

wander | lust

*Genre, Sexuality and Identity in
Ana Kokkinos's Head On*

JOE HARDWICK

Since the 1970s, one genre in particular has had an especially privileged place in Australian cinema. This is the road movie, hardly surprising given both the cinematic spectacle afforded by Australia's rural landscape and the kind of thematic considerations provided by the genre itself. The road movie—in both spatial and narrative terms—maps out for spectators a clear if often circuitous trajectory that often takes the form of a variation of the quest narrative. This allows questions to be posed about the notion of identity, both at an individual and a cultural level, by affording characters the opportunity to find themselves in the process of losing themselves. The genre almost always features wanderer figures as protagonists who also tend to be marginal identities. Australian cinema has provided several memorable examples of these, from the archetypal loner of *Mad Max* (1979), to the Bonnie and Clyde-style outlaws of *Kiss or Kill* (1997), the travelling transgender trio of *The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* (1994) and the young Indigenous protagonists of the walking road movies *Rabbit-Proof Fence* (2002) and *Beneath Clouds* (2002).

Somewhat less prevalent, though nonetheless increasingly present in Australian cinema, has been the phenomenon of what French critic Francis Vanoye has named the street movie.¹ The *film de rue* (street movie), as opposed to the *film de route* (road movie), follows the path of characters who wander the streets of major urban centres. Although in some respects the urban counterpart of the road movie, the street movie sometimes functions according to a slightly different dynamic. As Eyerman and Löfgren have written, the road movie is often associated with either flight or escape, be it from the law, from injustice or from the banality or claustrophobia of urban existence.² Alternatively, the narrative thrust of the road movie may be geared towards a specific goal, though often this serves as a mere pretext for following

the circuitous route taken by the protagonists and the obstacles they encounter on the way. With the street movie, however, the emphasis is far less on the idea of reaching a destination and much more firmly placed on digressiveness or deviation from a linear trajectory—although it must be stressed that the difference from the road movie is one of degree rather than kind.³ This is a type of film perhaps more often associated with European, and in particular French, cinema rather than the road movie which is seen as a more typically American genre, at least in its origins. Indeed, recent French cinema abounds in examples of the *film de rue*, with notable examples including *Les Amants du Pont Neuf* (1989), *La Haine* (1995), *Ma CT va craquer* (1997) and *Vendredi Soir* (2002), with perhaps the classic French example being provided by Agnès Varda's *Cléo de 5 à 7* (1962).

The recurrence of wanderer figures in the street movie, together with storylines that favour deviation rather than a simple teleological structure, raise the question whether such films might be read as the cinematic counterparts of those literary texts which Ross Chambers describes as 'loiterature'.⁴ Loiterly texts place at the centre of their digressive storylines characters who wander, stroll, tour, cruise or loiter with or, more likely, without specific intent. While Chambers's book focuses for the most part on an eclectic set of literary texts, his ideas are adaptable to the cinema as well, as is shown by his detailed discussion of Agnès Varda's 1985 feature *Sans toit ni loi* (*The Vagabond*).⁵ Like the protagonist in Varda's film, Chambers's loiterly protagonists tend to be marginal identities whose wandering allows them to constantly shift contexts. This brings them into contact with characters whom they would not otherwise meet—this of course being a standard trope shared by both street and road movies. Such encounters have the power, as Chambers puts it, to 'change the subject', an idea relevant not only in terms of character but also with regard to genre, explaining in part the generic mixity which is a characteristic of loiterly texts.

In this article, I want to use Chambers's writing to look at questions of marginality, identity and genre in perhaps the most remarkable Australian example of the street movie in recent years: Ana Kokkinos's 1998 feature *Head On*. This is a film that Felicity Collins and Therese Davis have described as 'the troubled teen of 1990s Australian cinema', not only in terms of the story it brings to the screen, but also in the way it seems to have been largely overlooked by academic critics.⁶ The film recounts, over a twenty-four-hour period, the story of Ari, a late-adolescent Greek-Australian male who wanders the streets of Melbourne participating in sexual encounters with mainly, though not exclusively, other men. As a young wanderer figure in the Australian cinema of the 1990s and beyond, Ari is certainly not alone, with other examples including the neo-Nazi gang of *Romper Stomper* (1992), the various young, alternative inner-city characters of *Sample People* (2000) or the marginalised, male buddies of *Idiot Box* (1996), suggesting that what we have seen on Australian screens since the beginning of the 1990s is something like a loiterly generation. In extending Chambers's

concept of the loiterly to take in certain generational questions, I want to use a loiterly approach as a means of questioning standard generational discourses evident in certain reviews of and articles about the film. These have read *Head On* as being very much about the notion of identity, or rather about a denial of identity on behalf of the protagonist, both in ethnic and sexual terms. More specifically, *Head On* has been read as both coming-of-age and coming out story, narratives whose teleology and simplistic before/after structure, I would argue, fail to render the complexity of questions of sexuality and identity posed by Kokkinos's film.

I want to concentrate on two specific loiterly characteristics of *Head On* in the following discussion of the film, the first being what Chambers refers to as the 'time out' function of loiterly texts and the second the way in which the film 'flirts' with two different 'sexual' genres, part of its generic hybridity. Chambers writes that the: "time-out" quality of loiterly writing, its failure to detach itself completely from a linearity from which it departs only to return in due course, is as characteristic a feature as its digressivity and errancy'.⁷ For this reason, Chambers sees loiterature as an essentially 'modern' genre since 'it is of the age of discipline and scheduling'.⁸ In other words, the loiterly always relies on a deviation from a more formal structure, without which it could not count as digressive.

In many ways, Ari fits the profile of a classic loiterly protagonist, spending his time walking the streets, drinking, taking drugs and, in particular, cruising for sex whenever the opportunity presents itself. Yet there is an important sense in which Ari would also be disqualified from the loiterly, since he neither works nor actively seeks employment. Chambers writes that loiterature 'excludes the unemployed and any others who have idleness thrust upon them unwillingly'⁹ since the formal structure of the work schedule from which the loiterly represents a departure does not exist.

Nonetheless, there is a different kind of disciplinary narrative from which the life of Ari can be read as a deviation. If a person's lifetime is generally divided into a neat succession of stages which take one from childhood, to adolescence, to adulthood and eventually to old age, late adolescence itself appears as a kind of 'time-out' period from this overall disciplinary life-script, one which importantly precedes the period where couple and/or family as well as work or career responsibilities are meant to take over, responsibilities at the heart of societal definitions of identity. If we extend the concept of the loiterly to take into account the question of age, we might consider Ari to be similar to Chambers's loiterly characters:

the loiterly subject, who is always on the cusp of a context and its other, becomes a socially marginal figure to the extent that social centrality is defined in terms of stability, permanence and closure—the virtues of single-mindedness and discipline that eschew digressivity.¹⁰

Ari, in his early twenties and therefore on the borderline of late adolescence and adulthood, is reminded repeatedly that he is out of sync with traditional life narratives. This is evident from the very first frames of *Head On* where we see him literally walk away from the kind of path that his parents in particular would like him to follow. The opening voice over—which follows black and white shots of Greek migrants arriving on the docks in Melbourne—underlines the familial discourse to which Ari is expected to conform:

They tell you that God is dead, but they still want you to have a purpose. They say look at your parents, hard working migrants, work two jobs, struggle all your life, buy your kids a house, yeah, that's purpose. They tell you to be a doctor, a teacher, be creative, do something, believe in something, believe in family, in the future, save the world, believe in love. But fuck it, I'm no scholar, I'm no worker, I'm no poet.

The voice over is heard as we see shots of Ari at the wedding of a family friend, as he, his parents and his little sister form a circle as part of a Greek dance. While on the one hand happy to form part of the family unit, Ari's refusal to follow the straight and narrow is nonetheless clear as he breaks out of this literal family circle to leave the wedding and wander down the street to a nearby public toilet which also functions as a gay beat.

A key characteristic of loiterly figures is their ability to shift contexts and to cross frontiers, and the contrast here between the Greek wedding and gay sex in public toilets could not be more stark. In reviews of the film, Ari is seen very much as mediating between different contexts, in particular in terms of sexual and cultural identity. The *San Francisco Chronicle* review of *Head On*, for example, describes Ari as 'split: between cultural tradition and independence, between the acceptance of the straight world and the risks of being gay'.¹¹ Aaron Krach in the *IndieWire* website review similarly sees Ari as 'struggling to balance his queerness and his Greekness with white Australian society'.¹²

In a number of respects, Ari's inbetween-ness comes across as a most uncomfortable position, perhaps because he is seen less as between two worlds than straddling both. In reviews of the film there is an interesting tension between respecting its digressiveness and the need to impose a linearity on the story, and this is underscored by the different genres attributed to the film, a degree of generic mixity which is consistent with loiterly texts. The *New York Times* review sees *Head On* as a film alternating between a kitchen-sink realism, which allies itself with a digressive, chronicle-like structure, and melodrama, which follows a more teleological trajectory.¹³ *Head On*, in fact, appears to engage in a kind of generic flirtation, playing on the tension between following the straight and narrow of a traditional narrative or wandering off to pursue more loiterly interests. And this is significant in terms of how Ari's identity is conceived. An inbetween-ness which sees Ari definitively passing from one position to another would be consistent with standard, linear rite-of-passage

narratives; however, an inbetween-ness which would see Ari move back and forth, refusing to be pinned down, is consistent with a more loiterly relation to the notion of identity.

It is in terms of Ari's sexuality in particular that we see him under pressure to conform to pre-established identity categories. As gradually becomes more and more clear in the course of the film, Ari's sexuality will not so much come to represent liberation from family expectations but a lifestyle which threatens to impose its own set of constraints. Many reviews of the film read Ari's inbetween-ness as simply a rite of passage, seeing his story as tracing a path towards adopting a specific sexual identity, this taking the form of a quest narrative; the title of the *San Francisco Chronicle* review, for example, reads 'A 24-Hour Quest for Sexual Identity' and describes the film as 'an intimate story of male sexual confusion',¹⁴ while respected French film journal *Positif* similarly describes the day in the life of Ari as the 'problematic stage of his search for a "true" identity'.¹⁵ In such reviews, a loiterly reading is displaced by the quest for identity, a narrative which privileges the destination over the digression and according to which Ari can be read as following the path of that particular coming of age narrative known as coming out.

I want to look first at how the film flirts with the potential coming out story before moving on to more loiterly possibilities. In *Head On*, there are really two traditional narratives to which Ari is being asked to subscribe, the one familial and the other both emotional and political. These alternative traditional narratives are evident in an early *mise en abyme* in the film, a reference to a classic French loiterly film, Agnès Varda's *Cléo de 5 à 7* (1962). Varda's film begins with a tarot card reading in which the protagonist, Cléo, is told that she will meet a mysterious man. This she eventually does at the end of the film after wandering the streets of Paris, during which time her identity is completely transformed. In *Head On*, Ari receives a tea-leaf reading in which his Aunt Talia predicts he will form a liaison with someone whose name begins with S, a someone who is clearly a man, prompting Talia to urge Ari to settle down and get married: after that, she says, it doesn't matter what he does.

The first traditional narrative to which Ari might subscribe is therefore that of marriage, one we see him repeatedly reject in the course of the film. This is most obvious in Ari's arguments with his friend Joe, who has succumbed to the familial expectation of engagement to his girlfriend following the offer from Joe's parents to buy him and his fiancée a house. However, importantly, as is made clear by Aunt Talia's advice, marriage and love are not necessarily the same thing, with the love story in fact presented not as an integral part of but as supplementary to marriage. It is the potential love story, rather than marriage, that will provide the traditional framework from which Ari's wandering can be read as a digression. The 'S' of Talia's reading is the Anglo-Celtic university student, Sean, whom Ari meets at his brother's house early in the film. Ari that night will go to the Greek club specifically to meet Sean, after which they will separate before crossing paths again following a long drug- and

alcohol-fuelled night that will terminate in a very troubled sexual encounter. This is the penultimate scene in the film in which Ari begins a fight after Sean tells Ari that he loves him.

The real importance of the love story, however, lies in its coupling with the potential coming out story, and this is put in place not only through Ari's emotional involvement with Sean but through Ari's relationship with his best friend, Johnny, who regularly transforms himself into the transvestite Toula. Johnny/Toula, in fact, represents the other extreme to Joe: instead of absolute capitulation to the expectations of those around him, Johnny represents absolute rebellion, most evident in a scene where he arrives unexpectedly at the Greek club as Toula to perform a dance, to first the astonishment then the appreciation of those assembled. Toula's resistance, however, comes at a price, for she is the target of insults and abuse from her father who ironically idolises Ari. Moreover, it is Toula who stands up for herself when she is arrested with Ari and then beaten at the hands of a heavily compromised Greek-Australian police officer under the goading of his Anglo-Celtic colleague. Ari looks on but does not directly intervene to help Toula.

Now, several reviews of the film read the juxtaposition of Johnny/Toula and Ari as somehow representing a kind of good cop/bad cop of gay identity politics. Such readings deny even the possibility of a quest narrative by seeing Ari's identity as already fixed, both in terms of his sexuality and his ethnicity. Ari is read in reviews as being 'gay and closeted',¹⁶ as in 'denial of his natural sexual inclinations',¹⁷ or worse, as a figure of self-disgust, as 'a lazy, violent, self-hating bigot',¹⁸ as a 'self-hating "wog"',¹⁹ as suffering from 'internalised homophobia'.²⁰ But if we're to believe that Ari's identity is already fixed, then the only possible narrative interest must lie in a final coming out. This is how Ivan Cañadas in *Overland* has interpreted the film, claiming that Ari's 'only growth is in terms of his sexuality, as he ultimately accepts the wisdom and dignity of "coming out", in what becomes a gay cinematic bildungsroman'.²¹ Cañadas continues:

Perhaps the most significant transformation in the film is the closing scene, in which Ari, having been tongue lashed by Johnny, in the transvestite guise of 'Toula', for being willing to remain 'in the closet', to live 'on his knees', then chooses to go down on his knees, literally, for another man, a visual clue that he has come to terms with his own identity and is no longer concerned to wrestle others into a submissive position.²²

Now, the reasoning behind Cañadas's assertion seems to map (outdated) heterosexist models of sexual power relations onto a homosexual context, based on the spurious assumption that the giver of oral sex is somehow submissive while the receiver of oral sex is dominant. Moreover, although it is true to claim that the final scenes do represent the possibility of a potential narrative resolution, this is realised not through the sexual encounter between Ari and Sean

but through the kiss between them, for although we have seen Ari engaged in various sexual situations in the film, the penultimate scene at Sean's house is the first time that Ari actually kisses someone. Whereas sexual activity in itself does not necessarily carry with it a subscription to a particular sexual identity, it is the kiss that allies the potential love story with the potential coming out story. It is, in fact, such a narrative that Cañadas reads into the final frames of the film where we see Ari along Melbourne's docks, stating that the scene 'incorporates a voice-over speech in which Ari implies that he has "come out" to his parents'.²³ Given its importance in the overall narrative, the final voice over is worth quoting in its entirety:

I'm a whore, a dog, a cunt. My father's insults make me strong. I accept them all. I'm sliding toward the sewer: I'm not struggling, I can smell the shit but I'm still breathing. I'm gonna live my life, I'm not gonna make a difference, I'm not gonna change a thing. No one's going to remember me when I'm dead. I'm a sailor and a whore and I will be until the end of the world.

Cañadas's reading seems to mistake as sincere Ari's voice over in the final scene which, I would argue, is not to be taken at face value, for several different reasons. 'I'm a dog, a whore and a cunt' seems quite a long way removed from 'Guess what, mum, I'm gay' as a coming out statement. Chris Berry has written of the final scene that:

on the visual level, it invokes all the liberatory imagery of rite of passage films, with Ari standing alone on a dock, turning circles as the camera cranes above him. However, instead of a 'positive image' affirming his freedom and faith in the future now that he has 'found himself' and 'begun to come out', Ari's voice-over statement is a far more ambiguous assertion of self-determination.²⁴

Felicity Collins and Therese Davis concur, writing that as a 'coming-of-age moment, this is a wonderfully perverse image',²⁵ while Mark Sinker in *Sight and Sound* goes even further by picking up on a reference to Jean Genet, insisting that '*Head On* could not be less of a rites-of-passage/getting-of-wisdom movie—the poetry and pain of outsider love are not redeemed, no haven of loving acceptance is found, no possibility of reconciliation is glimpsed'.²⁶

The reference to Genet is perhaps the key here in understanding Ari's tactic for declining—or rather reworking—the discourses that others would impose on him. He does this specifically through language. In Genet's writing, as Elizabeth Stephens has argued, the possibility of a separate, marginal language is denied: all Genet's queens can do is to reappropriate and subvert the language of the dominant culture: 'It is therefore through the misuse of the dominant language rather than the formulation of oppositional languages, that

homosexuality can be written'.²⁷ Ari's taking on of his father's insults isn't an oppositional language, but it is an oppositional tactic, in de Certeau's terms, unable to operate outside the familial discourse it nonetheless reappropriates it to other ends. This, too, is one of the primary characteristics of the loiterly. Ari's tactic, then, is not to create a new form of identity outside the discourses that would position him but is rather a repetition of them, though one that is specifically ironic. The structure of irony is that of a citation, a repetition whose context has changed in order to produce a meaning different from the original. Ari owns his father's insults in a way never intended by his father. At the same time, this affirmation shares a similar structure to gay libertarian statements, but it means something completely different. Ari's final voice over is a refusal, then, of both the kind of political commitment of his father's generation, as well as the sexual politics of his friend Toula.

Ari's reappropriation extends not just to language, but to space, as he makes this statement on the docks which serve the double function of a gay beat. Far from the 'self-hating homo' and 'the self-hating wog' that some reviewers read into his character, Ari's taking on the identity of sailor and whore connect him both to sex and to ethnicity, but not to predefined identity categories. As Collins and Davis underline, Ari's ethnicity and sexuality are not actually in question in the film:

Ari knows he is a Greek Australian who likes to have sex with men. His dilemma takes the form of a double bind: he simultaneously belongs to and is rejected by his patriarchal Greek community. As a result, Ari lives a double-life.²⁸

The sailor—that classic Genet character—links Ari to those early shots of Greek migrants arriving on boats—images repeated and intercut into the final frames of the movie—as his movements on the docks echo the Greek dancing of the opening frames. The docks place Ari at the border, between land and sea, at any time a potential launching off point. At the same time, the figure of the whore links him to a different kind of cruising, specifically a sexual one.

And this is where the other, more loiterly, generic flirtation of the film comes into play. The cruising story, in fact, is the digressive narrative that Chambers sets in opposition to the teleology of coming out, and this is the other genre which the film imitates in some ways.²⁹ This is underlined by paratextual material. Various posters of *Head On* emphasise Ari's body and sexuality, shown either naked from the torso up or about to embrace Sean, an image which, of course, shares certain structural affinities with the cruising story, if not with pornography, where the narrative is merely the frame on which to hang a series of sexual encounters. For in the end, as much as being about the heart or the head, Kokkinos's film is about the body, about sexuality in constant, fluid movement as well as about a physical or social collision. Francis Vanoye, with reference to the street films of *le jeune cinéma français*, talks about the idea of 'emotional wandering',³⁰ where connection with someone else may eventually be found, but not actively sought:

the search for a connection isn't explicitly the basis for the movements of the character ... rather, it is at the end of the itinerary. The movement of the body in space appears at first purely automatic or unconscious ... or motivated by something inconsequential.³¹

This would be particularly apt in Ari's case, although he explicitly rejects the possibility of a love story with Sean that presents itself in the penultimate scene of the film.

It is also worth noting that the major vehicle for the completion of the coupled narratives of the love story and the coming out story comes from a character who is clearly not marginal in the way that Ari is, but rather a character linked to standardised political and intellectual discourses, the Anglo-Celtic Sean, a politically engaged university student. In Christos Tsiolkas's book, *Loaded*, on which *Head On* was based, Sean's literary counterpart George explicitly tries to get Ari to come out to his parents and to leave home. In this sense, Sean is no different from Ari's parents in encouraging him to adopt a predetermined lifestyle and identity. Ari, however, chooses to tune out to the message, saying in his case that it is better to lie, this again echoing Genet's valorisation of lies over truth.³²

As a closing thought, if the coming out narrative applies at all, it certainly isn't coextensive to all contexts. Coming out, as Michael P. Brown has argued in a book entitled *Closet Space*, often involves a kind of migration: a permanent move from one place to another, not a loiterly tactic at all.³³ Ari refuses this, preferring to stay in constant movement, to continue shifting contexts. This allows him to remain closely connected to family and community however problematic that continual frontier crossing might be, while being able to continue to explore his sexuality. Indeed, in the specific context of *Head On*, we might think of the discourse of coming out in fact as not being about the revelation of some kind of inner truth but as a form of false consciousness. As Chambers writes in *Loiterature*:

False consciousness, like hypocrisy (in one sense of the term), is a state of unconscious error: it derives from our ability to make a particular context that happens to be culturally dominant for the only context; and it is open to correction, therefore, by the basically very simple act of changing context, by means of a pointed digression.³⁴

In this sense, we might consider *Head On* to be not simply a 'troubled teen' in terms of Australian cinema in the 1990s, but also in terms of the proliferation of standardised coming out narratives—both literary and cinematic—that emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, including Australian films such as *The Sum of Us* (1994) and *The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert* (1994) which Chris Berry has argued are more traditionally identitarian—and Anglo-Celtic—in orientation.³⁵ *Head On*, like its protagonist Ari, refuses to follow the straight and narrow in this respect. It is in relation to these films in particular that we might consider *Head On* to be, in Chambers's terms, precisely such a pointed digression.

JOE HARDWICK is a lecturer in French in the School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies at the University of Queensland. His research interests cover French cinema, literature and cultural studies as well as the French reception of Australian cinema. He was curator for the French New New Wave retrospective at the Australian Cinémathèque, Brisbane, in 2007 and is currently preparing a monograph on wandering protagonists in *le jeune cinéma français*. <joehardwick@uq.edu.au>

-
1. Francis Vanoye, 'Le Cinéma français contemporain: sous le signe du lien', in Michel Marie (ed.), *Le Jeune Cinéma français*, Nathan, Paris, p. 59.
 2. Ron Eyerman and Orvar Löfgren, 'Romancing the Road: Road Movies and Images of Mobility', *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol. 12, 1995, pp. 60–3.
 3. Indeed, both North American and European road movies regularly depart from a simple linearity and subvert the quest narrative that initially propels the storyline.
 4. Ross Chambers, *Loiterature*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London, 1999.
 5. Chambers, pp. 42–6.
 6. Felicity Collins and Therese Davis, 'Escaping History and Shame in *Looking for Alibrandi*, *Head On* and *Beneath Clouds*', in *Australian Cinema after Mabo*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, p. 159.
 7. Chambers, p. 32.
 8. Chambers, p. 32.
 9. Chambers, p. 54.
 10. Chambers, pp. 56–7, Chambers' emphasis.
 11. Edward Guthmann, 'A 24-Hour Quest for Sexual Identity: Lead Actor Steals Show in *Head On*', *San Francisco Chronicle*, 11 November 1999, p. B3.
 12. Aaron Krach, 'Interviews: *Head On* with Anna [sic] Kokkinos: On Greeks, Queers and Aussies', in *Indiewire*, 1999, <http://www.cinemasmag.com/people/int_Kokkinos_Anna_990812.html>.
 13. Stephen Holden, 'Head On: A Proud Immigrant Family and a Closeted Gay Son', *New York Times*, 7 April 1999, p. B5.
 14. Guthmann, p. B3.
 15. 'étape problématique de sa recherche d'une identité "vraie".' E. O'N., 'Head On', *Positif*, vols 449–50, 1999, p. 94. My translation in the text.
 16. Holden, p. B5.
 17. E. O'N., p. 94.
 18. Holden, p. B5.
 19. Ivan Cañadas, 'A Sin That Dare Not Speak Its Name: Class and Sexuality in Christos Tsiolkas's *Loaded* and Anne Kokkinos's *Head On*', *Overland*, vol. 177, 2004, p. 46.
 20. Cañadas, p. 43.
 21. Cañadas, p. 44.
 22. Cañadas, pp. 44–5.
 23. Cañadas, pp. 44–5.
 24. Chris Berry, 'The Importance of Being Ari: Chris Berry Takes a Sideways Glance at *Head On*', *Metro*, vol. 118, 1999, p. 37.
 25. Collins and Davis, p. 162.
 26. Mark Sinker, 'Head On', *Sight and Sound*, vol. 9, no. 11, 1999, p. 46.
 27. Elizabeth Stephens, 'Je suis un mensonge qui dit toujours la vérité': Genet's Queer Subjectivities', in Juliana de Nooy, Barbara Hanna and Joe Hardwick (eds), *Soi-Disant: Life-Writing in French*, University of Delaware Press, Newark, 2005, pp. 49–50.
 28. Collins and Davis, p. 60.
 29. Chambers, pp. 251–2.
 30. 'errance affective'. Vanoye, 1998, p. 59. My translation in the text.
 31. 'La quête du lien n'est pas explicitement à l'origine des déplacements du personnage (ou du couple de personnages), elle constitue plutôt l'aboutissement de son itinéraire. L'élan du corps dans l'espace paraît d'abord purement moteur ou machinal ... ou bien motivé par un objet inessentiel'. Vanoye, 1998, p. 59. My translation in the text.
 32. Christos Tsiolkas, *Loaded*, Vintage, Sydney, 1995, pp. 128–9.
 33. Michael P. Brown, *Closet Space: Geographies of Metaphor from the Body to the Globe*, Routledge, London and New York, 1993, p. 50.
 34. Chambers, pp. 159–60.
 35. Berry, p. 37.