

[Introduction for Special Issue on Mobility and the Humanities]

Mobility and the Humanities

It seems that a new paradigm is being formed within the social sciences, the “new mobilities paradigm”. (Sheller and Urry 2006, 207)

The new mobilities paradigm seeks the fundamental recasting of social science.
(Sheller and Urry 2016, 11)

The knowingly ‘provocative’ labelling of a ‘new mobilities paradigm’ has received a mixed response from scholars in a number of disciplines (Adey et al. 2014, 2; Sheller 2014a; Sheller and Urry 2016). Referring, at once, to the emergence of both new forms of mobility and a new academic focus on mobility, the identification of a ‘new mobilities paradigm’ has been criticised for framing this work as ‘new’, for referring to it as a ‘paradigm’, and for the focussing on ‘mobilities’ as opposed to other objects of enquiry such as transport, migration or travel (Cresswell 2010, 18). And yet, few scholars have questioned the positioning of this emerging body of work within the social sciences, and the association of this work with social science approaches, philosophies and methods (although see Merriman 2014). In some ways, this is not surprising. Sheller and Urry (2006) were writing at a time when academic debates on mobility were dominated by scholars working in social science disciplines such as sociology, transport studies, anthropology and human geography.¹ What’s more, we doubt that Sheller and Urry (2006) intended to denote a tightly bounded and exclusionary field called the social sciences, as separate from the arts and humanities. Nevertheless, whether the distinction was intended or not, there is no doubt that debates on mobility have also been driven forward by scholars who clearly align themselves with the arts and humanities; which

we can usefully delineate as a broad grouping of scholars and arts practitioners concerned with studying, documenting, performing or enhancing cultural life, past and present. Indeed, it would be fair to say that recent scholarship on mobility has led to a partial ‘recasting’ of discussions of movement in arts and humanities disciplines such as art and design (Witzgall et al. 2013; Jensen 2014; Jensen and Lanng 2016), archaeology (Leary 2014), history (Merriman et al. 2013; Divall 2015; Mom 2015a, 2015b), performance and dance (Wilkie 2012, 2015), film studies (Archer 2012; Borden 2013), and literary studies (Parkins 2009; Aguir 2011; Mathieson 2012, 2015; Berensmeyer and Ehland 2013; Murray & Upstone 2014; Pearce 2016; Livesey 2016).

In this special issue we showcase some of this emerging research on mobility by scholars working across a range of arts and humanities disciplines, as well as challenging overly simplistic accounts which position mobilities research as a product of the social sciences. In section two of this introduction we present an alternative history of the emerging field of mobilities research. We reveal how early conceptual engagements with mobility were often closely aligned with humanities traditions of thinking, as well as highlighting the ‘genre-defying’ approaches of many leading mobility scholars whose work transcends any ‘easy’ social science/arts and humanities divide. In section three, we outline some of the distinctive contributions we feel that arts and humanities scholars could make to mobilities research, ranging from artistic experiments with mobile methods and philosophical treatises on movement and flow, to examinations of kinaesthetics which are sensitive to the ways in which movement is enabled, felt, perceived, expressed, metered, choreographed and desired. Finally, in section four, ‘Text, movement, method’, we provide an overview of the articles included in this special issue, focusing in particular on the relationship between their audience (the field(s) to which they may be seen to be speaking) and their methodologies, and the way in which this has the potential to radically extend the readership of this journal.

An Alternative History of Mobility Studies

On the one hand variations of mobility (spaces of flows, nomadology, travelling theory) have become central metaphors for abstract forms of understanding in cultural geography, anthropology, cultural studies, critical theory, philosophy and the humanities in general. Metaphors of mobility are used to bring into question the apparent fixities of older forms of understanding. In general this has gone hand in hand with the move against foundationalism and towards anti-essentialism. At the same time there has been a dramatic increase in attention paid to mobile people ranging from travellers and explorers, to tourists, to migrants to the homeless and exiled. (Cresswell 2001a, 9)

The marked success and purchase of debates, approaches, concepts and methods associated with mobility studies is not only a reflection of the relevance and timeliness of mobilities research. It is also a reflection of the successful networks, fora and publishing ventures which have been forged by leading scholars in the field, from the establishment of key journals, associations, book series, research centres and mailing lists, to the organisation of influential symposia and conferences. Key moments are frequently referred to in makeshift genealogies of this emerging field (see Merriman et al. 2013; Adey et al. 2014; Sheller and Urry 2016). The founding of the Centre for Mobilities Research (CeMoRe) in 2003, the Alternative Mobility Futures conference in 2004, and the launch of this journal in 2006 are just three examples, all of which were closely associated with the Department of Sociology at Lancaster University. Indeed, the 'new mobilities paradigm' was not only labelled by, but also effectively institutionalised and materialised by, sociologists working at Lancaster, often

in collaboration with academics elsewhere. The danger, though, is that such statements and sketched genealogies overlook the diverse influences, labours and lines of flight constituting this amorphous, diverse, multi-disciplinary field.

There have been many influences and events shaping thinking on mobility, resulting in what we might call multiple, often personal, ‘mobility turns’. For one of us (Peter), key formative influences and events included Nigel Thrift’s (1994, 1996) and Tim Cresswell’s (1993, 1996, 1997, 1999) early geographies of mobility and mobile practices, John Urry’s early sociologies before ‘the turn’ (1999, 2000a, 2000b), and a multi-disciplinary ‘Mobilities’ colloquium organised by Tim Cresswell, Prys Gruffudd and Ulf Strohmayer at Gregynog Hall in mid-Wales in 1999. The latter conference featured scholars from a broad range of humanities disciplines (including cultural geography, literary studies, and history), which resulted in the publication of a special issue of *New Formations* on ‘mobilities’ in 2001. What is notable about Cresswell’s (2001a, 2001b) introduction to the special issue is that he traces a genealogy of mobility theory and mobile metaphors that is more clearly attuned to humanities literatures than any nascent social science paradigm. Cresswell’s own work has always transcended and problematised any easy humanities/social science divide; demonstrating a clear concern with tracing the political and social production of mobilities, while examining the cultural and historical significance of mobile practices, and drawing influences from (and critiquing) movement-thinking in anthropology (Clifford 1992, 1997), literary/postcolonial theory (Said 1994), cultural studies (Morris 1988; Chambers 1990), sociology (Castells 1996; Bauman 2000; Urry 2000a), and human geography (Massey 1991; Cresswell 1993, 1996; Thrift 1994, 1996) (see Cresswell 1997, 2001b, 2006). Philosophical and empirical lines of flight can, of course, be seen in the earlier processual philosophies of Lucretius, Bergson, Serres, Deleuze and Guattari (Cresswell 2006; Merriman 2012a) as well as transformations in our understandings of subjectivity set in motion by Saussure, Derrida,

Lacan, Althusser, Foucault, Kristeva, and post-structuralist thinkers in general (see Weedon 1987, 19-21, 86-92). They are also evident in theoretically-engaged transport histories (Schivelbusch 1980), in cultural histories of Modernism, Futurism, speed and acceleration (Kern 1983; Millar and Schwartz 1998; Schnapp 1999, 2009; Thacker 2003; Tomlinson 2007; Duffy 2009; Rosa 2013), and the movement studies and experiments of Muybridge, Laban, Taylor, and most recently Forsyth, Manning and McCormack (Cresswell 2006; McCormack 2008, 2013; Manning 2009; Henriques et al. 2014). What's more, firmly established traditions of thinking on transport history, migration studies, travel writing, postmodern theory, and creative movement practices have explored many themes which resurface in the 'new mobilities paradigm' (see Cresswell and Merriman 2011). Indeed, any future history or genealogy of mobilities approaches needs to account for the diverse conceptual influences, disciplinary perspectives, and distinctively personal 'mobility turns' undergone by scholars.

A close examination of the theoretical influences, approaches, methods and disciplinary perspectives underpinning the 'new mobilities paradigm' starts to challenge any easy alignment of mobilities research with a neatly demarcated realm called the social sciences. This is because, as noted above, mobility theories have themselves emerged out of, and become aligned with, trans-disciplinary, post-humanist, anti-essentialist, and post-structuralist debates which span disciplines as diverse as political theory and cultural geography (Thrift 1996, 2008; Cresswell 2001a, 2001b, 2006; Massey 2005; Adey 2006; Bissell 2010; Merriman 2012a), literary theory (Jardine 1986; Kaplan, 1996; Butler 1990), cultural studies (Morris 1988; Hall 1996; Baudrillard 2010 [1984]), sociology (Urry 1990; 2000a; 2000b; Bauman 2004), anthropology (Ingold 2000, 2007; Clifford 2007), feminist theory (Kristeva 1980; Irigaray 1985; Cixous 1991; Kaplan 1996), continental philosophy (Deleuze and Guattari 1988; Bergson 1992) and postcolonial/migration studies (Brah 1986;

Spivak 1997; Canclini 1989; Bhabha 1994; Pratt 1992). Looking across these disciplines – and dates – serves as an important reminder of the immense contribution of individual authors and texts in preparing the ground for mobility to become an object of study in its own right. Mary Louise Pratt's *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturalism* (1992) and Caren Kaplan's *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement* (1996) stand out in this regard, as do so many of the founding texts of twentieth-century postcolonial studies, including Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1994 [1978]), Homi Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* (1994), Gayatri Spivak's *In Other Worlds* (1987) and Nestor Garcia Canclini's work on cultural hybridity (*Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*, 1989). One reason why work in postcolonial studies hasn't been linked to the emergence of the 'new mobilities paradigm' might be because much of it originated in literary criticism – somewhat divorced from sociological debates on mobility. Another reason would be because it has long been annexed (for teaching purposes, especially) to other important political issues and debates – e.g., Foucauldian analyses of power and oppression and cultural/ethnic identity, with its implicit (or, indeed, explicit) comment on the mass-movements of people around the globe placed to one side. More recent recognition of the 'two-way traffic' that is consequent to migration has focussed attention on the common interests of the two fields in the *flow(s)* of people (e.g. Rouse 1991; Pearce et al. 2013). Post-colonial literary criticism, colonial and post-colonial histories, and sociological and cultural studies of migration and diasporas can also contribute to a de-centring of mobilities scholarship which has all-too-frequently focussed on modern modes of transport and mobility in developed countries. Paul Gilroy's (1993) writings on *Black Atlantic* mobilities – shifting attention to the 'routes' through which bodies, knowledges and cultural forms have flowed – serves as one useful and important counter. Mimi Sheller's (2003) early work provides another, showing how the Caribbean serves as a dynamic exemplar of the circular movement of people (and goods)

since its first colonisation, revealing how the poets, novelists and academics who have written about this region deserve to feature more prominently in genealogies of the ‘mobilities turn’ (see for example, writings by Grace Nichols 1984; Pauline Melville 1991; Derek Walcott 1992; Richard Braithwaite 2013; Cooper 1993; Benitez-Rojo 1997; Puri 2003; Scott 2013).

A further challenge to any easy alignment of mobilities research with the social sciences is that mobility scholars have very diverse biographies and influences. John Urry’s synthetic sociology has always cut across neat disciplinary boundaries, rarely drawing upon traditional social science methods, and frequently reflecting upon the histories and diverse cultural practices associated with mobility, tourism, and transport (see Urry 1990, 2000, 2007). Mimi Sheller has worked and published across sociology, history, literature and, to a certain extent, human geography, serving as President of the International Association of the History of Transport, Traffic and Mobility (T2M) and undertaking detailed historical studies of mobility (see Sheller 2003, 2014b). Peter Adey’s work has similarly spanned social theory, political geography, and cultural history (Adey 2010), while transport and mobility historians have begun to engage with sociologies of mobility from the ‘other direction’ (see Divall and Revill 2005; Pooley et al. 2005; Mom et al. 2009; Divall 2015; Mom 2015a, 2015b). In particular, Gijs Mom has actively sought to reshape the field of transport history as mobility history, co-founding the International Association of the History of Transport, Traffic and Mobility (T2M) in 2003, and launching *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* in 2011.

Transfers was originally intended to be a more historically-oriented, humanities-leaning journal than *Mobilities*, ‘bring[ing] into conversation perspectives from both the humanities and social sciences’ (Mom et al. 2013, 1). However, it would be a mistake to see *Mobilities* as a journal narrowly framed around social science approaches and methods. A

close examination of back issues of the journal reveals a broad array of humanities-oriented papers dotted amongst the more numerous contributions of social scientists. Since its very first issue, *Mobilities* has featured papers by literature scholars, historians, geographers, film scholars and others who draw upon humanities approaches, theories and methods. This includes papers addressing cinematic representations of mobility, transport and tourism (Tzanelli 2006; Roberts 2010), philosophical approaches to mobility (Adey 2006), histories of ships and ocean travel (Ashmore 2008; Anim-Addo 2014; Davies 2014; Hasty 2014), histories of rail travel (Löfgren 2008; de Sapio 2013), and literary representations of mobility, travel and migration (Szczeszak-Brewer 2007; Pearce 2012a, 2012b), even though, as will be discussed in section four of this Introduction, they have frequently been written with a social science audience in mind. Humanities approaches, then, are an important aspect of both mobilities research and *Mobilities* research, but there have been few, if any, statements on the distinctive contributions which humanities approaches, theories and methods can make to mobility studies (and vice versa). In the next section we outline some of the distinctive contributions we feel arts and humanities scholarship can bring to mobilities research.

Kin-aesthetics: Arts and Humanities Approaches to Mobility and Movement

The river where you set your foot just now is gone – those waters giving way to this, now this. (Heraclitus c.600BC [2001], 41)

Before the spectacle of this universal mobility there may be some who will be seized with dizziness. ...They must have “fixed” points to which they can attach thought and existence. They think that if everything passes, nothing exists; and that if reality is mobility, it has already ceased to exist at the moment one thinks it – it eludes thought.

The material world, they say, is going to disintegrate, and the mind will drown in the torrent-like flow of things. – Let them be reassured! Change... will very quickly appear to them to be the most substantial and durable thing possible. Its solidity is infinitely superior to that of a fixity which is only an ephemeral arrangement between mobilities. (Bergson 1992 [1946], 150)

The history of the humanities is littered with lines of thinking, philosophical approaches, and complex ontological frameworks in which movement and mobility are understood in ‘alternate’ ways. As Tim Cresswell’s writings have so astutely demonstrated, Western societies, governments, and scholars have invested heavily in ways of understanding the world which are grounded in what Liisa Malkki has called a ‘sedentarist metaphysics’ (Cresswell 2001b: 16; see Malkki 1992), but we must remember that movement and mobility have been approached in a diverse array of ways within different philosophical traditions, scientific theories, societies, and cultures. Within both ancient and modern traditions of processual philosophy – including writings by Heraclitus, Lucretius, Bergson, and contemporary post-structuralist thinkers such as Braidotti, Serres, and Deleuze and Guattari – it has been suggested that movement is not simply an exception to a tendency to stasis and fixity (Deleuze and Guattari 1988; Braidotti 1994; Serres 2000; Adey 2006; Merriman 2012a, 2016). Rather, for process thinkers, the world is in constant flux, movement, and becoming – ‘movement is primary’ (see Merriman 2012a, 2012b). In contrast, many mobility scholars have argued that such fluidifying tendencies and nomadic philosophies flatten and universalise movements, romanticise figures such as the nomad, and divert attention away from contextual understandings of the politics of mobility (Kaplan 1996; Cresswell 2006, 2010, 2014; cf. Merriman 2016). The danger of such criticisms, we would argue, is that they themselves generalise and abstract the movements envisioned through processual approaches,

because to argue that everything is moving and in process is not the same as arguing that all movements occur with the same speed, magnitude, quality, and affective force, or indeed that effects and affects of stillness, stasis or fixity do not occur (Merriman 2012a, 2016). Indeed, mobilities scholarship has, at times, demonstrated a tendency to adopt rather conservative, limited and indeed ‘realist’ framings of mobility and movement, where movement is either that of discrete objects or subjectified, feeling, experiencing and governed bodies who generate distinctive effects, affects and meanings. Thus, while a range of social scientific writings on movement and mobility have clearly been underpinned by processual, non-representational and post-structuralist approaches to movement and becoming (see Adey 2006; Bissell 2010; Merriman 2012a), Mimi Sheller has recently argued that the ‘new mobilities paradigm’ is ‘realist’ in its approach, suggesting:

It is neither structuralist nor post-structuralist, but instead advocates for a realist relational ontology for contemporary social science capable of transcending old debates and bridging disciplinary boundaries. (Sheller 2014a, 790)

While appreciating the politics informing Sheller’s stance, we would argue that mobilities research traditions are highly diverse, while also suggesting that humanities approaches to movement and mobility – particularly historically-oriented accounts – force us to challenge singular figurations of what ‘the real’ is, was, or might be. Arts and humanities expressions and articulations of movement have the potential to trace how particular movements, experiences and sensations may be grounded in very different ontologies, embodied practices, and cultural and historical contexts.

What different movement traditions and practices reveal is the diverse array of kinaesthetic and proprioceptive practices, sensations and experiences which emerge through

embodied movements associated with particular cultural, spatial and artistic practices and relations (Schwartz 1992; Manning 2009). People's perceptions and cultural understandings of embodied movement and position, and their sense of embodied effort vary, and it is just these kinds of diverse embodied practices and movements which scholars adopting non-representational approaches and mobile methods have attempted to target and apprehend (see Thrift 2008; Manning 2009; Merriman 2012a; McCormack 2013; Vannini 2015). What's more, for many processual and non-representational thinkers the focus is not on the meanings or power relations of movement, but on the 'affective qualities [and capacities] of moving bodies', where movement is not simply taken to be an expression or phenomenon of intentional and active bodies (McCormack 2013, 208-209). For Erin Manning, for example, movement is a primary and 'incipient' quality of relational bodies in becoming (Manning 2009, 6; Merriman 2012a).

Arts and humanities approaches bring to the fore a broad range of distinctive methodologies, approaches, epistemologies and practical methods which are exciting for us as mobility scholars, but this is also the area where arts and humanities scholarship has already had the greatest influence on the 'new mobilities paradigm' (see Fincham et al. 2010; Büscher et al. 2011). A perusal of the now diverse 'mobile methods' literature reveals engagements with a broad array of methods and practices (and research 'products') which are frequently associated with the arts and humanities, from different ways of writing, diagramming and representing mobility (Cresswell and Dixon 2002; Haldrup 2011; Cresswell 2013; Murray and Upstone 2014), to engagements with particular movement and performance practices (Manning 2009; McCormack 2013; Hunter 2015), and experimental artistic expressions (Biemann 2002; Büscher et al. 2011; Myers 2011; Domschke and Bambozzi 2013; Ravalet et al. 2013; Witzgall et al. 2013; Sheller 2015). These methodological innovations have been driven by a number of factors, including debates

surrounding: the challenge of apprehending and articulating mobile experiences, events and situations; the (im)possibility of representing mobile or embodied practices; and critical appraisals of the epistemological claims of academic researchers (Merriman 2014). At a basic level, scholars have developed experimental new ‘mobile methods’ in order to ‘capture, track, simulate, mimic and shadow the many and interdependent forms of intermittent movement of people, images, information and objects’ (Büscher et al. 2011, 7). Innovative methods can enable researchers to experience, observe and record movements ‘as they happen’, and underpinning the justifications of a number of proponents is an assumption that ‘mobile methods’ (along with ethnographic, participative and video methods) may enable researchers to overcome the failures of other methods, providing a more ‘close’, ‘first-hand’, ‘unmediated’ encounter with subjects, objects and events (e.g. Spinney 2009, 2011; Vergunst 2011; cf. Merriman 2014). For some scholars, the turn to ‘mobile methods’ appears to be motivated by a desire to advance approaches and methods which are attuned to the ‘non-representational’ and dynamic qualities of movements and embodied practices (Spinney 2009, 2011), with an assumption that mobility is best investigated while researchers and subjects are on the move. However, other academics have queried the faith which appears to be placed in such methods, asking whether traditional methods really have ‘failed’, and questioning the knowledge claims underpinned by these methods (Dewsbury 2010; Hitchings 2012; Merriman 2014). Perhaps interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups can still be useful for understanding (people’s experiences of) fleeting mobile, embodied practices (see Dewsbury 2010; Hitchings 2012). In what sense should experimental mobile methods and arts and humanities methods be approached as tools to ‘know-and-tell’ rather than as tools to experiment *with* (after Dewsbury 2010, 321)? For ‘non-representational’ thinkers such as Nigel Thrift and J.D. Dewsbury, the problem is that experimental, practise-based, arts and humanities methods (and, we could add, mobile methods) are frequently enrolled into a

realist social science methodology built around a ‘notion of bringing back the “data”’ (Thrift 2000a, 3). However, artistic and philosophical engagements with, and reflections on, mobile subjects, experiences, methods and practices might not translate into a clear methodology, hypothesis, set of intentions, body of data, or set of conclusions. Further, when we allow for the fact that experiences of mobility are not confined to the ‘now’ – but have been central to past practices as well as current memories – there is a strong counter-argument that retrospective representations of movement through literary and other texts are no less evocative, important, lively, and dynamic than ethnographic ‘data’ captured ‘on the move’ (see section four and conclusion).

If there is a common thread running through much arts and humanities research on mobility, we feel it might be encapsulated in the concepts of ‘kinaesthesia’ and ‘kinaesthetics’, perhaps re-punctuated as ‘kin-aesthesia’ and ‘kin-aesthetics’. Kinaesthesia, the sensation of movement, particularly the sense of muscular effort relating to voluntary embodied movements, is central to many arts and humanities practices, experiments, and expressions. This is particularly the case when the concept is framed broadly as kin-aesthetics – the aesthetics of movement – rather than simply associated with the muscular sensations of those who move. This is movement enacted, felt, perceived, expressed, metered, choreographed, appreciated and desired. While formal understandings and definitions of kinaesthesia were developed across a broad range of disciplines and movement practices in the mid- to late-nineteenth century – from Francois Delsarte’s early teachings on gymnastics to Henry Bastion’s physiological and neurological research on muscular sensation and kinaesthetic impressions (Bastion 1887; Schwartz 1992) – the influence of such movements, practices, creative expressions, and scientific practices was most strongly felt with the advancement of different cultures of embodied movement practice in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, from the photography of Jules-Marey and Muybridge and painting

practices of the Impressionists, Futurists, Cubists, and later the Abstract Expressionists, to the modern dance and choreographic traditions associated with Duncan, Laban and Dalcroise (see Thrift 2000b; McCormack 2005; Cresswell 2006). Dance movements, hand-writing, music, gymnastics, painting, sculpture, nursery education, and much more start to be understood through a focus on movement, harmony and rhythm, while new technologies of movement – including the zip, motor car, escalator, elevator, cinema projector, conveyor belt, phonograph, and roller-coaster – facilitated a ‘new kinaesthetic in that perpetually grey area between gesture and thought’ (Schwartz 1992, 85; also Kern 1983; Kwinter 2001; Schwarzer 2004). This was a grey area which Nigel Thrift and others have discussed in terms of pre-cognition, non-cognitive ‘automatic’ embodied practices, and the ‘half second delay’ (Thrift 2008; Laurier 2011; Merriman 2012a).

As the preceding paragraph reveals, humanities scholars have held a long-standing concern with tracing the historical emergence, transformation and significance of practices, sensations, spaces and experiences of movement and mobility, which are frequently read as ‘barometers of modernity’ (Thrift 1995, 19; after Descombes 1993). Indeed, the best historical studies of movement and mobility can act as something of a corrective to the rather hyperbolic language, dystopian prophecies, and modern futures envisioned in some accounts of movement, speed, acceleration, fluidity and flow (Thrift 1995; Merriman 2007, 2017). Sensations, registers and experiences of movement, speed and acceleration are not simply confined to late twentieth or twenty-first century societies and cultures, and have a long history to which arts and humanities scholars (alongside social science scholars) have made a major contribution.

Movement and mobility frequently emerge in arts and humanities writings which focus on questions of rhythm, temporality and spatiality (see Schivelbusch 1980; Thrift 1995, 1996; Lefebvre 2004; Cresswell 2006; Sharma 2014). Indeed, as key primitives or

foundational concepts which appear to underpin our very being, the relationship between space, time, and movement are aligned in ways that appear to echo physical science approaches to movement, life, being and events (see Cresswell 2006; Merriman 2012a). The danger, of course, is that physical theories are simply accepted in uncritical ways (i.e. assuming that space, time, distance, speed and acceleration do all have clear functional relationships), and that the experiences and meanings gathering around movement, space and time are merely treated as ‘productions’ or ‘constructions’ that are superstructural to a physical world. In contrast, theoretical approaches to movement and mobility (whether grounded in arts and humanities or social science approaches) have the potential to challenge accounts which infer that movement or mobility simply occur ‘*in or across* space and time’ (Merriman 2012a, 1). Movement and physical displacement may enact processes of spacing and timing in different ways, and embodied movements may become aligned with a diverse array of produced and sensed spatialities and temporalities which do not simply align with geometric notions of space, time and distance. Movement and mobility, like space and time, are embodied, sensed, and apprehended qualities, emergences and multiplicities (Merriman 2012a). Movement and mobility become associated with distinctive proprioceptive and kinaesthetic ontologies and cultural practices.

Text, Movement, Method

All the articles featured in this special issue are distinguished by the fact that their authors draw upon at least one humanities discipline (History, French, English, Creative Writing, Philosophy, Historical Geography) and source their ‘data’ in textual materials of various kinds, ranging from newspapers, periodicals, photographs, films, and Modernist fiction, to ‘middle brow’ fiction, children’s fiction, poems, diaries, philosophical treatises and cultural phenomena. This material is mined not only for how it represents mobility, or what it says

about mobility, but also for how it enacts or performs mobility through processes of production and interpretation. In this section we consider the different theoretical and methodological frames within which our authors are working, the audiences they address, and the distinctive contribution their work makes both to mobilities scholarship and the ‘parent’ disciplines informing their practice. Indeed, in reviewing the wide diversity of articles presented here, it quickly becomes clear that the nature of the textual materials with which each author is working – or, indeed, the discipline in which he or she is based – often matters less than who the piece is speaking *to* in identifying where its principal contribution to knowledge lies.

This last point is exemplified neatly by the five articles which work closely with literary texts – **Livesey, Culbert, Murray and Overall, Pearce and Davidson**. While **Livesey** and **Culbert** both employ concepts and perspectives from mobilities scholarship originating in sociology, geography and anthropology to gain a new perspective on the authors/texts who are the subject of their enquiry, it may be argued that they primarily address other literary scholars. **Murray and Overall**, on the other hand, explore the representation of actual and imagined space in children’s literature through a mobilities lens in order to contribute to sociological work on childhood rather than literary criticism. Ian **Davidson**, meanwhile – whose textual base is twentieth-century American fiction and poetry – combines a broad-brush acknowledgement of the ‘mobilities paradigm’ with a particular take on Rancière, Badiou and Plato, in order to theorise a ‘mobility aesthetic’ that can be used to explain the form, function and reception of contemporary literature as well as its representation of mobility of various kinds. As a consequence, his audience is, again, literary – but this time, the literary theorist rather than the period or subject specialist. Lynne **Pearce**, by contrast – as a cultural theorist – does not make the early twentieth-century motoring texts she engages the ‘object’ of her enquiry but, instead, uses them as a means of theorising the

nature of automotive consciousness and what she characterises here as the ‘driving-event’. Her audience, then, is not primarily the literary critics who have worked on many of the authors she discusses in the context of Modernism, but rather the sociologists and cultural geographers who have initiated debates about the subjective experiences of driving and passengering (Laurier 2008) in recent times. Meanwhile, the contributors who work with historical texts – **Clarsen** and **Pooley** – are similar in the way in which they utilise mobilities theories to gain new perspectives on personal mobility in the early twentieth century, yet use their findings to speak to different fields: social and cultural history (concerned with colonialism and nation-building) in **Clarsen’s** case, and historical geography and transport studies in **Pooley’s**. Neil **Archer**, finally, uses his expertise as a film studies scholar not, on this occasion, to speak to others in his field but to reflect upon what mobilities scholars – specifically those working in the social sciences – might gain from learning to engage more effectively with ‘film as film’ rather than using film texts in a simplistic, ‘social reflectionist’ way. Recognition of the diverse target audiences and scholarly objectives of the articles presented here is, we would argue, crucial if we are to properly understand the consequences of mobilities research becoming genuinely cross- and inter-disciplinary in the future. It is towards this end that we now proceed to evaluate their significance for the wider mobilities community. The rich archive of mobility-themed texts upon which these authors’ draw, and the close readings used to make visible the gaps and contradictions in the texts concerned, will, we hope, serve as an illustration of how skilful textual analysis can shed new light on a wide range of mobilities debates and theories.

As noted above, the articles by Ruth **Livesey** and John **Culbert** sit most firmly within the discipline of English literature and may, at first, seem to be addressed to that audience. Livesey’s piece nevertheless fuses together two rather different traditions in literary studies, the first taking the form of a close-reading of a text (in this case, George Eliot’s *Silas Marner*

1861) which focuses upon the ‘micro-mobilities’ in the narrative as a means of challenging a nineteenth-century review of the novel which described it as ‘a mere photograph of a stationary phase of human society’. However, alongside this intricate engagement with the text’s form, function and symbolism, **Livesey** develops another thesis on how the ‘realist’ depiction of place in novels like *Silas Marner* came to function as vicarious ‘portable place(s)’ in what, by the mid nineteenth century, was already perceived to be a ‘traumatised’ (hyper)mobile world. This vivid example of how a spatial-temporal imaginary spoke to the nineteenth-century public’s anxieties of living in a fast-paced, fast-moving world, clearly addresses scholars on both sides of the humanities/social sciences divide and cleverly links the textual representation of mobilities with those involved in its consumption.

John Culbert’s article, meanwhile, uses deconstructionist techniques to interrogate the theme of (im)mobility in Edith Wharton’s fiction and non-fiction writings. In line with the argument presented in his 2010 book *Paralyses*, **Culbert** demonstrates how Wharton herself, as well as the characters in her texts, were repeatedly immobilised or ‘moored’ (both literally and metaphorically), thus challenging the enduring association of both modernity (as a social/cultural epoch) and Modernism (as a literary aesthetic) with speed and empowerment. Thus, once again, an article which may be situated in a very particular literary critical tradition (deconstruction) includes a cultural reference point that will be of interest to scholars across a range of disciplines. Furthermore, the framing of this article – through reference to the way in which the humanities may be seen to become a ‘poor relation’ within academia, increasingly dependent upon itinerant sessional labour – imaginatively links the challenges Wharton faced at the beginning of the twentieth century with a dynamic which persists today. In her milieu, as ours, the association of empowerment with mobility is not always what it seems – and certainly not for all persons.

In the case of **Murray and Overall**, the close readings performed across a wide selection of children's fiction – from contemporary favourites like *James and the Giant Peach* (1961) to the literary classic *Alice in Wonderland* (1897) – are undertaken specifically to explore and illustrate recent sociological research on the ways in which children learn to negotiate space, place and movement through a combination of 'imagined' and 'lived' experience. In this regard, their article directly addresses a social science audience in a way that Livesey's and Culbert's articles do not, drawing upon literary texts to help researchers understand the role of space, place and mobility in a child's imagination. As they acknowledge, the fact that these texts are written *by* adults *for* children means that they cannot be construed as a window onto childhood imagination *per se*, but their representations of 'impossible mobilities' (whether flying, driving, floating – or, in Alice's case, shrinking and growing) can nevertheless be productively employed by researchers seeking new insights into childhood perception and cognition.

This use of literary texts – as a way of theorising those aspects of human consciousness that are not easily accessible by other means – is not dissimilar to Lynne **Pearce's** approach in her article on the 'driving-event'. As a cultural theorist rather than a literary critic, Pearce makes clear that she is not investigating her texts – which range from early twentieth-century motoring periodicals to Modernist and inter-war fiction – in order to ascertain their thematic, ideological or narratological representation of automobility, but rather as material with which to model the different forms that 'automotive consciousness' may take. In this article she focuses specifically on the idiosyncratic nature of individual car journeys when seen in terms of the drivers'/passengers' subjective experience rather than the utility (e.g., commute, motor-tour, road trip) that has more typically been used to categorise them. In this regard, **Pearce** may be seen to be contributing to recent debates within the now well-established field of (auto)mobilities scholarship, with a focus that will possibly be of

more interest to cultural geographers and sociologists than literary scholars, even though it does generate new readings of authors like Virginia Woolf.

Like **Pearce's** piece, Neil **Archer's** article may be seen to primarily target a (sociological) mobilities' readership in its attempt to demonstrate the ways in which a more sophisticated – 'medium'- and 'genre'-aware – use of film will enable such texts to be put to better use in mobilities scholarship in general. Indeed, this is very much an article 'about' methodology, seeking to demonstrate how the evolution of particular genres (such as the road movie) and new technologies (such as the mobile tracking-shot) can tell us as much, if not more, about the changing nature of contemporary mobilities as a film's thematic content. When we do engage with the latter, **Archer** argues that it is essential that we pay attention to the text's 'gaps and silences' in order that we grasp its latent content, and he uses the example of the French road movie *L'Emploi du Temps (Time Out)* (2001) to show how the central protagonist's 'everyday' commuting should be seen as an expression of 'extraordinary' pleasure and desire rather than the nihilistic boredom it could easily be mistaken for.

In Ian **Davidson's** article, meanwhile, mobilities theory, continental philosophy (notably Badiou and Rancière) and contemporary American literature are all set in dialogue with one another in order to both elucidate, and demonstrate, the author's claim that the literary text is, in and of itself, inherently mobile; this is on account of the fact that *all* texts are arguably (re)mobilised through the process of their production, performance and reception. While Davidson presents this as a general principle, he also uses texts like Kerouac's *Some of the dharma* (1997) and Eileen Myles's poetry sequence *Snow Flake* (2012), as examples of texts that self-consciously draw attention to the mobility inherent in the process of production and consumption as well as their thematic content. This move to present mobility as an aesthetic that is integral to, and expressive of, specific art forms and

textual practices forces us to rethink the idea of mobility and movement as simply the subjects/objects of representation, reminding us of the processual theoretical traditions discussed earlier in which movement is the basic conceptual ‘building-block’ of thought as well as of the life-world in general.

For the two contributors – **Clarsen** and **Pooley** – whose textual sources are expressly historical (both dating to the early twentieth century), the connection between the representational and the material is very closely observed and integral to their projects. **Clarsen’s** piece, which extends her earlier ground-breaking work on the significance of automobility in early twentieth century Australia (2008), combines analysis of the early white-settlers’ ‘overlanding’ to reveal how it was both a form of ‘transport’ and ‘communication’: ‘Automobiles were made to move, but in their networked movement across space they simultaneously functioned as media of communication that shaped social worlds’. In addition, the piece features a fascinating re-scripting of what automobility meant for the aboriginal population during this period; in signal contrast to the newspaper reports which figured aboriginals as ‘terrified’ of the new technology, **Clarsen** demonstrates how ‘a used car or truck was a prize possession’ for those who managed to get hold of one, as evidenced by revelatory photographic archives that have recently come to light.

For all historians, however, textual ‘evidence’ is necessarily partial, mediated and liable to multiple interpretations: a methodological concern that Colin **Pooley** reminds us of at the beginning of his article on transport use in Manchester in the first decade of the twentieth century. Working with the private diaries of what are, necessarily, a class-specific group of travellers, **Pooley** provides us with an illuminating glimpse into the ways in which men and women of all ages embraced the multiple forms of transport available to them (trains, trams, bicycles, motorbikes, cars and – of course – walking) and reveals how they were seemingly comfortable moving between modes during the course of a journey. This

snapshot of how an integrated transport system might operate in urban areas speaks, of course, to scholars working in transport studies and urban planning today (as well as historians), demonstrating the policy-relevance of historical studies based upon textual sources (see Divall et al. 2016). Both **Clarsen** and **Pooley**, then, may be seen to be using their textual sources to rewrite misplaced assumptions about historical social practices even though they target rather different disciplinary audiences.

For many social scientists casting their eyes over the contents of this special issue, there will, nevertheless, remain doubts about the extent to which textual representations of mobilities – even ones which appear to refract kinaesthetic sensibilities and moments – constitute ‘data’ of the kind that can substitute, or be used alongside, that garnered from living subjects or other forms of empirical evidence. The use of materials that are not only perceived to be ‘subjective’ but also, in many cases, ‘fictional’ may be seen to sit awkwardly alongside findings generated by ‘real-world’ research, especially given that post-structuralism has taught us *never* to mistake anything in a text for an unmediated ‘window onto the world’ (Pearce 2014, 79-81). Most cultural theorists have, of course, side-stepped this issue by insisting (as **Pearce** does here) that they are using what they find in texts not as evidence of how people perceive, think or feel in the material world but rather as prompts to *model* theoretical possibilities which may, in turn, be put to work alongside more empirical data. However, the methodological reality is that texts create ‘worlds’ so immersive, persuasive and complete that it is frequently a struggle for the researcher, as it is for the general reader, to maintain their critical distance and keep the mediated nature of the experiences with which they engage in view. Yet rather than be fearful of the seductive mimetic-yet-illusory quality of the text in this way, there is clearly an argument – implicit in a good deal of the processual and non-representational theory cited at the beginning of this Introduction – that it is not the subjective and/or fictional status of the text that is the obstacle

here but rather the ‘old-fashioned’ realism that clings to the way we think about the world and how we ‘know’ it. Notwithstanding the ways in which authors like Ben Highmore (2005) (following Lefebvre 2004) have creatively combined the literary with the ontological in an effort to demonstrate just how thoroughly mediated our experience of the city (and, indeed, other spaces) is, there remains a reluctance to regard the textual realm as intrinsic to our lived experience rather than merely a representation of it.

In a similar vein, we have also observed a tendency for differences of *temporal standpoint* to present themselves as an obstacle to the integration of textual materials into social science approaches: texts, by definition, trade in representations of our individual and collective *pasts*: via memories and narrative (in the case of autobiography), or the retrospective positioning of the reader (who is always reading about something that happened in the past) (Currie 2007) in the case of fiction and non-fiction. By contrast, social science research is often focused on the present and the future. Here, the ‘subjective’ veil (in the form of ‘faulty’ and/or intrusive memory and ‘unreliable’ story-telling) that is the life-blood of both autobiographical and fictional texts may be seen to undermine the ethnographer’s attempts to capture the immediacy of lived experience; while in mobilities research, specifically, the popularity of Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology (1945) in explaining the nature of embodied movement (e.g. Dant 2004), with its focus on *pre-consciousness* and the ontological present, purposefully excludes the significance of the past, consciousness, and memory. Yet if we elect, instead, to follow Henri Bergson’s account of how perception and memory continuously ‘shadow’ one another in the present (Bergson 1908; Pearce 2016, 13-18), the intrinsically reflective and retrospective nature of textual material becomes a fascinating resource through which to explore the ways in which events in the past (recent or otherwise) are perpetually informing experiences – including movement(s) of every kind – in the present. For where interview-based research often struggles to capture these unconscious

and/or retrospective aspects of experience, the written text cannot escape them and hence provides the researcher with many fascinating glimpses into our complex temporal situatedness in the world: a reminder, if you like, of how every (mobile) event in the present is informed by an ontological and/or discursive event in the past (the walk we took, the book we read, the film we watched). Texts, then, may be seen to do much more than take mobilities scholars 'inside' the embodied/sensuous present; they also dig deep into the ontological past of that experience, and through the author/protagonist's reflections, reveal its unique history.

Conclusion

In this Introduction we have attempted to complicate the perception that, as a field, mobilities research is intrinsically oriented – either historically, or in terms of current research – towards the social sciences. Although many of the leading scholars associated with mobility studies do align themselves with the social sciences, our 'alternative history' has attempted to show how the humanities – and indeed the *arts* – have been central to the emergence of scholarly debates on mobility, playing a crucial role in helping scholars to argue for the ubiquity of mobility as a structuring principle in every aspect of human and non-human life.

As part of our overview of the diverse range of articles included in this special issue, we have sought to tease out the methodological implications of the use of texts – autobiographical, fictional, poetic, visual, journalistic etc. – in mobility studies. In so doing, we have pointed both to the significance of the destination-audience in determining the use to which texts are put, and also the way in which the features of texts that have been deemed 'unreliable' sources for social science research may – in the wake of both 'representational' (Lefebvre 2004) and 'non-representational' theory (Thrift 2008) – render them invaluable in

helping us better to understand how we inhabit our spatial, temporal and, of course, mobile worlds.

At the same time, we would like to make clear that it was never our intention to remind social scientists of what they owe to the arts and humanities and/or of what they might gain if they deployed their materials and methods more widely. As we repeatedly acknowledge, social scientists working in the mobilities field have, by-and-large, demonstrated an awareness of both its multi-disciplinary origins and the value of working with textual sources of every kind. What has been lacking, however – and what we hope this collection will begin to redress – is a rather more formal recognition of the field's complex genealogy. Indeed, it could be that the more immediate beneficiaries of the special issue – and, indeed, the overview provided in this Introduction – will be colleagues from arts and humanities departments around the world who have not previously engaged with this journal, but who do so now in order to read an article by a colleague working in their discipline. In our experience, many such colleagues – including those working in manifestly cognate fields like travel writing studies or postcolonial literature – have yet to discover that a 'mobility paradigm' exists or to realise their potential contribution to it. To these new readers, in particular, then, we extend the hand of friendship, and we hope that in years to come more scholars in the arts and humanities will engage with the journal and contribute their texts – and textual practices – to our ongoing debates.

Notes

References

- Adey, P. 2006. "If Mobility is Everything it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of (Im)mobilities." *Mobilities* 1: 75-94.
- Adey, P. 2010. *Aerial Life*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Adey, P., D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman & M. Sheller. 2014. "Introduction." In *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, edited by P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, and M. Sheller, 1-20. London: Routledge.
- Aguiar, M. 2011. *Tracking Modernity: India's Railway and the Culture of Mobility*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Anim-Addo, A. 2014. "'The Great Event of the Fortnight': Steamship Rhythms and Colonial Communication." *Mobilities* 9: 369-383.
- Archer, N. 2012. *The French Road Movie: Space, Mobility, Identity*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Ashmore, P. 2013. "Slowing Down Mobilities: Passengering on an Inter-War Ocean Liner." *Mobilities* 8: 595-611.
- Bastion, H.C. 1887. "The 'Muscular sense'; Its Nature and Cortical Localisation". *Brain* 10(1): 1-89.
- Bauman, Z. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Baudrillard, J. 2010 [1984]. *America*. London: Verso.
- Benitez-Rojo, A. 1997. *The Repeating Island: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Perspective*. Trans. J.E. Maraniss. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Berensmeyer, I. and C. Ehland, ed. 2013. *Perspectives on Mobility*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bergson, H. 1992 [1946]. *The Creative Mind*. New York: Citadel Press.
- Bergson, H. 2000 [1908]. "Memory of the Present and False Recognition." In *Time and the Instant: Essays in the Physics and Philosophy of Time*, edited by R. Durie. Manchester: Clinamen Press, 36-63.

- Bhabha, H. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge Classics.
- Brah, A. 1996. *Cartographies of Diaspora*. London: Routledge.
- Biemann, U. 2002. "Touring, Routing and Trafficking Female Geobodies." In *Mobilizing Place, Placing Mobility*, edited by G. Verstraete and T. Cresswell, 71-86. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bissell, D. 2010. "Vibrating Materialities: Mobility-Body-Technology Relations." *Area* 42(4), 479-486.
- Borden, I. 2013. *Drive: Journeys through Film, Cities and Landscapes*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Braidotti, R. 1994. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodied and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Braithwaite, E.R. 2013 [1971]. *To Sir, With Love*. London: Vintage Classics.
- Büscher, M., J. Urry & K. Witchger. 2011. "Introduction: Mobile Methods." In *Mobile Methods*, edited by M. Büscher, J. Urry & K. Witchger, 1-19. London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge.
- Canclini, N.G. 2005 (1989). *Cultural Hybridity: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cantet, L. (dir.) 2001. *L'Emploi du Temps/Time Out*. Haut et Court.
- Carroll, Lewis. 1982 (1897). *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass*, edited by R. L. Green. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castells, M. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chambers, I. 1990. *Border Dialogues: Journeys in Postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
- Cixous, H. 1991. *Writing the Feminine*. Trans. R. Conley. Lincoln NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Clarsen, G. 2008. *Eat My Dust: Early Women Motorists*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Clarsen, G. 2015. "Introduction to Special Section on Settler-Colonial Mobilities." *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* 5(3): 41-48.
- Clifford, J. 1992. "Traveling Cultures." In *Cultural Studies*, edited by L. Grossberg, C. Nelson and P. Treichler, 96-116. London: Routledge.
- Clifford, J. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Coleborne, C. 2015. "Mobility Stopped in its Tracks: Institutional Narratives and the Mobile in the Australian and New Zealand Colonial World, 1870s–1900s." *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* 5(3): 87-103.
- Cooper, C. 2003. *Noises in the Blood: Orality, Gender and the Vulgar Body of Jamaican Popular Culture*. London: Macmillan Caribbean.
- Cresswell, T. 1993. "Mobility as Resistance: a Geographical Reading of Kerouac's 'On the Road'." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 18: 249–262.
- Cresswell, T. 1996. *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression*. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cresswell, T. 1997. "Imagining the Nomad: Mobility and the Postmodern Primitive." In *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity*, edited by G. Benko and U. Strohmayer, 360-379. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cresswell, T. 1999. "Embodiment, Power and the Politics of Mobility: the Case of Females Tramps and Hobos." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 24: 175-192.
- Cresswell, T. 2001a. "Mobilities – an Introduction." *New Formations* 43: 9-10.
- Cresswell, T. 2001b. "The Production of Mobilities." *New Formations* 43: 11-25.

- Cresswell, T. 2006. *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World* (London: Routledge).
- Cresswell, T. 2010. "Towards a Politics of Mobility." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28(1): 17-31.
- Cresswell, T. 2011. "Mobilities I: Catching Up." *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(4), pp.550-558.
- Cresswell, T. 2013. "A Theory of Migration." *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* 3(1): 6-6.
- Cresswell, T. 2014. "Mobilities III: Moving On." *Progress in Human Geography* 38(5): 712-721.
- Cresswell, T. & D. Dixon, eds. 2002. *Engaging Film: Geographies of Mobility and Identity*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cresswell, T. & P. Merriman, eds. 2011. *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.
- Currie, M. 2007. *About Time: Narrative, Fiction and the Philosophy of Time*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dahl, R. 2007 [1961]. *James and the Giant Peach*. London: Puffin Book.
- Dant, T. 2004. "The Driver-Car". *Theory, Culture and Society*, 21 (4-5): 61-79.
- Davies, A.D. 2014. "Learning 'Large Ideas' Overseas: Discipline, (Im)mobility and Political Lives in the Royal Indian Navy Mutiny." *Mobilities* 9: 384-400.
- de Sapio, J. 2013. "Transient Communities: Travel, Knowledge, and the Victorian Railway Carriage, 1840–90." *Mobilities* 8(2): 201-219.
- Deleuze, G. and F. Guattari. 1988. *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Athlone.
- Descombes, V. 1993. *The Barometer of Modern Reason: On the Philosophies of Current Events*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dewsbury, J.D. 2010. "Performative, Non-representational and Affect-Based research." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Human Geography*, edited by D. DeLyser, S. Aitken, M. Crang, S. Herbert, L. McDowell, 321-334. London: Sage.
- Divall, C., ed. 2015. *Cultural Histories of Sociabilities, Spaces and Mobilities*. London: Pickering & Chatto.
- Divall, C., J. Hine & C. Pooley, eds. 2016. *Transport Policy: Learning Lessons from History*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Divall C. and G. Revill. 2005. "Cultures of Transport: Representation, Practice and Technology." *Journal of Transport History* 26(1): 99–111.
- Domschke G. and L. Bambozzi. 2013. "Labmove I: Media Arts on Wheels." *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* 3(2): 116-121.
- Duffy, E. 2009. *The Speed Handbook: Velocity, Pleasure, Modernism*. London: Duke University Press.
- Eliot, G. 2003 [1861]. *Silas Marner*. London: Penguin.
- Fincham, B., M. McGuinness & L. Murray, eds. 2010. *Mobile Methodologies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gilroy, P. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: Verso.
- Haldrup, M. 2011. "Choreographies of Leisure Mobilities." In *Mobile Methods*, edited by M. Büscher, J. Urry & K. Witchger, 54-71. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. and P. du Gay, eds. 1996. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage
- Hasty, W. 2014. "Metamorphosis Afloat: Pirate Ships, Politics and Process, c.1680–1730." *Mobilities* 9: 350-368.
- Henriques J., M. Tiainen & P. Väliäho, eds. 2014. "Rhythm, Movement, Embodiment (special issue)." *Body and Society* 20(3-4): 3-221.
- Heraclitus. c.600BC [2003]. *Fragments*. London: Penguin.

- Highmore, B. 2005. *Cityscapes: Cultural Readings in the Material and Symbolic City*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hitchings, R. 2012. "People Can Talk about their Practices." *Area* 44(1): 61–67.
- Hunter, V., eds. 2015. *Moving Sites: Investigating Site-Specific Dance Performance*. London: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. 2007. *Lines*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Irigaray, L. 1985. *The Sex Which Is Not One*. Trans. C. Porter. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jardine, A. 1986. *Gynesis: Configurations of Woman and Modernity*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jensen, O.B. 2014. *Designing Mobilities*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.
- Jensen, O.B. and D.B. Langg. 2016. *Mobilities Design*. London: Routledge.
- Kaplan, C. 1996. *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. London: Duke University Press.
- Kern, S. 1983. *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kerouac, J. 1997. *Some of the Dharma*. New York: Penguin.
- Kristeva, J. 1980. *Desire in Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kwinter, S. 2001. *Architectures of Time: Toward a Theory of the Event in Modernist Culture*. London: The MIT Press.
- Laurier, E. 2011. "Driving: Pre-cognition and Driving." In *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*, edited by T. Cresswell and P. Merriman, 69-81. Farnham: Ashgate.

- Leary J., ed. 2014. *Past Mobilities: Archaeological Approaches to Movement and Mobility*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Lefebvre, H. 2004. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life*. London: Continuum.
- Livesey, R. 2016. *Writing the Stage Coach Nation: Locality on the Move in Nineteenth-Century British Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Löfgren, O. 2008. "Motion and Emotion: Learning to be a Railway Traveller." *Mobilities* 3(3): 331-351.
- Malkki, L. 1992. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees." *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 24-44.
- Manning, E. 2009. *Relationscapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. London: The MIT Press.
- Massey, D. 1991. "A global Sense of Place." *Marxism Today* June: 24-29.
- Massey, D. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Mathieson, C. 2012. "'A Moving and a Moving On': Mobility, Space, and the Nation in Charles Dickens's 'Bleak House'." *English* 61: 395-405.
- Mathieson, C. 2015. *Mobility in the Victorian Novel: Placing the Nation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McCormack, D. 2005. "Diagramming Practice and Performance." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23(1): 119-147.
- McCormack, D. 2008. "Geographies for Moving Bodies: Thinking, Dancing, Spaces." *Geography Compass* 2(6): 1822-1836.
- McCormack, D. 2013. *Refrains for Moving Bodies: Experience and Experiment in Affective Spaces*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Melville, P. 1991. *Shape-shifter*. London: Picador Books.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 2002 [1945]. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by C. Smith. London and New York: Routledge.

- Merriman, P. 2007. *Driving Spaces*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Merriman, P. 2012a. *Mobility, Space and Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Merriman, P. 2012b. "Human Geography Without Time-Space." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(1): 13-27.
- Merriman, P. 2014. "Rethinking Mobile Methods." *Mobilities*, 9(2): 167-187.
- Merriman, P. 2016. "Mobilities II: Cruising." *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(4): 555-564.
- Merriman, P. 2017. "Mobilities III: Arrivals." *Progress in Human Geography*, doi:10.1177/0309132516635948
- Merriman, P., R. Jones, T. Cresswell, C. Divall, G. Mom, M. Sheller, and J. Urry. 2013. "Mobility: Geographies, Histories, Sociologies." *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* 3(1): 147-165.
- Merriman, P. & C. Webster. 2009. "Travel Projects: Landscape, Art, Movement." *Cultural Geographies*, 16(4): 525-535.
- Millar, J. & M. Schwartz, eds. 1998. *Speed – Visions of an Accelerated Age*. London: The Photographers Gallery and Whitechapel Art Gallery.
- Mom G. 2015a. *Atlantic Automobility: Emergence and Persistence of the Car, 1895-1940*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Mom G. 2015b. "The Crisis of Transport History: a Critique and a Vista." *Mobility in History* 6: 7-19.
- Mom, G., G. Clarsen, P. Merriman, C. Seiler, M. Sheller, and H. Weber. 2013. "Editorial." *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* 3(1): 1-5.
- Mom, G., C. Divall, and P. Lyth. 2009. "Towards a Paradigm Shift? A Decade of Transport and Mobility History." In *Mobility in History: the State of the Art in the History of*

- Transport, Traffic and Mobility*, edited by G. Mom, G. Pirie and L. Tissot, 13-40.
Neuchâtel: Éditions Alphil.
- Morris, M. 1988. "At Henry Parkes Motel." *Cultural Studies* 2: 1–47.
- Murray L. & S. Upstone, eds. 2014. *Researching and Representing Mobilities: Transdisciplinary Encounters*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Myers, M. 2011. "Walking Again Lively: Towards an Ambulant and Conversive Methodology of Performance and Research." *Mobilities* 6(2): 183-201.
- Myles, E. 2012. *Snow Flake - New Poems, Different Streets - Newer Poems*. Seattle and New York: Wave Books.
- Nichols, G. 1984. *The Fat Black Woman's Poems*. London: Virago.
- Parkins, W. 2009. *Mobility and Modernity in Women's Novels, 1850s-1930s: Women Moving Dangerously*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pearce, L. 2012a. "The Urban Imaginary: Writing, Migration, Place." *Mobilities* 7(1): 1-11.
- Pearce, L. 2012b. "Automobility in Manchester fiction." *Mobilities* 7(1): 93-113.
- Pearce, L., C. Fowler and R. Crawshaw, *Postcolonial Manchester: Diaspora Space and the Devolution of Literary Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pearce, L. 2014. "A Motor-Flight through Twentieth-Century Consciousness: Capturing the Driving-Event, 1905-35. In *Researching and Representing Mobilities: Transdisciplinary Encounters*, edited by L. Murray and S. Upstone, 78-98.
Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pearce, L. 2016. *Drivetime: Literary Excursions in Automotive Consciousness*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pooley, C.G., J. Turnbull & M. Adams. 2005. *A Mobile Century? Changes in Everyday Mobility in Britain in the Twentieth Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Pratt, M.L. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturalism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Puri, S. 2003. *The Caribbean Postcolonial: Social Equality, Post-Nationalism and Cultural Hybridity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ravalet, E., S. Vincent-Geslin, V. Kaufmann, & J. Leveugle. 2014. *Slices of (Mobile) Life: A Sociological Study and Manifesto on Work-Related High Mobility*. Paris: Éditions Loco-L'Atelier d'édition and Mobile Lives Forum.
- Roberts, L. 2010. "Making Connections: Crossing Boundaries of Place and Identity in Liverpool and Merseyside Amateur Transport Films." *Mobilities* 5(1): 83-109.
- Rosa, H. 2013. *Social Acceleration: A New Theory of Modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rouse, R. 1991. 'Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism', *Diaspora*, 1 (1), 8-23.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage Books.
- Schivelbusch, W. 1980. *The Railway Journey*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schnapp, J.T. 1999. "Crash (Speed as an Engine of Inviduation)." *Modernism/Modernity* 6: 1-49.
- Schnapp, J.T., ed. 2009. *Speed Limits*. Milan: Skira.
- Schwartz, H. 1992. "Torque: The New Kinaesthetic of the Twentieth Century." In *Incorporations*, edited by J. Crary and S. Kwinter, 71-126. New York: Zone.
- Schwarzer, M. 2004. *Zoomscape: Architecture in Motion and Media*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Scott, H. 2006. *Caribbean Women Writers and Globalization: Fictions of Independence*. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

- Serres, M. 2000. *The Birth of Physics*. Manchester: Clinamen.
- Sharma, S. 2014. *In the Meantime: Temporality and Cultural Politics*. London: Duke University Press.
- Sheller, M. 2003. *Consuming the Caribbean: From Arawaks to Zombies*. London: Routledge.
- Sheller, M. 2014a. "The New Mobilities Paradigm for a Live Sociology." *Current Sociology* 62: 789-811.
- Sheller, M. 2014b. *Aluminum Dreams: The Making of Light Modernity*. London: The MIT Press.
- Sheller, M. 2015. "Vital Methodologies: Live methods, Mobile Art, and Research-Creation." In *Non-Representational Methodologies: Re-Envisioning Research*, edited by P. Vannini, 130-145. London: Routledge.
- Sheller, M. & J. Urry. 2006. "The New Mobilities Paradigm." *Environment & Planning A* 38: 207–226.
- Sheller, M. & J. Urry. 2016. "Mobilizing the New Mobilities Paradigm." *Applied Mobilities* 1: 10-25.
- Spinney, J. 2009. "Cycling the City: Movement, Meaning and Method." *Geography Compass* 3(2): 817-835.
- Spinney, J. 2011. "A Chance to Catch a Breath: Using Mobile Video Methodology in Cycling Research." *Mobilities* 6(2): 161-182.
- Spivak, G. 1987. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Szczeszak-Brewer, A. 2007. "Teleology without a Telos? Constitutive Absence in Leopold Bloom's Pilgrimage." *Mobilities* 2(3): 347-362.
- Thacker, A. 2003. *Moving Through Modernity: Space and Geography in Modernism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Thrift, N. 1994. "Inhuman geographies: Landscapes of Speed, Light and Power." In *Writing the Rural: Five Cultural Geographies*, by P. Cloke, M. Doel, D. Matless, M. Phillips, and N. Thrift, 191-248. London: PCP.
- Thrift, N. 1995. "A Hyperactive World." In *Geographies of Global Change*, edited by R. J. Johnston, P. J. Taylor and M. J. Watts, 18-35. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thrift, N. 1996. *Spatial Formations*. London: Sage.
- Thrift, N. 2000a. "Introduction: Dead or Alive?" In *Cultural Turns/Geographical Turns*, edited by I. Cook, D. Crouch, S. Naylor, and J.R. Ryan, 1-6. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Thrift, N. 2000b. "Afterwords." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18(2): 213-255.
- Thrift, N. 2008. *Non-Representational Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Tomlinson, T. 2007. *The Culture of Speed*. London: Sage.
- Tzanelli, R. 2006. "Reel Western Fantasies: Portrait of a Tourist Imagination in *The Beach* (2000)." *Mobilities* 1(1): 121-142.
- Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.
- Urry, J. 1999. "Automobility, Car Culture and Weightless Travel: A Discussion Paper." Published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YN, UK, at: <http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/resources/sociology-online-papers/papers/urry-automobility.pdf>
- Urry, J. 2000a. *Sociology Beyond Societies*. London: Routledge.
- Urry, J. 2000b. "Mobile Sociology." *British Journal of Sociology* 51: 185-203.
- Urry, J. 2007. *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Vannini, P., ed. 2015. *Non-Representational Methodologies: Re-Envisioning Research*. London: Routledge.

- Vergunst, J. 2011. "Technology and Technique in a Useful Ethnography of Movement." *Mobilities* 6(2): 203-219.
- Walcott, D. (1992) *Collected Poems, 1948-1984*. London: Faber.
- Weedon, C. 1987. *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wilkie, F. 2012. "Site-specific Performance and the Mobility turn." *Contemporary Theatre Review* 22: 203-212.
- Wilkie, F. 2015. *Performance, Transport and Mobility: Making Passage*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Witzgall, S., G. Vogl, and S. Kesselring, eds. 2013. *New Mobilities Regimes in Art and Social Sciences*. Farnham: Ashgate.

ⁱ While we have included 'human geography' in this list of social science disciplines advancing debates on mobility, it is important to note that human geography is a collection of very diverse overlapping sub-fields which span the social sciences and humanities, and often adopt very different methods and philosophical approaches. The same could, of course, be said about anthropology and sociology. What's more, a number of the leading mobility scholars in human geography have been cultural geographers who align themselves more with the arts and humanities, or at very least pursue research programmes which span both the social sciences and humanities (for example, the work of Peter Adey, David Bissell, Tim Cresswell, and Peter Merriman).

Acknowledgement

Many – though not all – of the papers included in this special issue originated in a CeMoRe colloquium on 'Mobilities and the Humanities' held at Lancaster University in September 2014. This event, organised by the editors of the special issue, was originally suggested by the late John Urry, and we would like to acknowledge his ever-generous encouragement and support. We would also like to thank the anonymous referees and journal editors for their constructive criticism on the special issue, including this Introduction.