Traces of the Flâneuse

From Roman Holiday to Lost In Translation

This article critically considers the trope of the nineteenth-century flâneur/flâneuse as found in two films: *Roman Holiday* (William Wyler, 1953) and *Lost in Translation* (Sofia Coppola, 2003). Both films construct a traditional narrative from the adventures of a single female protagonist as she negotiates urban space. In tracing the references to the flâneur/the flanuese as found in these two films, one can begin to map a certain trajectory of contemporary gender relations in respect to urban space from the post–World War II era to the present, as well as to understand the context in which the “city” itself is seen as a site for such transformations.

**Introduction**

The city is “masculine” in its triumphal scale, its towers and vistas and arid industrial regions; it is “feminine” in its enclosing embrace, in its indeterminacy and labyrinthine uncenterness. Cinematic representations of contemporary urban life in Western cultures are more often than not paradoxical. As suggested by Wilson above, most urban-based narratives develop around some type of dialectic—between the city as the culmination of human civilization or its demise, between the city as the place where one is found or the place where one gets lost. As such, in each narrative the city stands— in for larger social metaphors that define the individual characters. Whether a film critiques the city (as in many films noirs) or revels in it uncritically (as in many romantic comedies), the narratives convey the idea that urban experience is not universal but is, in fact, highly contingent upon gender, age, race, and/or class.

Although we are at the threshold of the twenty-first century— an era when an increasingly rapid pace of urban life is expected to impact ever more people worldwide—our cinematic representations suggest that we still look back to a time when such a trajectory was first starting—that is, to the nineteenth century, when the dialectics between the “moral” country and the “immoral” city, between the feminine place of home and the masculine place of work, between the notion of the domestic as stifling and the urban as liberating, all began to be knitted into our collective imagination. This ideological connection to the past is particularly true for gender roles.

Many of the mixed signals given to women (and men) in media today rehearse a dilemma that emerged at the outset of the industrial age when our domestic spheres became radically separated from our workplaces. Jane Rendell summarized the basic conundrum that underlies at least some of the hypercritical ways we deal with gender in popular urban representations today:

In the early nineteenth century increasing urbanization and the expansion of capitalism resulted in the rising cultural importance of certain social spaces of leisure, consumption, display and exchange. These were the sites of conflicting concerns, those of public patriarchs seeking to control female occupation of the city, worried that their female property—mothers, wives and daughters—would be visually and sexually available to other men, and those consumer capitalists aiming to extend the roles of women as cheap workers and consumers in the city.

From the nineteenth century on, with the development of major industrial/global cities such as Paris, New York, and London, these new tensions and their subsequent gender classifications began to have spatial impact in addition to their more obvious social ramifications.

As Richard Sennett suggests in *The Fall of Public Man: On the Social Psychology of Capitalism*, it is at this point that our collective mapping of urban space began to be defined by and through gender in several significant ways. Sennett states, for example, that for women of this time

Public and the idea of disgrace were closely allied . . . In the restaurants of the 19th century, a lone, respectable woman dining with a group of men, even if her husband were present, would cause an overt sensation, whereas . . . the extramarital liaisons of Victorian men were
sometimes conducted more publicly than one
would in retrospect imagine, because they
occurred in social space, which continued to be
far away from the family; they were “outside” in
a kind of moral limbo.3

These spatial classifications extended easily into
our colloquial language such as when we define
a female of questionable character in urban space
as a “street walker.”4

Flâneur: Flâneuse
While the extremities of these issues have been
softened by time (yes, most women now feel
comfortable in restaurants), these spatial classi-
fications still remain potent reference points and
are often used by film directors to explore con-
temporary and still unresolved gender tensions.
Two films produced 50 years apart both explore
contemporary gender relations in an urban set-
ting and reveal the subtle transformations in the
traditional gender mappings of urban space. The
first film is Roman Holiday (1953) directed by
William Wyler (Figure 1). The second is Lost in
Translation (2003) directed by Sofia Coppola
(Figure 2).

In Roman Holiday, Audrey Hepburn portrays
a modern day princess on an official visit to Rome.
Upon her arrival, she has a bit of a nervous break-
down; after being medicated, she escapes from the
palace in the middle of the night. She meets
a character played by Gregory Peck who conceals
his true identity as a newspaperman wanting to get
a scoop on her disappearance so that he can pay off
a debt. The two explore the city of Rome together,
visiting the sights while skillfully eluding the legion
of people looking for the Princess (Figure 3). They
eventually fall in love, yet in the end realize that
they must part ways.

In Lost in Translation, Scarlett Johansson’s
character accompanies her photographer husband
on assignment in Tokyo. While lounging around
their hotel, she meets Bill Murray’s character, the
star of an advertising campaign for Suntory
Whiskey. Left to her own devices by a husband
either absent or overly attentive to others,
Johansson joins Murray to explore Tokyo
(Figure 4). They connect deeply with each other,
yet as with Hepburn’s and Peck’s characters,
eventually realize that they must part ways.

Both narratives are based on the chance
meeting of two protagonists in an unfamiliar city.
The women in each film are socially defined by
a form of patriarchy (Johansson’s character is
married; Hepburn’s character is the daughter of the
King of England). In each case, the absence of the
male patriarch in both foreign settings allows the
possibility for these protected women to encounter
a more urbanized/globalized older male, thereby
setting up a classic triadic structure between the
stability of the domestic and the excitement of the
city. More importantly, in both narratives, we can
see the female characters struggle as they attempt
to escape the confines of their own domesticity by
adopting characteristics of the nineteenth-century
urban flâneur—a desire that runs counter to more
stable gender roles found in our popular culture,
providing the necessary tension around which to
construct each film’s plot as well as the crisis point
which will ultimately require narrative resolution.

The flâneur was the seminal nineteenth-
century cosmopolitan male, both real and imagined,
for whom mobility through public urban space was key. He was the social body for which the capitalist industrial city was structured—a city with boulevards and cafes, a city based on free financial exchange, separate from the domestic. Through many popular sources, such as the pulp Rambler tales set in London in the early part of the nineteenth century to the more poetic writings of Baudelaire in the later nineteenth century, this character and his spatial transgressions ultimately entered the collective imagination as definitive expressions of a modern urban experience. The figure’s very autonomy implicitly excluded respectable women, thereby reinforcing urban experience quintessentially figured as male.

In these two films, the flâneur emerges not only in the male characters (a common cliché in popular culture) but in the female characters as well. As such, these films suggest that, to a large extent, gender relationships have grown more complex or at least more intertwined since the post–World War II era. For both films, the historical icon of the flâneur represents a convenient and powerful mechanism to reexamine each generation’s sense of gender classification and its transgressions, ambiguities, and ideological difficulties.

As the female protagonists in these two films struggle to adopt the role of the urban flâneur, several more of the common nineteenth-century gender issues become folded into the narratives. These include the notions that the female body in public space is disruptive to civic order, that there is a relationship of power between being seen and unseen in the visually consumptive landscape of the capitalist city, and last, that a type of existential fallout can occur when anonymous visibility is coupled with a separation from the domestic, undermining a sense of personal value. Each of these connections to the nineteenth-century discourse is discussed here within as evidenced via these two films.

**Stable: Disruptive**

One of the most resilient tropes found in urban literature dating from the early nineteenth century to the present is the notion that the female body disrupts the order of the male-controlled city. As early as London’s nineteenth-century Rambler tales, the urban male’s constant pursuit of pleasure has been celebrated as urban exploration, harkening back to the explorations of new worlds by adventurous males over the preceding three centuries. In the same schemes, the mobility of the urban female “represent[ed] [the] cause of her eventual destruction. Her movement was transgressive, blurring the boundaries between public and private, suggesting the uncontrollability of women in the city.” Over time, this notion entered into literature and later into cinema as a fixture when women expanded their roles beyond that of daughter, wife, and mother—especially in the post–World War II era when women became irreversibly part of the general workforce. Initially, the primary question in these media representations revolved around how men could negotiate this new condition as seen in such films as *The Apartment* (1960) and *Klute* (1971). More recent films such as *Lost In Translation* now extend this question to their female characters, whose portrayals extend far beyond the comedic (*The Apartment*) or the pathological (*Klute*) as victims of male confusion.
Throughout *Lost in Translation*, several highly stereotypical renditions of the unattached female temptress challenge domestic security. The “rip my stockings” prostitute at the beginning of the film visits Bill Murray as a gift from the commercial producers. An American actress who has worked with Johansson’s husband openly flirts with him on several occasions and alienates Johansson with her “dumb blond” ways. Finally, a female lounge singer sleeps with Bill Murray’s character at the end of the film. The director gives high narrative importance to these characters as sexually disruptive females, accenting them with the most striking deep reds, setting them visually apart within an otherwise neutral and subtle color palette film.

On a more substantive level, Johansson’s character, left unattended by her workaholic husband, eventually highlights the unsettled relationship between Bill Murray’s character and his own wife who remains back in Los Angeles. In a sense the entire narrative conflict is set in motion through the demonstrable weakness of Johansson’s relationship to her own domestic sphere. As we watch Johansson either listen to her self-help tapes or take lonely strolls where she encounters the most traditional of Japanese females (in the flower-arranging sequence at the hotel or in the temple/geisha sequence in Kyoto), we come to understand that Johansson’s tenuous connection to “home” urges her to find herself. At first, this seems to open the potential of finding herself through the attention of another male (i.e., Bill Murray’s character—which would thereby confirm her as a stereotypical female in urban space who will eventually undermine other domestic relationships). But in the end, something more profound occurs. We see, in the final scene of the film, that she remains independent. Her identity and sense of self have been bolstered by human companionship with Murray rather than by sexual activity. In the final shot of the film, she is seen in urban space not as a sexual object or female defined in relationship to other men or to tradition, but as an individual in control of her own life choices.

Popular media forms commonly combine the trope of the woman as disruption with the notion that the city is a site of liberation for the transgressive female. This simultaneous reading of the female as transgressive and the transgressive as liberating is fully available in *Roman Holiday*. In such key scenes as the moped escapade at the beginning of the film or the dance-brawl scene on the river at the end of the film, we can clearly see how Hepburn’s presence in urban space causes disruption and rupture. On the other hand, these scenes also depict how simultaneously liberating and exhilarating these experiences can be for Hepburn’s character (Figure 5).

Yet, it is the acts that are most liberating to the female that ultimately trigger a more urgent demand for control by authorities. Hence, Hepburn’s character lands in the police station at the end of the moped scene and temporarily in the hands of authorities at the end of the brawl scene. In the police station scene, once Gregory Peck’s character lies to the authorities about having just married Hepburn, she is released back into the city, but only because she enjoys male protection (Figure 6). All those who were once angry with her and to whom she caused disruption now congratulate her and wish her well. Unlike the open endedness of *Lost In Translation*, *Roman Holiday’s*
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5. Hepburn and Peck causing mayhem in the streets of Rome. (Courtesy of Paramount Pictures.)

6. Peck’s character lies to authorities that he and the Princess were just married. (Courtesy of Paramount Pictures.)
ending possesses little ambiguity. The Princess, though personally stronger after her adventures, returns willingly to the patriarchal control of the kingdom. Order is resumed in an appropriately 50s way with the narrative's own closure.

While most popular representations tie the sense of uncontrollability or vulnerability of women in urban space to issues of sexuality, we can also see that the woman as a disruptive social body might at times merely be standing in for a much larger fear of the city as a place that resists control altogether. As Elizabeth Wilson writes of literature in the twentieth century,

Woman is present in cities as temptress, as whore, as fallen woman, as lesbian, but also as virtuous womanhood in danger, as heroic womanhood who triumphs over temptation and tribulation . . . writers definitely and clearly posed the presence of women as a problem of order, partly because their presence symbolized the promise of sexual adventure. This promise converted into a general moral and political threat.7

Wilson further suggests that the city was seen as a threatening site because it potentially liberated the poor, well before the nineteenth century:

The sociologist Max Weber argued that the western city developed a typical form of political organization: democracy. Feudal lords found that they were unable to retain their hold over their vassals, bondsmen and serfs once these had settled in cities . . . The western city evolved political organizations which displaced existing paternalistic and patriarchal forms, and so the way was opened both to individualism and to democracy . . . 8

In many ways, this duality plays out between the two male characters in the two films: between the husband photographer and Bill Murray’s character in Lost in Translation and between the king/father and Gregory Peck’s character in Roman Holiday. The king is the ultimate panopticon, the absent but ever-present eye that monitors the social behavior of his subjects. The hundred secret service men looking for the Princess as she tries to avoid detection are the eyes of her father and her country (Figure 7). Gregory Peck’s character, on the other hand, acts as the tour guide to the panorama that is Rome, opening and expanding the Princess’ world and behavior rather than controlling them (Figure 8). Lost in Translation is more post-modern in that the eye is not so much ever-present as wondering or distracted. Johansson’s husband is a photographer whose job it is to see— yet his eyes are often turned to others, thereby allowing Johansson’s character to move alone through the city without his attention.11

In each film, the illusion of the panorama and its virtual journey must come to an end. The ride must stop and the conflict must be resolved.
Hepburn’s victory is that she is able to retain her experiences for herself, outside the confines of any visual authority. This is conveyed at the end of the film when the covert photographs taken of her adventures are discretely delivered to her without ever being revealed to the public or her family. Johansson’s character remains in a more ambiguous state. She nurtures a sense of hope that her time in Tokyo has moved her forward, but the denouement has yet to be written. We are not sure whether she will return to the gaze of her husband or remain comfortably alone with her newfound anonymity and emboldened selfhood.

In 1863, Baudelaire wrote of his poet flâneur:

To the perfect spectator, the impassioned observer, it is an immense joy to make his domicile amongst numbers, amidst fluctuation and movement, amidst the fugitive and infinite. To be away from home, and yet to feel at home; to behold the world, to be in the midst of the world and yet to remain hidden from the world—these are some of the minor pleasures of such independent, impassioned and impartial spirits... the observer is a prince who always rejoices in his incognito.12

Here Baudelaire identified the most distinguishing characteristic of the nineteenth-century flâneur: his invisibility as the condition of his ultimate mobility and freedom. Baudelaire also states that the flâneur is “one with a love of masks and masquerade, the hate of home and the passion for roaming.”13 As such, hiding and masquerading have come to be understood as typically MALE characteristics, allowing a man the ability to move through urban space without constraint. Being observed has become a feminizing or constricting characteristic, defining the city for women as a series of sites for exposure or concealment. Once again, this duality also plays out in both films.

Early in Roman Holiday, the Princess changes into the most neutral of attire for her escape from the palace (as compared to the ball gown we saw her in earlier). She wears what amounts to the female version of Gregory Peck’s plain gray suit. She later shortens her hair to a more masculine length, and to her delight, several people announce that no one will recognize her (Figure 9). When she finds herself in Peck’s pajamas, he states “You should wear my clothes more often.” Finally, once she embarks upon her adventure as a flâneuse, she is given a more masculine nickname of “Smitty.” As this invisible
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8. Peck showing Hepburn the panorama that is Rome. (Courtesy of Paramount Pictures.)

9. The Princess getting her hair cut. (Courtesy of Paramount Pictures.)
voyeur, she is able to experience the masculine perspective of freedom in the urban space.

More subtle transformations are registered through her neckwear. She first appears in a feminine, expensive diamond necklace. For her escape, she chooses a masculine-like tie, which changes to a racy scarf midfilm when she is at her most daring. At the end she wears no neck attire at all, as if to say that the masquerade is over.

In *Lost in Translation*, it is Bill Murray’s character rather than Johansson’s who is caught between the binary conditions of being simultaneously visible and invisible. This, I believe, highlights what Richard Sennett calls the paradox of isolation in a field of constant visibility. In the capitalist city, where all is made visible through architectural transparency and media exposure, the individual has, in fact, been further isolated by such exposure. Being seen by all, Murray’s character is ironically lost to himself, making him more like the compatriot of the nineteenth-century flâneur, the prostitute, or streetwalker, caught in the game of monetary and visual exchange.

Baudelaire suggested that his flâneur was the equivalent of the prostitute, because like the prostitute the poet also sells his own soul to make money. As Murray sells himself so that others can sell Suntory, he is forced to reconcile the conflict between freedom and prostitution (Figure 10). Like Baudelaire’s flâneur, Murray’s character is not as free as he might seem, and is constricted by his image much as a nineteenth-century urban woman might be constricted by the gaze of others. As Elizabeth Wilson suggests of such contemporary male protagonists, “gone is the hero who metaphorically carved his name on the city; now men are petulant, temperamental and uncertain; they have become the ‘Other’ to female subjectivity . . .”

**Home: Away**

The paradox of being isolated within a field of total vision touches all four of the two films’ main characters to varying degrees. No one, male or female, has a place from which to escape the scrutiny of a completely visual and mobile society. Instead, they escape like the nineteenth-century flâneur by hiding in the crowd. In both films, none of the characters are at home; instead, each is either on “holiday” or “lost.” In the fifty-year span between these two films, we can see the emergence of a new recurring crisis of urban life, that in a global world no one is ever allowed to really be at “home” either literally or figuratively.

According to Sennett, for the contemporary urban dweller “each person’s self has become his principle burden; to know oneself has become an end, instead of a means through which one knows the world. And precisely because we are so self-absorbed, it is extremely difficult for us to arrive at a private principle, to give any clear account to ourselves . . .” In both films discussed here, no character has his or her own kitchen, no one sleeps in his or her own bed, or spends time with his or her own family/spouses. And through these absences, they are left only with themselves.

In David Harvey’s terms, this crisis could stem primarily from the single fact that “industrial capitalism, through the reorganization of the work process and the advent of the factory system, forced the separation between place of work and place of reproduction and consumption.” And it is not just the female characters who suffer from this rupture, for at one point Bill Murray’s character bemoans how his wife, now separated from his work and consumed by her own domestic responsibilities, “doesn’t need me anymore.”

At the end of *Roman Holiday*, the Princess offers to cook something for Gregory Peck’s character, yet there is no kitchen. Peck then jokes that he will have to move and get a new apartment with a kitchen. We see through her change of expression that the Princess realizes she can only choose between two domestic realms rather than escape from either of them. With her obligations to the throne outweighing all other responsibilities, she returns to the palace. The viewer’s only solace emerges in one of the final scenes, when the Princess finally sets clear boundaries for herself by no longer allowing her servants to intrude into her own private world.

Jane Jacobs, as well as Sennett, has suggested that any social body without a clear sense of a private
self will never coalesce into a healthy public persona. As Sennett observes, “human beings need to have some distance from intimate observation by others in order to feel sociable.” In a world where everyone is exposed, personal control is fragile. At the onset of each film, the female protagonist shows signs of becoming unglued, as a female body in a global world with no place to regain composure (Figures 11 and 12). This too can be linked to issues surrounding the crisis of gender that arose in the nineteenth century—particularly the common problem of female hysteria. Sennett writes

The common and mild forms of hysteria were the various “complaints,” the physical betrayal of tension, which people, especially bourgeois women, could not succeed in suppressing. Something more than Victorian sexual prudery explains the existence of these nervous disorders; we have seen their cultural setting to be one of great pressure to maintain stable appearances within the family, so that the family itself could be a principle of order in a chaotic society. Set against this regulation of appearances was the belief in and fear of involuntary disclosure of emotion. Hysterical disorders were, in sum, the symptoms of a crisis—and the word is not too strong—in the distinctions between, and stability of, public and private life.

For our two female protagonists as well as the nineteenth-century woman, this condition is made more intense because they are under surveillance by a patriarchal eye (either father or husband), a gaze through which each is defined.

Sex: Romance
When Hepburn’s and Johansson’s characters attempt to escape this condition and enter the city alone, they each must then dodge the suspicions and innuendos of being a disruptive sexual body. Through adopting the characteristics of the flâneur and being accompanied by males other than those who legally define them, they see and experience a type of freedom that is not typically available to women. In both films, female and male protagonists are transformed through their shared exploration of a foreign city.

This transformation occurs because all four characters, regardless of gender, transcend the narrow figuration of gender typical of the nineteenth-century city in their actions and in their final conceptions of each other. Ultimately, neither character is limited by the cultural ideology of the free heterosexual male dictating the social definition of the female. This transcendence arises from the shift in their relationships from sexual to romantic.

This romantic element is profoundly transformational and should not be seen as something fluffy or commercial. It is through romance rather than sexual hierarchy that we are allowed to see people experience the positive potential of global urban life. Both stories are about unrequited love—love that is acknowledged but not fully attained (Figure 13). Here, the directors seem to aptly recognize and suggest that, while collectively we might not be fully beyond the classifications of

11. Hepburn’s character becoming unglued in Roman Holiday. (Courtesy of Paramount Pictures.)
12. Johansson’s character losing composure in Lost in Translation. (Courtesy of Focus Features.)
the nineteenth-century city, we can still seek and find personal transcendence. They suggest in these films that, as Western culture grapples with its inherited definitions of gender and space, we (like these characters) can be transformed by the urban experience and our lives made more profound by its liberating humanity.

These two films are somewhat unique among other films of their respective eras. Typically, to quote Wilson, “in the absence of any clear moral outlook contemporary post-modern films ... tend to fall back on very traditional attitudes.” These two films, however, are not *Taxi Driver* (1976) or *Pretty Woman* (1990), or any other film where the city is still really only about sex and saving the female from its moral perils. Instead, both films embrace the poetic potential of urban life as something beyond the limits of the binary conditions of free versus confined, male versus female, transgressive versus tame, with women being either some version of the belle publique (woman of the streets) or belle honnête (honest or married female). Ultimately, in each film, the city is rendered a site for freedom found through human connection rather than through sexual encounter. These connections allow the two males to recover their souls from capitalist exchange — Bill Murray’s character is now more than a paid face for advertising alcohol and Gregory Peck’s character is now more personally enriched rather than simply out of debt. And for the two female characters, the “self” is defined as separate from one’s gender — Audrey Hepburn’s character is now more than a protected princess and Scarlett Johansson’s character is now more than someone else’s wife.

Though the nomenclature of the word “city” suggests something singular, a real city is of course nothing if not a heterotopic collection of many simultaneous things—a physical entity, an economic system, and a set of social relations to name a few. These narratives suggest that, through such complex diversity that favors chance over destiny, the city is a place where we can defy the very structures that define both the city and ourselves. The media’s continued interest in the flâneur is, I believe, rooted in the fact that we understand this “character” as someone who emerged within the narrative of history and found a way to revel in the modern city while all others were made its subject. For filmmakers such as Wyler and Coppola, the flâneur and the flâneuse with their inherent contradictions remain potent models for resistance in our collective consciousness. There is a sanguine quality to both films discussed here that makes them more compelling than those that oversimplify or idealize the flâneur. None of the protagonists in the two films fully escapes the conditions that control them, but they do find within the structure of urban life a type of human connection that can operate despite such constraints—beyond the economic constraints of capitalist exchange and beyond the gender constraints of marriage and family. These films suggest that cities like individuals can potentially be more than the forces that try to define them.
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