Plateau 43). On account of this consideration, Deleuze and Guattari state that “[b]ecoming-woman means going beyond identity and subjectivity, fragmenting and freeing up lines of flight, ‘liberating’ a thousand tiny sexes that identity subsumes under the One” (Grosz 1460, emphasis added). Flieger also contends that “becoming-woman does not aim at a homogeneous collectivity (women), an aggregate of same-sex subjects with a shared ‘identity’, struggling to gain political and economic rights” but to step forward a “tensile transformation and transgression of identity,” which deviates from the critical suspicion from the feminists (43).
The issue of becoming-woman departs from the concern of identity, stressing that becoming-woman is not a matter of representation. Since becoming-woman is the procedure to enter becoming-imperceptible, this in-between process never pins down a specific position of the subject. Thus, Deleuze and Guattari do not mean to focus on women, not the issue of being-woman. Their theory of “becoming-woman/animal/intense is not concerned with the same level of experience as is the ‘becoming-ourselves’ which is feminism” (Flieger 44). In so doing, Deleuze and Guattari’s becoming theory is discrepant from the appeal of identity searching that feminists advocate. Likewise, in *A Room with a View*, the protagonist, Lucy undergoes the process of becoming. Rather than examine her journey of self-searching in the perspective of identity, Lucy’s position should be explored as a directional traveler. In her travel, Lucy enters her process of becoming to becoming-traveler.

By shifting spaces, Lucy in *A Room with a View* experiences her gradual and unconscious becoming. Just as Islam asserts, travelers could be categorized into two kinds, the sedentary and the nomadic, and only the latter one brings upon the effect of becoming. Since sedentary travelers are regarded as commercial travelers, they are unable to encounter the other, to have close contact or interaction, and hence delimit themselves within a built fortress. Boundary-crossing is impossible to achieve for sedentary travelers. Yet, sedentary travel is the molar mode of travel that most people adopt, conforming to accepted regulations and codes. Due to this layer of stereotypical confinement, sedentary travelers will not be influenced by their geographical movements, which is in contrast with the nomadic travelers. Becoming-traveler as a result is a becoming-minoritarian that only few people achieve. Nevertheless, this is the real traveler. Lucy as a nomadic traveler sheds her original shell as a molar entity, gradually getting rid of the cultural prejudice and education to
become a genuine traveler. She is capable of having interactions with the space she is positioned in. Her incessant becoming continually changes with the shifting space and setting. Lucy is not merely becoming-traveler during her journey. As Deleuze proposes, she will continue to experience ceaseless becoming toward becoming-imperceptible.

V. Lucy’s spatial becoming

Lucy’s process of becoming could be observed through three layers. The first layer is the original English spatiality that Lucy is coerced to follow. The second layer is the Italian spatiality that inspires Lucy during her travel. And the last layer is Lucy’s position in-between the spatial changes. Though Lucy herself is unconscious of her change, her becoming begins at the moment when she encounters the other in the hotel in Italy. The events she experiences in Italy, such as the conflict over swapping rooms in Florence, her insistence on street-walking and going on outings in rural areas, signify that Lucy’s state of mind is stimulated by virtue of her experiences and encounters. Her stay in Italy hence is a turning point that invigorates her spirit, which meanwhile suggests a divergence between the cultural and natural environment of Italy and England. Traveling between the two countries, Lucy begins to question the limiting and binding nature of her English education and boldly breaks through the limitations to interact with the other.

A. English Spatiality as A Room

A Room with a View opens with a dispute over rooms led by Lucy’s cousin, Charlotte Bartlett. Charlotte claims to have “south rooms with a view,” but the Signora assigns them a room that has no view, “looking into a courtyard” instead (A

---

8 Hereby the English spatiality not only refers to geographical location, but also refers to the rooted English conventions that is carried with the sedentary traveler’s “moved body” (Islam 59) Since the relation between space and the subject is interwoven, and the concept of sedentary implies one’s stubborn, unchanged and conservative modes of behavior, English spatiality implicates the conventional attitude people hold when dealing with the other.
Room with a View 3). The conflict with the Signora proves the need to reconsolidate the territory that Charlotte assumes they should possess. On the surface, she claims a deserved right. Yet, her actions suggest her underlying intention to defend for her territory. More interestingly, their hotel, the Bertolini is “patronized exclusively by English visitors” (Page 34). The Signora of the hotel has an “unexpected [London] accent” and Lucy notices that the ornaments on the wall are English styles: “the portraits of the late Queen and the late Poet Laureate that hung behind the English people; heavily framed; […] [and] English church” (A Room with a View 3). Lucy thus tells her cousin, “Charlotte, don’t you feel, too, that we might be in London? I can hardly believe that all kinds of other things are just outside” (A Room with a View 3). Even though they are in Italy, Florence, the concept of “portable territory” still influences Charlotte’s choice of the Bertolini as a hotel for their vacation (Islam 59). This sedentary territory prevents Charlotte from maintaining a friendly attitude toward the other. In her opinion, the distance between herself and the other is clearly demarcated, which is essential to her territory consolidation. She does not even think that there would be someone else that will cross the fence to offend what she has constructed, for that is completely incomprehensible.

Miss Bartlett was startled. Generally at a pension people looked them over for a day or two before speaking, and often did not find out that they would not “do” till they have gone. She knew that the intruder was ill-bred, even before she glanced at him. (Forster, A Room with a View 4, emphasis added)

Because of these stereotypes, Charlotte fails to encounter the other yet continues to regard the Emersons as impolite intruders that invade her territory. As the “intruder,” Mr. Emerson, offers to swap rooms, advising Charlotte that “you can have our rooms, and we’ll have yours. We’ll change,” Charlotte refuses his proposal indifferently,
saying “that is out of the question” (A Room with a View 5). Accordingly, Charlotte’s refusal to concession marks her sedentary concept. Although she eventually accepts the room swap owing to the clergyman, Mr. Beebe’s interference, Charlotte’s social etiquette is depicted as very obdurate.

In the novel, the English ideology is very likely to be metaphorized as a room with rooted values and a limited horizon. One may acquire a sense of security and certainty when staying in the room, yet lose the opportunity to understand and approach other unknown worlds. However, for people with sedentary spatiality, rules and conventions are the top priority. For example, Lucy’s fiancé Cecil is another archetype who believes that “learn[ing] the framework of society […] did her no harm” (A Room with a View 139). Nevertheless, Lucy feels that London would isolate her from the freedom she is eager to possess. Forster associates this sense of estrangement with the city image of London:

Life, so far as [Lucy] troubled to conceive it, was a circle of rich, pleasant people, with identical interests and identical foes. In this circle, one thought, married, and died. Outside it were poverty and vulgarity for ever trying to enter, just as the London fog tries to enter the pinewoods pouring through the gaps in the northern hills. (A Room with a View 127)

Just as the fog permeates the city of London, Lucy is aware of the fact that she will be circumscribed within the constrained social circle if she stays in London. Even though the rules ensure Lucy a smooth life, she still worries that the convention will force her to give up the freedom she is eager to own, just as the fog tries to cover up and devour her inner desires. Yet, it is not until her trip to Italy that learns how English conventions confine the vision and freedom she longs for.
B. Italian Spatiality as a View

Whereas English spatiality carries constraints, Italy gives a completely different type of freedom. Italy is a place “where anyone who chooses may warm himself in equality, as in the sun,” and where “this conception of life vanished, [one’s] senses expanded” (A Room with a View 127). Forster deliberately describes two outdoor settings in the novel to manifest how Italian spatiality is connected with picturesque colors and freedom. One is the outing with the English guests and the Italian locals, the other one is Lucy’s personal experience in Florence. During the outing in suburban Italy, Lucy has an opportunity to experience the vivid spring nature: “Light and beauty enveloped her. She had fallen on to a little open terrace, which was covered with violets from end to end” (A Room with a View 78). Intoxicated by the breath-taking scenery, Lucy drinks in the natural beauty: “from her feet the ground sloped sharply into view, and violets ran down in rivulets and streams and cataracts, irrigating the hillside with blue […] covering the grass with spots of azure foam” (A Room with a View 78). Italy “awakens Lucy,” urging her to “put aside her parasol of pretense and finds the world ‘beautiful and direct’” (Heath 193, A Room with a View 77). It is in this dream-like scenery that Lucy loses control of her reason, captured by moments of passion, and is unexpectedly kissed by George. This newfound stimulation, though accidental, is unforgettable to her.

During the room debacle, Charlotte argues for her right to have the room with a view as they demanded before, which demonstrates her characteristics of sedentary style: territory reconsolidation. Yet, George Emerson and his father Mr. Emerson handle this situation with an open attitude, asking the ladies to swap rooms. Since territory is not important to the Emersons, they see this proposal as unproblematic. Mr.

9 Likewise, for this section, Italian spatiality is regarded as the nomadic fluidity as well as the open unconventional smooth space that allows lines of flight to break through the boundary, which symbolizes the friendliness and geniality that Italian people hold when getting along with the other.
Emerson is actually perplexed by Charlotte’s refusal, wondering “Why should she not change? What possible objection had she” (A Room with a View 5-6). This corresponds to the nomadic style presented by Deleuze and Guattari: the Emacers regard space as smooth and variable that composed by vectors of directions. Hence, interactions are easily accepted in this fluid space. Not even courtesy and manners are considered important. Their concept of space is to be restrained in a room, but is extended to boundless views.

The space on Florence streets is another characteristic that symbolizes the liberty and life of Italy. At her first day in Florence, Lucy wakes up and finds it pleasant to “open the eyes upon a bright bare room, with a floor of red tiles which look clean though they are not […] pinching the fingers in unfamiliar settings […]” (A Room with a View 16). When she walks into the streets, she is embraced by a “sense of festivity” (A Room with a View 11). Her companion, Miss Lavish leads her to observe the cityscape, opens up her mind and has an adventure in this attractive city. In the streets, the positive and negative sides of Florence is revealed. Yet, this layer of experience unveils the fact that Italy is a city with life. Unlike London, which only gives Lucy the impression of identical life circle, Italy is charming in that people in this space live with their own distinct life style and personality. One could daringly express and discuss the political viewpoints and values, to run, shout and play rather than partially repress one’s true self. Italy may not be delicate or elegant—it may even be vulgar—but “the presence of brutality” vividly exposes how Italian life is (A Room with a View 6).

C. Lucy as a nomadic traveler in-between

For Lucy, the journey to Florence is the commencement of her becoming. She

---

10 Hereby, the life circle refers to what Lucy observes from London: the identical circulation of life. Please see my explanation quote on page 33.
alters her values and takes actions to experience things sensational and different, which is a direct consequence of the spatial influence. Having grown up in England, Lucy is educated to always be ladylike. Nevertheless, this journey forces her to recognize that her education only enables a room for her to dwell in, instead of a view to explore. Italy initiates her by presenting her a completely different style of life and Lucy herself is willing to follow the inspiration and to interact with the other she encounters. Her becoming begins as an attempt to search for her desires and self. Yet, in the course of becoming, Lucy naturally and unconsciously embraces and accepts the other little by little. Lucy “responds positively to Italy,” and she has the ability to “bridge the gap between the two worlds” (Cavaliero 104). She then is able to walk out the room toward a view to her process of becoming-traveler. In other words, Lucy neither leans toward the English spatiality as an enclosed sedentary room, nor has she turned out to be an Italian spatiality supporter. In the last scene of the novel, she stays in a room with a view with George, which implies that even when the story comes to an end, Lucy’s becoming has not yet ended. Her becoming is not a sudden realization or an impulse, but an observant and careful process that is directional.

In the beginning of the novel, Lucy in the beginning is surrounded by sedentary travelers that care more about the form of travel rather than its content. Yet, it is these people and their sedentary modes of behavior that help Lucy to discern and consider a different attitude toward life and travel. Islam argues that sedentary travelers are unable and unwilling to eliminate the fences they have built for themselves (5). They have fixed and unshakeable values and stereotypes and as such, traveling to other places will not bring any other influence or impact on them. Sedentary travelers do not really cross the boundary. Their travel is still a surface tour that concerns tourist attractions, guidance and rules. For them, travel is to follow the rigid line that has already settled and arranged. In the novel, Charlotte and Lucy are new-comers to
Florence and other guests in the hotel enthusiastically give them advice:

A perfect torrent of information burst on them. People told them what to see, when to see it, how to stop the electric trams, how to get rid of the beggars, how much to give for a vellum blotter, how much the place would grow upon them. Then pension Bertolini had decided, almost enthusiastically, that they would do. Whichever way they looked, kind ladies smiled and shouted at them. (*A Room with a View* 8)

These guests offer Lucy and Charlotte advice as tourists. Their suggestions infer an easy and elegant way to travel in Florence: to avoid trouble spots and to see only the charm of Italy. Yet this way of traveling, seemingly joyful, lacks depth. If tourists only travel for what they really attempt to see, they will lose the opportunity to experience the life style of the country. In the novel, the Italian clergyman mocks Lucy, we residents sometimes pity you poor tourists not a little—handed about like a parcel of goods from Venice to Florence, from Florence to Rome, living herded together in pensions or hotels, quite unconscious of anything that is outside Baedeker, their one anxiety to get ‘done’ or ‘through’ and go on somewhere else [...] mix[ing] up towns, rivers, palaces in one inextricable whirl. (*A Room with a View* 69)

The clergyman sharply points out and criticizes the problematic pattern of travel for tourists—hasty yet neglecting the valuable experience that guide books exclude, which is very likely to reinforce “narrowness and superficiality of the Anglo-Saxon tourist” (*A Room with a View* 70). The tourists are inclined to “follow prescribed circles, imitate the old tradition of the Grand Tour, under[standing] less and less of its original tradition of cultural enlargement, and return laden with bits from everywhere” (Lago 24). Since sedentary travelers rely too much on guidance, meanwhile marking clear boundaries, they will never encounter the other and undergo the process of
becoming.

Moving toward the direction of becoming-traveler, Lucy’s change illustrates her reconfigured nomadic self. In Florence, Lucy’s suspicions of English conventions arises as she is gradually exposed to exotic culture, noticing that sedentary manners turn out to be contradictory against Italian values. Charlotte’s conservative style restrains Lucy’s eagerness for freedom. Lucy feels that “there was a rebellious spirit in her […] At all events, she entered her own room without feeling a joy” (A Room with a View 14). As Lucy encounters the Emersons who advice to swap rooms with them, Lucy is able to understand their viewpoints, and feels perplexed about Charlotte’s decision, instead of judging them recklessly. When Charlotte eventually decides to exchange rooms with the Emersons, Lucy was bewildered as to why it was more suitable for her to “accept a favour […] under an obligation to his father than to [the young man]” (A Room with a View 15). Whereas Charlotte deliberately distant Lucy from George to avoid misunderstandings, Lucy yet responds that “mother wouldn’t mind, I’m sure” (A Room with a View 15). She dislikes Charlotte’s “protective embrace,” for it “gave Lucy the sensation of a fog” (A Room with a View 15). Just as London fog blurs the vision, Lucy cannot tolerate Charlotte’s attempts to envelop her with a loving but smothering embrace. She is the type in need of a view, so she “opened the window and breathed the clean night air” whereas Charlotte by contrast “fastened the window-shutters and locked the door” (A Room with a View 15). Norman Page criticizes that Charlotte’s “prim, prickly attitude [which] causes her to recoil from any new experience, any encounter that might call for adjustment for her prejudices or broadening of her narrow outlook” (34). This apparently shows that sedentary room-like travel is at variance with Lucy’s inner nature.

Though Italy is a new and unfamiliar city for Lucy, she is not bothered by its strangeness. On the contrary, she positively accepts and interacts with the impression
that space endows. Lucy’s spatial becoming is initiated in Italy. Her experiences and her encounters in Italy spur her to reconsider the English values she used to hold and follow. Regarding cultural differences, Lucy in the beginning is bewildered and perplexed, but she still respects the divergences, trying to understand the other by having more contacts and interactions. Instead of judging others arbitrarily or blindly following Charlotte’s decision and comments, Lucy is able to have her own judgment through her experiences.

VI. Conclusion

Florence and London respectively contain different spatiality and characteristics, which are highly relevant to the subjects that are involved in that specific space. London fog carries the conservative and solemn atmosphere as is reflected on English values, whereas Florence sunshine embodies the liberal and vivid life that Italian people are in pursuit of. The interwoven connections between space and the subjects influence travelers who enter this space.

Yet, not every traveler will be influenced by space. The sedentary traveler is the type that only reinforces one’s territorial concept but the nomadic traveler will break through the boundary and encounter the other. Territory is not the central concern for nomadic travelers. Lucy’s spatial becoming, then, should be examined from the perspective of becoming-molecular, transcending the concern of identity and female rights. Her becoming should not be measured as a progressive growth or regressive result, but an interaction on account of spatial influence. Hence Forster employs a combination of space and the involved subject to manifest how the protagonist Lucy steps out from a room and walks into a view during her endless becoming-traveler.