

**TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
(İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI)**

**THE REPRESENTATIONS OF BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA IN EMMA
DONOGHUE'S *ROOM*, ALI SMITH'S *THERE BUT FOR THE* AND PAT BARKER'S
*TOBY'S ROOM***

Doktora Tezi

Elif DEMİR

Ankara, 2022

**TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
(İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI)**

**THE REPRESENTATIONS OF BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA IN EMMA
DONOGHUE'S *ROOM*, ALI SMITH'S *THERE BUT FOR THE* AND PAT BARKER'S
*TOBY'S ROOM***

Doktora Tezi

Elif DEMİR

Prof. Dr. Ufuk EGE UYGUR

Ankara, 2022

**TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI**

**THE REPRESENTATIONS OF BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA IN
EMMA DONOGHUE'S ROOM, ALI SMITH'S *THERE BUT FOR
THE* AND PAT BARKER'S *TOBY'S ROOM***

DOKTORA TEZİ

Prof. Dr. Ufuk EGE UYGUR

TEZ JÜRİSİ ÜYELERİ

Adı ve Soyadı

İmzası

1-Prof. Dr. Ufuk EGE UYGUR (Danışman)

.....

2-Prof. Dr. Gülsev PAKKAN

.....

3-Prof. Dr. Nazan TUTAŞ

.....

4-Doç. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN

.....

5-Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Nisa Harika GÜZEL KÖŞKER

.....

Tez Savunması Tarihi

06.06.2022

T.C.
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne,

Prof. Dr. Ufuk EGE UYGUR danışmanlığında hazırladığım “The Representations of Body, Space and Trauma in Emma Donoghue’s *Room*, Ali Smith’s *There but for the* and Pat Barker’s *Toby’s Room* (Ankara.2022)” adlı doktora tezimideki bütün bilgilerin akademik kurallara ve etik davranış ilkelerine uygun olarak toplanıp sunulduğunu, başka kaynaklardan aldığım bilgileri metinde ve kaynakçada eksiksiz olarak gösterdiğimi, çalışma sürecinde bilimsel araştırma ve etik kurallarına uygun olarak davrandığımı ve aksinin ortaya çıkması durumunda her türlü yasal sonucu kabul edeceğimi beyan ederim.

06.06.2022

Elif DEMİR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	10
1.1. Defining “Body”: Oppositions in Philosophy and Sociology.....	10
1.2. Body and Space: Foucault, Deleuze and Kristeva.....	17
1.3. Trauma Theory and Kübler-Ross Model.....	25
CHAPTER II: BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA in EMMA DONOGHUE’S ROOM (2010)	33
2.1. “Stories Are a Different Kind of True”: Traumatic Subjugation and Resilience.....	34
2.2. “Room’s not on any Map”: Spatial Features of The Room and The Antinomy of Inside/ Outside.....	47
2.3. “It’s like a Crater, a Hole Where Something Happened”: Trauma and Working Through.....	64
CHAPTER III: BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA in ALI SMITH’S THERE BUT FOR THE (2011)	79
3.1. “There was Once a Man”: Capitalism and Body Politics.....	80
3.2. “It is a Really Outstanding Spare Room in There”: Capitalist Terrains, Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization.....	96
3.3. “The Head Has its Coffins”: Trauma and Working Through.....	111
CHAPTER IV: BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA in PAT BARKER’S TOBY’S ROOM (2012)	128
4.1. “Yet Again, She was Being Treated Like a Child”: Patriarchal Modes of Domination and Elinor’s Social Relations.....	129
4.2. “Taking up More and More Room Until There was No Space Left for Her”: Spatial Paths and Choraic Flights.....	144
4.3. “She Realized That Silence Has a Sound”: Trauma and Working Through.....	159
CONCLUSION	174
WORKS CITED	184

ÖZET.....196
ABSTRACT.....198



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Prof. Dr. Ufuk Ege Uygur whose invaluable guidance and support made this dissertation possible. Without her endless trust in me, I would lose my path. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Gülsev Pakkan for her constructive comments and encouraging manner. I felt secure with the fruitful feedbacks of Assist. Prof. Dr. Nisa Harika Güzel Köşker whose positiveness and trust in me always encouraged me to go on. I also would like to thank Prof. Dr. Nazan Tutaş and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin for their time to read my thesis in their busy schedule.

I am also deeply grateful to all the professors of Department of English Language and Literature whom I owe the achievement of this dissertation. I always felt proud to be their student. Without their knowledge and academic guidance, I would not gain analytic lenses. I especially extend my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren Atayurt-Fenge who helped me to gain my academic perspective and to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Seda Pekşen who always opened new horizons.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my mother Gülsevil Aybar who cheered me up and believed in me. She was always there to comfort me with her generous emotional support whenever I was panicked. I also thank my dear friend Cansu Güçlü for her support and faith in me. She shared my loneliness, anxiety and enthusiasm until the completion of this study. I also owe heartfelt thanks to Funda Hay and Candan Kızılgöl Özdemir who were ready to hold my hand whenever I needed them.

INTRODUCTION

Gaining academic momentum for the last three decades¹, body studies is an umbrella term covering the research of different sorts of socially stigmatized bodies such as gendered body, excessive body, disabled body and ageing body. Because the focal point in such studies is to interrogate the perception of the “normal” and “proper” body in society, body studies become a crucial area of concern. Presenting alternative representations of the body, literature also diversifies body images and tackles problematized body-related issues. In this respect, traumatized body can also be a part of this research area since trauma is a process which affects both physical and mental faculties. While trauma is triggered by social, cultural, environmental and individual factors, spaces also feature as psychological stressors within this process. Therefore, this dissertation tackles traumatized bodies and their intertwined bond with the rooms in three contemporary works, Emma Donoghue’s *Room* (2010), Ali Smith’s *There but for the* (2011) and Pat Barker’s *Toby’s Room* (2012). The reason for the selection of these works is to reveal how their analyses contribute to both body and space studies and how a critical dialogue is established through space and traumatized body in three different authors’ contemporary works. Hence, this thesis aims to explore the ways these three contemporary novels present the interwoven relationship between spaces and traumatized bodies.

The body carry various attributions, stigmas and meanings which make it a complex subject. As one factor contributing this complexity comes the notion of space. On the one hand, the body can be taken as an encapsulated space where

¹ According to Bryan S. Turner, human body as an academic research interest gained increasing attention only over the last three decades, “culminating in 2009 with recognition by the American Sociological Association of ‘the body and embodiment’ as an area of professional growth and academic relevance” (1).

certain codes are inscribed, on the other it is a space within a public space where new meanings are constantly generated. Therefore, the spatial significance of the body can be addressed in two interrelated approaches: First, if "there is no such thing as an uncoded body" as Spivak suggests (12), then it means that the body, as a corporeal topos², is a concrete encapsulation of the abstract norms, which turns the body into a physical site of codes in the homogeneous space³. In other words, the body, as a whole, can be taken as an embodied space of social codes. Besides, as the bodily codes are used to define and to identify an individual, therefore, it makes embodiment a materialized space in society. Secondly, as a tangible being, the body in a way not only materializes itself but also materializes the experiences happened in a particular setting, which changes this space from a neutral one into a coded space. While the body as a coded space occupies a particular architectural space through which this space also becomes a representation of certain embodied codes, it also integrates the codes into the space and in turn, this architectural space loses its neutrality by representing a certain spatial embodiment. Hence, the code system of society is transmitted into an architectural space through the bodily codes. However, the codes written on do not necessarily include only positive ones. In this respect, trauma and its effects can be a factor in refashioning the bodily codes. When the traumatic codes of the body and space coalesce, they also influence one another. Therefore, it may be said that the body and space have an inseparable bond fashioning and transforming one another.

The concept of traumatized body has a tight bond with space. In literary imagination, with the rise of trauma theories, novelists begin to seek ways to

² "Place" in Ancient Greek.

³ According to West-Pavlov, homogeneous space is the neutral one that both keeps things apart at the microcosmic level and becomes the container of things that inserted into at the macrocosmic level (15).

conceptualize trauma and its representations. Although it is an overwhelming experience which bereaves the language, novelists have found that “the impact of trauma can only adequately be represented by mimicking its forms and symptoms, so that temporality and chronology collapse, and narratives are characterized by repetition and indirection” (Whitehead 3). In this context, from 1980s until now, novelists, who include trauma in their fiction, employ different techniques and embody different stressors of trauma. Establishing a direct link between the representations of traumatized body and space, as the scope of this dissertation also suggests, one of the novels discussing this issue can be said as Jeffrey Eugenides’ *Virgin Suicides* (1993) which narrates the successive suicides of the five Lisbon sisters whose lives are restricted by their parents from home to school. Therefore, unlike their peers, their adolescence years are trapped in two spaces, which affects their decision of committing suicide. Another novel pursuing trauma and space relationship is Laurie Halse Anderson’s *Speak* (1999) which tells the story of Melinda Sordino who is raped by one of her schoolmates at a summer party and is ostracised by her peers because she interrupts the party by calling the police and refusing to say why she called. Because she is traumatized in a crowded space, she now begins to spend her time alone at school inside a closet she calls “sanctuary”. Another trauma fiction, Roxane Gay’s *An Untamed State* (2014) narrates the captivity of Mireille in her origin country of Haiti. Setting off a vacation from the United States to Haiti, she is kidnapped by a gang who demands ransom from her affluent father, yet he refuses to pay it. This causes the gang to torture, beat and rape her for thirteen days. After this terrible event, she stigmatizes the whole geography of Haiti as hopeless, brutal and ugly. Therefore, as the afore-mentioned novels suggest, trauma can have a close relationship with space, which makes it an interest for academic research.

The first selected novel within the scope of this dissertation is *Room* (2010) in which a man called Old Nick kidnaps a young woman whom he has held captive for years. He produces a docile body on which he commits sexual offences. For this purpose, he designs a well-secured single room in his backyard which cannot be seen or accessed by anyone except him. He builds a Foucauldian panopticon and heterotopic space where he regularly exercises his tyrannical discourse and actions to exploit a female body which in time turns into a docile platform for his desires. In *Discipline and Punish* (1977), Foucault argues that various ways of social and political discipline exercised on people intend to produce a settled atmosphere of surveillance to keep bodies under control. Punishment serves for discipline and docile bodies are generated through the practice of power (*Discipline and Punish* 136-137). Therefore, the novel portrays a woman who is deprived of all her social rights and bodily autonomy against the desire of a man who inflicts both physical and psychological violence on her. At this point, the trauma of the submissive body becomes more severe due to a long-standing process of struggle against the threat. According to Van Der Kolk, “traumatization occurs when both internal and external resources are inadequate to cope with external threat” (“The Compulsion” 393) and in the case of this unnamed woman, called by his son as Ma in the novel, she has neither internal strength nor any access to the physical resources to fight against Old Nick. The deprivation of social needs in the way to the trauma is crucial in the sense that she loses not only his basic right to lead a normal life outside like other people, namely her freedom to be in the public space, but also loses the privacy of her own bodily space through assaults. Therefore, the room, dominated by his toxic masculine thoughts, coalesces with her disenfranchised private space, which also raises the issue of unfair biopower dynamics between a male and a female in the social arena. As for the

boy, although he does not lose his private bodily space like her mother, he is raised deprived of the public, which causes him to lose his sense of reality because he believes that only the room and the things in it are real, but the images on TV and outside their room are not. Because Old Nick's morbid desires toxify the room, it negatively influences the way he perceives things, which persists even after they are free and prevents them from living in a space with too many stimuli compared to their limited room. No matter how much they yearn for emancipation in the enclosed room, he realizes that he takes refuge in the comfort of being detached from all the chaotic experience of the outer world. In this regard, the bodily and spatial codes of the characters will be examined to set forth the function of traumatized bodies and a single room in the novel with a Foucauldian perspective of the issues of discipline, docility, panopticism and heterotopia.

In the second novel, Ali Smith's *There but for the* (2012), the story is based on Miles' voluntarily locking himself in a spare room upstairs of an upper middle-class family. Miles feels disconnected with society due to his experiences which traumatized him in the past and still negatively affect his way of social adaption. In the first chapter entitled "There", Lee family seeks ways out to persuade Miles to leave their home. For this purpose, Gen reaches one of his acquaintances called Anna with whom Miles travelled across Europe when they were younger as the winners of a short story contest. Miles' interest in expressing himself in writing makes him lose his faith in verbal communication and therefore he remains alone in silence in a room and avoids any form of social interaction. Although exchanging words in a public space require the physical presence of the speaker and the addressee, writing is an act that can be conducted in isolation. Therefore, Miles' desire to be in an isolated space can be interpreted as a desire

to attain Deleuzian and Guattarian concept of “body without organs”. While Foucault focuses on the docile body as an output of the systematic exercise of institutional power, Deleuze and Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) suggest an active body who can challenge subjugation with his/her desires. Calling this body as “schizo”, they describe him/her as “a free man, irresponsible, solitary and joyous, finally able to say and do something simple in his own name, without asking permission” (156). Therefore, a schizo can decipher the social codes and transgress the boundaries to attain “the body without organs” which is “not a projection, not a body, or an image of the body” (*Anti-Oedipus* 32), but rather, a sort of space where none of the norms and limits exists. In this regard, a schizo can be said to reject the known territories of society. Deleuze and Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980) coin the words “deterritorialization” and “reterritorialization”. They define the former as “the movement by which ‘one’ leaves the territory” (508), whereas the latter is a process in which the schizo turns to familiar spaces where the social codes keep on operating. Therefore, Miles first deterritorializes himself in a spare room to escape his traumatic memories of his girlfriend’s death and also the label of homosexuality written on his body for being a friend of Mark who is a gay photoresearcher. He also refuses the imposed capitalist codes of the hosts and the regular guests. Rejecting the societal expectations of how he should accept all the codes, he chooses to withdraw into himself, communicating only through notes until Brooke, nine-year-old neighbour, finds out the door unlocked. Although as a schizo character he rejects the capitalist ways of society, Brooke encourages him to write his experiences in the short story form in the hope that it will be a way to recover from the trauma. Therefore, during the period Miles takes refuge in the room, his body and the room merge, becoming a symbol of nausea of social expectations. In this context, this novel will be examined within

the framework of Deleuzian philosophy, focusing on how Miles' traumatic experiences leads to his escape into a spare bedroom and how his body and the room were intertwined and turned into a single symbol of disenfranchisement.

As for the last novel, *Toby's Room* (2012) by Pat Barker, Elinor Brooke has a close relationship with her brother Toby. When they pay a visit to the den and the old mill in the woods where they used to go often when they were small, Toby kisses Elinor passionately which is a shocking experience foreshadowing the impending incest. In feminist narratives, a cave is a metaphorical space which stands for womb and therefore it is the space where patriarchy is challenged. However, in this novel, the cave functions as Freudian woods where repressed and dark desires come to the surface. Even though Elinor cannot stop Toby, she goes into his room at night to express her frustration, but this time Toby rapes her which traumatizes Elinor and causes her gradual bodily languishment and detachment from all family members. Elinor identifies Toby's room with shame, guilt, assault and hatred which are also the codes she inscribes on her traumatized body. Although she never forgets what happened, Elinor mends her relationship with Toby in London, where both study at a university, and looks after him when he is sick during the final exams. After both finish their studies, Elinor comes back home, and Toby serves in the army during the First World War where he dies mysteriously. Elinor as an artist paints portraits and includes Toby's figure somewhere in the context, yet mostly she is not content with the output of her labour. Meanwhile, she finds out that Toby committed suicide not to be reported because he is caught having an affair with a stable boy. She cures herself with painting in her new studio where she turns from Lacanian Symbolic to Kristevan semiotic *chora*. According to Kristeva, *chora* is a space where a child and a

mother is connected before birth and this pre-symbolic stage makes *chora* associated with womb (“The Semiotic” 27-28). Although the trauma causes her to identify her abject body with Toby’s room, later the whole house functions as a choraic space where she gives birth to her artistic creations. Through these new codes, she connects with her true self to cure her traumatized body. She shifts her perspective from Lacanian pejorative abject to Kristevan empowering abject. Therefore, Elinor’s bodily experiences and traumas will be examined in line with Lacan’s and Kristeva’s theories.

Bringing both body and space issues together in three different contemporary writer’s works, trauma is thought to be an interconnecting notion among the selected novels. Although the main characters undergo different processes of trauma, there are similarities in how their bodies are traumatized in their private and social lives, how they are emotionally attached to their rooms and how they take a step to overcome their trauma. Firstly, all works revolve around the study of gendered body: Ma and Elinor are raped, and their female bodies are abused by an abrasive male desire. Miles is prejudicated because he is a friend of a gay photographer. Secondly, the traumatic grief turns into a melancholic state in which they withdraw their physical existence from society and become alienated from themselves until they face what holds them captive. Thirdly, every one of them is emotionally tied to their rooms where function both poisonous and therapeutic. For this reason, although different philosopher’s theories are applied to examine how their bodies sink into trauma in a particular space, Kübler-Ross’ concept of “the stages of grief” is used in each final section to connect the analyses of body and space politics.

Before the analyses of the novels within the given objectives and methods, it is essential to scrutinize the term body to pose queries on its theoretical background. Therefore, the first chapter will centre on body and space theories, which is respectively followed by the chronological analyses of the main texts. Therefore, the second chapter of this dissertation deals with the representations of space and traumatized body in Emma Donoghue's *Room* (2010). The third chapter examines Ali Smith's *There but for the* (2011) and the final chapter scrutinizes Pat Barker's *Toby's Room* (2012). Subsequently, the conclusion section will synthesize the general theoretical and conceptual frameworks that formulate the key points of the thesis.

CHAPTER I:

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1. Defining “Body”: Oppositions in Philosophy and Sociology

Becoming a popular topic of academic interest in recent years, the term “body” is expressed in multiple definitions. The difficulty of defining a human body manifests itself in Merriam-Webster Dictionary through the definitions focusing mainly on plants and animals rather than human body: “1) the main part of a plant or animal body especially as distinguished from limbs and head” and “2) the organized physical substance of an animal or plant either living or dead” (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/body>). On the one hand, the definitions reckon upon only plants and animals, on the other, they concern only biological circumstances. However, a human body is a landscape which encompasses both physical and social incorporators. Although dictionary definitions are based more on “nature” of the body, considering a socially transformed body infers “becoming” and “unfinishedness”, thereby revealing the aspect of “nurture”. Richardson and Locks in the preface of their work describe the body as “the way in which we make sense of the world and our environment” (ix), which transgresses physiological references by signalling corporeality and embodiment. They also argue that “the body may be biological (it is undoubtedly flesh and blood) but it is also cultural in that we all shape and manipulate our bodies” (2), which emphasizes the social aspect of the body. In this regard, this section discusses the classical thoughts on “nature” of the body in the philosophical and sociological arena along with the views of the recent scholars in the same fields on “nurture”.

Because this dissertation aims to draw body and space studies together, the philosophy of mind, which deals with the nature of the mind and its relation to the body, is intended to be firstly centred on. The problematization of the mind/body dualism constitutes the core aspects of both areas of study in this thesis because the traumatic experiences of the characters maximize the negative perception of their material body, and the result bridges the change in the cognitive perception of the space. The significance of the mind/body dualism resides in the fact that the mind as an immaterial entity can grasp all sort of material objects and store experiences. In this regard, the division between immateriality and materiality underlies the earliest thoughts on the separability of the mind and body. Ancient philosophy comprises a basis for the mind/body problem and the philosophers believe that human beings are part body and part soul; however, both are not equally substantial. Plato proposes to “flee from the body” (10) and Aristotle argues that all living things possess a life-giving soul, but human beings vary from others with nous (mind) which is a potency of soul to articulate (Aristotle 104). In the Middle Ages, the dominant idea is the ultimacy of God as the highest form of soul and later comes human soul, which can be exemplified from the work of Augustine who in his *Confessions* praises soul for its faculty of giving life to the body. He states: “O my soul, thou art my better part: for thou quickenest the mass of my body, giving it life, which no body can give to a body: but thy God is even unto thee the Life of thy life” (166). The basis of the mind/body problem, therefore, can be summarized as either Platonian, Aristotelian or God-centred which are united in the idea of the transience of the body and the emblazonment of the mind, thus subordinating the body. The continuity of this view manifests itself until the 20th century when the body begins to be taken into the account.

The sharp separability of the body and mind finds its known place in Rene Descartes' thoughts who proclaims a radical shift in philosophical thinking by changing the focus onto scientific analysis. This change is enunciated in his famous saying, "I think, therefore I am" with the emphasis put on the recentralization of human beings and their capacity. This idea is also highlighted in his formulation of Cartesian duality. In "Meditation II", Descartes voices his desire to find an indisputably sound truth that leaves no room for suspicion: "Beyond doubt then, [...] I should be nothing as long as I think I am something. So that, having weighed all these considerations sufficiently and more than sufficiently, I can finally decide that this proposition, 'I am, I exist', whenever it is uttered by me, or conceived in the mind, is necessarily true" (18). This philosophical thought also constructs the basis of his view on the mind/body dualism. Descartes in his search for truth relies on the mind rather than the body because he supposes that the body is a more complex substance, and he identifies his existence with his mind; hence Descartes' Cartesian dualism is crucial in the sense that his ideas lay the groundwork for the mind/body dichotomy especially for his successors. Baruch Spinoza believes that God is infinite and eternal, whereas the body is finite because "a thing is called finite after its kind" and "we can always conceive another body" (Spinoza 39). He describes the body as "a mode which expresses in a certain determinate manner the essence of God" (78). The uniqueness is ascribed to God, whereas the unity of the body and mind belongs to every individual. John Locke, the pioneer of English empiricism, advocates that our senses convey the perception of the things into the mind, thus we can have ideas if the sensible objects are "yellow, white, heat, cold, soft, hard, bitter or sweet" (108). Therefore, certain ideas, concepts and images are evoked in the mind through the experience of external and internal sensation. In the 18th century, Immanuel Kant also implies

the subordination of the body: “A human being, who receives all his ideas and conceptions from impressions which the universe awakens in his soul by means of the body” (147), which means all the soul’s conceptual activity is dependent on the sensory material that it is received through the instrument of the bodily actions. Hence, he posits the mind superior to the body.

The continuity of mind’s superiority prevails also in the 19th century. Even though in the 19th century “nurture” gets involved in the duality, the continuity of the division keeps on operating in favour of the mind. In this regard, Hegel proposes a more conscious and feeling soul sunk in “nature”, which is chained to other substances, thereby constituting a dynamic organism. He names the steps (thesis, antithesis and synthesis) of this process as dialectics (Ege Uygur 114). While thesis is a subjective spirit which is linked to the internal operation of the human mind, antithesis is an objective spirit which points to a mind fashioned by the social and political institutions. Synthesis is an infinite soul which stands for a spirit formed by both the private and public institutions (Ege Uygur 115). It is important to note that the distinction of Hegel’s ideas lies in the fact that he handles human beings from the aspects of the private and public. He discusses the internal operations of the mind along with the social operations of various institutions on the individual. In the 19th century, Nietzsche explains his ideas on the body and mind through instinct which is a strong drive that affects the way a human being responds to a stimulus. According to Nietzsche, strong individuals are those who can notice their bodily instincts and discipline them. They “react slowly to all kinds of stimuli” (Nietzsche 23) and avoid rushing. Therefore, in the dichotomy of the body and mind, the strong is the one who can control his mind and the actions of his body.

The classical sociology of the 19th century also follows Cartesian division. Chris Shilling notes that the traditional understanding in some way portrays the absent presence of the body because “it seldom takes into account the fact that we have fleshy bodies” and it concentrates more on “the structure and functioning of societies and the nature of human action” rather than human embodiment (8). Shilling points out that

Karl Marx was concerned with the assimilation of the body into capitalist technology. Georg Simmel wrote about the embodied dispositions that propelled people towards others, and the social emotions that helped maintain relationships, as well as examining the deleterious effects of the money economy in eroding these emotions. Max Weber's writings displayed an interest in the rationalization of the body, and the 'shelters' from physical instrumentalism provided by art, love and eroticism. Emile Durkheim viewed the body as a source of, as well as a location for, those sacred phenomena that served to bind together individuals into moral wholes.

Although these theoreticians do not explicitly handle the embodiment of an individual body, they adopt an approach that deals with the communal representation of it. As illustrated in the quotation, Marx implies that the workforce of the proletariat may eventually result in their bodies' adaptation to dehumanizing capitalist model. Simmel touches on how assets alter the shared emotions that once functioned to set social ties. Weber advocates that the body is rationalized through the replacement of accepted social and cultural motivators. Durkheim considers the bodies in a society are held together through the shared values. To concisely summarize, the classical theorists of sociology target class/status-based communities which undergo a change from the traditional values to the finance-oriented practices. Therefore, the classical sociology divides the mind and body in such a way as to

eliminate the mind and to represent the body in terms of bodily presence and actions.

The importance of the continuity of the classical insights until the 20th century is not only for their providing the key source of the recent ideas, but they also show the shift and discontinuity between the earlier and the latter thoughts. The traditional ideas in both areas operating as the separation of the mind and body suggests that a human being is dissociated from his/her environment yet is addressed separately as a biological entity. However, literature approaches a human being as a whole, considering both factors of “nature” and “nurture”. For this reason, the continuity of the separability of the body and mind until the 20th century is not applicable to the selected works since as a lived mechanism, the bodies in the novels are shaped through the understanding of being-into-the-world. Both “nature” and “nurture” contributes to the traumatic process of the bodies, which on a larger scale suggests the idea that the chaos of the world inescapably affects the individual life. For this reason, the body and mind as parts of a human being are equally influenced. In this respect, Maurice Merleau-Ponty demonstrates a lived body, aware of itself and the world around, which reveals the psychological and sociological aspects of the body more visible. Merleau-Ponty, in *The Structure of Behaviour* (1942), takes the body and mind not as separate substances, but through a holistic understanding. He identifies them as a part of a “universal milieu” with consciousness (199). Because the things are present in the mind-independent world, our perception, he believes, is fashioned through perspective; however, grasping a body from a certain perspective does not mean a limited understanding of the soul because it “remains coextensive with nature” (189), which also eliminates the idea of separation of the body and soul. This

transcendental notion of a consciousness locates the mind in an accomplished structural integration which is conditioned by the life it embodies. Therefore, as a 20th century philosopher, Merleau-Ponty strays from the stance of biological body but considers it as a whole in a particular environment.

In terms of sociological appreciation, the historical and political winds laid bare the prominence of the body starting from the 1960s with feminist second wave, civil rights and gay liberation movement which carved significant emancipatory impacts on the traditional establishment of the bodily structures. With the desacralization of the conventionally exalted mind, the body has gained more attention with the complementary sociological interest. The challenged norms have paved the way to the explicit study and theorization of the body in society. The body becomes the focal subject matter in the works of more recent social theorists such as Erving Goffman who accentuates the socially prescribed aspects. Based on the idea of a theatrical performance, Goffman's thought-provoking work *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1956) presents the importance of interactionism and evinces the details of self-presentation in the realm of social exchange. By doing this, he draws the attention to the kinship between a dramaturgical performance and social world. A performance is characterized by Goffman as "all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion that serves to influence in any way any of the other participants" (8) and a few pages later, he elaborates that he uses the term to refer to "the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers" (13). Therefore, the prerogative of a performance is to act in front of an audience at a particular time. In line with drama, interpersonal encounters comprise of the individuals on the

stage acting in front of one another at a particular setting and with a certain manner. The individuals give their top performances to reveal the best of their self. In the projection of the self, the purpose is to preserve the positive image of the face, which is the set of behaviours indicating social class. Goffman underlines cynicism in the presentation of self through masks people wearing in order to reinforce their positive face. He also quotes from De Beauvoir who states that dresses are a way of presenting self. When a status-indicator fancy dress is stained, it threatens the face of its wearer, which is a disaster in the case of a social interaction (151). Therefore, all sorts of belongings and resources serving as markers of class privilege is a way of anchoring the self on the existing socioeconomic conditions. In such social relations, the body functions as a cultivated area of inflicted roles in order to preserve facial values. In Goffman's theory, the individual is at the core with all his/her possessions. The sharp separation of Cartesian dualism is eradicated, and a person is portrayed in unison with his mind and body striving for exist in a community.

1.2. Body and Space: Foucault, Deleuze and Kristeva

Foucault, Deleuze and Kristeva also consider the body as a unified mechanism whose theories will be applied to the main texts. Firstly, Michel Foucault is mainly concerned with how bodies are fabricated and fashioned through discourses. Shilling defines Foucauldian discourses as “sets of deep principles incorporating specific grids of meaning which underpin, generate and establish relations between all that can be seen, thought and said” (66), thus reproducing inter-relational bonds between the subjects and objects. The body as the focal point of different discourses goes through the phase of disciplinary power. Foucault suggests that

The individual [...] is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called 'discipline'. We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it "excludes," it "represses," it "censors," it "abstracts," it "masks," it "conceals." In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him[her] belong to this production (*Discipline and Punish* 194).

Foucault connects power to discipline which asserts itself through institutional practices operated in the public places such as schools, prisons, hospitals, factories etc. This control mechanism reduces the body to an object of manipulation. He argues that the negative result of power is the emergence of docile bodies. Therefore, he tackles the individual not as a biological entity, but he considers "nurture" as a factor forming the body. From disciplinary power of discursive public institutions, Foucault turns his interest to concrete spaces. He calls certain discursive spaces as "heterotopia" in his article "Of Other Spaces" lectured in 1967, thereby offering a rereading of such spaces. He describes the features of heterotopia as follows:

There also exist, and this is probably true for all cultures and all civilizations, real and effective spaces which are outlined in the very institution of society, but which constitute a sort of counter arrangement, of effectively realized utopia, in which all the real arrangements, all the other real arrangements that can be found within society, are at one and the same time represented, challenged, and overturned: a sort of place that lies outside all places and yet is actually localizable. In contrast to the utopias, these places which are absolutely other with respect to all the arrangements that they reflect and of which they speak might be described as heterotopias (333).

Foucault argues that heterotopias are localizable places which subvert the familiar cultural codes. In contrast to the optimistic face of utopias, heterotopias are disturbing places. Foucault notes that boarding schools, honeymoon hotels, hospitals, prisons, cemeteries, museums and sacred places are heterotopias which have their

own discourse. In this regard, in *Room* (2010), Old Nick builds a heterotopic space, a boxy room which is localizable as a physical site. It is an “other” space built to produce a docile body because it mirrors Old Nick’s discourse of sexual violence, which contradicts with the norms of public spaces. Therefore, taking institutions in terms of being a physical space with discursive practices, Foucault’s concepts bring both body and space studies together in the novel.

In the first volume of their seminal work *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Deleuze and Guattari, like Foucault, argue the oppressive apparatuses which are employed to “normalize”. As an element of nurture, this cultural oppression devices function to displace desire and to form submissive bodies. For this reason, in *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) they offer a schizo body which withstands subjugation. Although psychoanalysis regards schizophrenia as a malady to be treated by its own methods, Deleuze and Guattari is inspired by the liberatory trait of it, which leads them to call this active body as “schizo”. Because they resist the familiar norms and territories of society, the schizo characters violate the rules and subvert the predestined role of the individual. For this purpose, they transcend both physical and mental boundaries to obtain “the body without organs” status. To attain such a status where no limit exists, the schizo rejects hierarchical structures and social codes because s/he produces “[his/her] own system of co-ordinates for situating [his/her]self” (*Anti-Oedipus* 27). However, it is hard to situate this body into a territoriality because such mobile bodies do not adhere to any territoriality yet depart from one space to another in order to avoid fixedness:

The schizo knows how to live: he has made departure into something as simple as being born or dying. But at the same time his journey is strangely stationary, in place. He does not speak of another world, he is not from another world: even when he is displacing himself in space, his is a journey in intensity (*Anti-Oedipus* 156).

Being mobile in different territorialities requires being a free man of strong desires to take an action easily. In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari propose the terms “deterritorialization” and “reterritorialization” to explain the lines of flight. The former stands for the active process of moving to explore new territorialities, whereas the latter is contrarily defined by the known settled stations. Because the schizo cannot predict what the new station practises as a social code, therefore deterritorialization can either be negative or positive. It can only be positive when “it prevails over reterritorialization” (*A Thousand Plateaus* 508).

Although the stationary status of society accepts an Oedipal structure, the schizo rejects it as well. In this regard, a schizo can be called a desiring machine. Deleuze and Guattari note that from social institutions to human body, all structures are driven by binarily opposed groups which interrupt the flow. Machinism “is any system that interrupts flows, and it goes beyond both the mechanism of the technology and the organization of the living being, whether in nature, society, human beings” (*Desert Islands and Other Texts* 219). Because the schizo is an outcast wandering from one place to another and rejecting the established norms, therefore s/he interrupts the flow where he visits. Like every partial object operating the duty on its behalf, the schizo ceases the operation of another machine and in such a case, it is desire which functions as a connecting medium between different flows. Hence, the desiring machines are nourished by the dysfunction of another machine, because a body without organs disassembles its constituents, which works as follows:

Lodge yourself on a stratum, experiment with the opportunities it offers, find an advantageous place on it, find potential movements of deterritorialization, possible lines of flight, experience them, produce flow conjunctions here and there, try out continuums of intensities segment by segment, have a small plot of new land at all times. It is

through a meticulous relation with the strata that one succeeds in freeing lines of flight, causing conjugated flows to pass and escape and bringing forth continuous intensities for a Body without Organs (*A Thousand Plateaus* 161).

Therefore, the schizo decodes the code system of society which is conducted through the fluctuations of the whole operation of the system. Since it interrupts the ingrained values by breaking the walls, his effort results in attaining a “body without organs” who does not need the operation, flow, regulation or integration of any organs. In this context, Miles in *There but for the* (2011) is a schizo who rejects the codes and territories of his community which leads to his locking himself up in an unfamiliar room. Through this new line of flight, he deterritorializes himself from the anticipated social roles and produces his own territoriality where he does not need any operative part of society since he interrupts the whole capitalist operability of a bourgeois family. Therefore, bringing both body and space studies together, Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts can be applied to the analysis of body and space politics in the novel.

Julia Kristeva is another theorist within the scope of this dissertation who focuses on the female body and its relation to the semiotic. Her concept of the *chora* originates from Lacan’s stage of the Symbolic in which he argues that entering into the Symbolic stage means entering into language. Therefore, the body, on the psychoanalytic level, is fashioned through nurture offered by the Father. According to Lacan, the Symbolic is explicitly associated with the Law-of-the-Father: “It is in the name of the father that we must recognize the support of the symbolic function which, from the dawn of history, has identified his person with the figure of the law” (67). Language can be identified as a powerful medium since it functions as an agent of culture representing the patriarchal order. The

child, who on the phallogentric level fears of castration, obeys Father's law to be submissive. To manifest this, he internalizes the Father's discourse and practises it through language on the androcentric level. Therefore, the child follows his Father on both planes. In such a hierarchizing Oedipal system, Julia Kristeva proposes the semiotic stage coming before Lacan's Symbolic. The semiotic diverges from the Symbolic in the sense that it is not a language like the Symbolic, yet it is preverbal and preoedipal where no Father exists. Since the source of the semiotic *chora* is inside the mother, it is associated with womb where not only a baby comes to existence but a female language as well. Besides, Kristeva states that

There is also the connivance of the young girl with her mother, her greater difficulty than the boy in detaching herself from the mother in order to accede to the order of signs as invested by the absence and separation constitutive of the paternal function. A girl will never be able to re-establish this contact with her mother [...] except by becoming a mother herself, through a child, or through a homosexuality (*Women's Time* 29).

A girl is detached from the semiotic and is closed to the Symbolic in order not to have a female bond with her mother because a shared female language puts patriarchy at risk. Toril Moi suggests that "once the subject has entered into the Symbolic Order, the *chora* will be more or less successfully repressed" (162). In this respect, the patriarchal discourse gains its importance and dominance from the language itself.

The Symbolic subordinates the semiotic, yet it does not mean that the semiotic is eradicated fully. It is repressed, and comes to the surface through rhythms and intonations as in poetry, which is called *heterogeneousness* by Kristeva:

This heterogeneousness, detected genetically in the first echolalias of infants as rhythms and intonations anterior to the first phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, and sentences; this heterogeneousness, which is later reactivated as rhythms, intonations, glossalalias in psychotic

discourse, serving as ultimate support of the speaking subject threatened by the collapse of the signifying function; this heterogeneousness to signification operated through, despite, and in excess of it and produces in poetic language 'musical' but also nonsense effects that destroy not only accepted beliefs and significations, but, in radical experiments, syntax itself (*Desire in Language* 133).

Therefore, heterogeneity is directly linked with poetic language, which is also the language of the semiotic. Because of this productivity, women are closer to the semiotic than men because a female body can also give birth. For this reason, French feminists associate the *chora* with the artistic act of writing. Because womb is treated as the counterpart of the *chora*, it is located as a space in the body. Therefore, Kristevan term of the *chora* can be considered within both bodily and spatial frameworks. In *Toby's Room* (2012) Elinor detaches from the semiotic and yields to the Symbolic by the rape of his brother. Although she stigmatizes places where she was assaulted, her traumatized body accomplishes to reconnect to the *chora*. Due to the productive power of it, she creates a choraic body and space through painting portraits and thereby shifting a stigmatized platform into a generative one. In this regard, Elinor's trauma can also be grasped within Lacan's and Kristeva's notion of "abject". Lacan associates the abject with the excreted liquids out of the body which regards the female body as the abject, however; for Kristeva, abject is the powerful one who disturbs identity, system and order (*Powers* 2). Because of the sense of guilt, Elinor firstly treats her body in Lacanian sense and avoids her traumatized body from entering into his room even though he is not there, but later she finds necessary strength in Kristevan abject to strive against the predicament. In this respect, Kristeva's insight presents the relationship between the body and space which is analysed in the selected novel.

Through the detailed analysis of the methods applied to the main texts, the classical debate on “nature” factor on bodies is challenged through the contemporary ideas on “nurture”. Although nature engraves bodies in a pre-ordained position, the influence of nurture indicates that the individual is shaped through the dynamics of his/her environment. This approach can also be observed in the afore-mentioned theoreticians’ ideas which contribute both to the dismantling of the traditional views and to body and space studies. Although the oppositional views display a historical discontinuity, in this case it supplies an enwidening perspective to open new horizons by bringing different viewpoints together.

Along with the nature/nurture debate and the functions of the theoretical background, to connect the analysis of each chapter to one another Derrida’s concept of “pharmakon” is one of the concepts used. The word pharmakon in Derrida’s *Dissemination* (1981) denotes two meanings: remedy and poison. Derrida defines pharmakon as the embodiment of two opposed poles by stating that “this type of painful pleasure, linked as much to the malady as to its treatment, is a *pharmakon* in itself. It partakes of both good and ill, of the agreeable and disagreeable. Or rather, its within its mass that these oppositions are able to sketch themselves out” (*Dissemination* 99). He takes writing as a pharmakon since the external and internal devices work together in this act. Writing is tackled as influencing both the external and internal memory, therefore it is dangerous because poor memory of the past experiences hypnotizes the current memory (Derrida, *Dissemination* 110). Not only memory manipulates itself but also deceives the archon, a figure of authority and a representative of law and order deciding on the fate of knowledge and memory who can have the power to censor, repress or preserve the content of the archive, thereby having an explicit impact on what

will be recollected or not (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 2). Following this insight of pharmakon which contains binaries in itself, all of the novels similarly portray traumatized bodies and their relation to the rooms in such a way as to raise the question of whether the rooms are poisonous or healing. Besides, melancholia and grief as the psychological archons rule the archives of the main characters and have a say on their experience of the trauma. In a traumatic state of mind, the negative archon renders the room as poisonous. As the power of the archon diminishes, then the rooms attain a therapeutic feature. Therefore, because Ma, Miles and Elinor are traumatized in particular rooms and they also rise up out of it in these rooms, the concepts of pharmakon and archive are links to connect all the analyses of the main texts with one another.

1.3. Trauma Theory and Kübler-Ross Model

Because human mind tends to store and recall bad experiences more, space as a witness of trauma gains importance in the novels. As Gaston Bachelard suggests that house is a place where our memories are housed (8), the connection between the space and traumatized body is unignorable in the sense that homes as domestic spaces do not always envelop warmth but may accommodate traumatic experiences. For this reason, the relationship between the traumatized body and traumatizing spaces can be a research concern because both, on a larger scale, are factors contributing to the metamorphosis of human beings as a whole with his/her embodiment, well-being and consciousness in society. Before the analyses of the novels, it is, therefore, necessary to review trauma theory and Kübler-Ross' trauma model through which the selected texts will be examined. Because the model will be applied to each case in the novels, it is another connecting point to link the analyses of these three different novels.

Being a complex term, trauma does not have a fixed definition because it has been used by researchers in a variety of meanings for different disciplines (Joseph Sandler et al. 1). In its original sense, (derived from Greek 'traumatizo', meaning 'to wound') trauma signifies a blow or shock to the bodily tissues which led to injury or disturbance (Leydesdorff et al. 1), but later the term is broadened to address the psychological and sociological references. Kai T. Erikson suggests that the medical definition of trauma should also address to its psychological effects, which is observed especially in literature through the shock resulting in a sort of disconnection with the world. He writes: "Something alien breaks in on you, smashing through whatever barriers your mind has set up as a line of defence. It invades you, possesses you, takes you over, becomes a dominating feature of your interior landscape, and in the process threatens to drain you and leave you empty" (228). Therefore, Erikson focuses on the destructive psychological effects of trauma such as insecurity, hollowness, and weakness. Different from those who tackle the causes and effects of trauma within the framework of psychology, Boon et al. discuss trauma-related dissociation and its bodily effects, which presents trauma also as a bodily phenomenon since the mental shock leaves its shadow on the bodily reactions: Firstly, they argue that trauma may cause certain neurobiological conditions such as dementia and amnesia which are mental symptoms of a traumatic experience (31). Secondly, as result of depersonalization, they report that traumatized people may be so alienated from their body as to be insensitive to hunger, tiredness, heat or cold and even to physical pain (34). For this reason, trauma alters both mental and physical capacities. Psychoanalysis also highlights both physical and psychic symptoms. From his earliest work on hysteria in the 1890s, Freud identifies and theorizes the possibility that certain intractable "illnesses" (repressed sexual desire) might come to light as states of psychic

disturbance and disconnection, whose underlying causes could be traced back to the traumatic experiences in the past. According to psychoanalysis, the traumatic effects of a shocking event or circumstance upon the psyche are manifested unconsciously in a range of bodily symptoms and disturbances, in neurotic behaviours, in nightmares and hallucinations, and in amnesia (Breuer & Freud, 41-42). These can all be read as symbolic expressions of an experience which is difficult or impossible to make sense of, assimilate, or integrate with the “ordinary” sense of oneself. Using his earlier thoughts on hysteric trauma as a groundwork for his later viewpoint, Freud formulates his theory of trauma also in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920) and he argues that human experiences depend on pleasure-principle: Our mind avoids unpleasant mental processes because its function depends on the production of pleasure. When pleasure-principle is violated by the traumatic experiences, the ego splits its unity, and it leads to the repression of the pain. The pain surfaces its presence through dreams, which entails traumatic neurosis showing up such symptoms as the failure of motor skills and the damage of memory. Van Der Kolk also blends both psychological and physical effects of trauma by stating that

If the elements of the trauma are replayed again and again, the accompanying stress hormones engrave those memories even more deeply into the mind. Ordinary, day-to-day events become less and less compelling. Not being able to deeply take in what is going on around [us] makes it impossible to feel fully alive. It becomes harder to feel the joys and aggravations of ordinary life, harder to concentrate on the tasks at hand (*The Body* 67).

Van der Kolk’s statement emphasizes trauma as a complex condition having influences on both psychological and physical status with less functional daily activities as well as a black mood. Therefore, trauma is a compelling process with its multi-facets.

Freud's traditional model approaches trauma in a universalist perspective since the origin of trauma is admitted as universal events like wars. In this regard, Freudian formulation of war trauma is not applicable to the selected works since the main texts do not include war trauma and since both of the earlier views eliminate the diversity of personal experiences, identity and cultural dimensions. Dwelling on Freudian viewpoint of trauma, trauma studies gathered speed in the 1990s firstly with the works of Cathy Caruth who remodelled traditional understanding of trauma as a catastrophic experience that shatters consciousness and negatively impacts the linguistic ability. Both the dissociation of the self and the loss of previously possessed linguistic schema portray trauma not as "an effect of destruction" but as "an enigma of survival" (Caruth 58). Therefore, trauma is tackled as an unrepresentable condition due to the unreliability of fragmentation and unspeakability. Because the pluralistic trauma theory, as a new model, widens the trope of trauma by suggesting that "traumatic experience uncovers new relationships between experience, language, and knowledge that detail the social significance of trauma" (Balaev 366), the analyses of the main texts adopt this new perspective because it leaves room for the involvement of personal responses. Another distinguishing trait of the new model is that unlike traditional model accepting memory as a static entity, it considers memory to be a fluid process since the recollection of a past traumatic event and its present reaction do not always produce a stable correspondence, which reinforces the idea that "trauma occurs in specific bodies, time periods, cultures, and places, each informing the meaning and representation of traumatic experience" (Balaev 366). Therefore, this method is employed in the analyses of the main texts since the main characters experience not a universally shocking trauma, yet each goes through different processes of personal traumas. In this regard, Judith Herman's *Trauma and*

Recovery (1992) discusses trauma from different angles varying from political terror to domestic violence with a psychoanalytical stance. Because in the selected works Ma suffers from captivity trauma, Miles goes through disconnection and Elinor is a victim of domestic abuse, Herman's work will also be applied to the main texts in the analysis of trauma and its recovery.

What is presented both in the traditional and recent trauma theory is that trauma paves the way for the observation of the change between the previous and present self, identity, perception and perspective because it impairs the body through the insertion of the new adverse codes. Using the conventional trait of the difference between the former and the latter self, the process of trauma, arising from a loss, can be tackled within the scope of this dissertation with a focus on the social significance of it. To do this on a psychological level, Freudian terms of mourning and melancholia are instrumental. When discussing mourning and melancholia, Freud argues that the lost object "has not perhaps actually died, but has been lost as an object of love" (245), therefore not only the trauma of the loss of a beloved but also the trauma of the loss of an object of love widens the scope of both terms. Although mourning and melancholia can be the results of a traumatic experience, Freud differentiates the terms while defining the characteristics of melancholia:

The distinguishing mental features of melancholia are a profoundly painful dejection, cessation of interest in the outside world, loss of the capacity to love, inhibition of all activity, and a lowering of the self-regarding feelings to a degree that finds utterance in self-reproaches and self-revilings, and culminates in a delusional expectation of punishment (244).

While melancholia causes self-denigration, mourning does not disturb self-regard. Both of the concepts dwell on the fact that first, the libido is attached to a

particular object, later the loss of this object frees the libido and consequently the libido is withdrawn into the ego. In the concept of melancholia, the former status of the ego and the newly altered ego conflict, which leads to self-reproaches since the reproaches against the lost object are directed onto the patient's ego (Freud, "Mourning" 248). Although Freud does not directly address "the loss" as a reason for trauma, bereavement may lead to traumatic neurosis (Raphael 33). Hence, the melancholic loss is thought to provoke trauma in the selected works. In the first selected novel, *Room* (2010), the abduction of a young woman entails a separation from her family and social environment along with leaving her civil rights behind. In *There but for the* (2011), the loss of his girlfriend and his loss of interest in complying with the capitalist machine initiate Miles' traumatization. In the third novel, *Toby's Room* (2012), Elinor's rape traumatizes her. Different from mourning, all the characters undergo melancholia, damaging their self-worth as a result of a traumatic experience of losing. Therefore, Elisabeth Kübler-Ross' model, which scrutinizes the traumatic process of loss, can be applied to analyse their emotions stage by stage from the beginning of the trauma to the journey of recovery. Although Kübler-Ross formulates her model of grief around the response towards the death of a beloved, the five stages of grief (denial, anger, bargaining, depression and acceptance) can also be observed in the selected works because the main characters experience a traumatic loss and therefore, they go through a grief process. In the first stage of her model, Kübler-Ross argues that when someone facing a loss gets over the initial shock and collects himself, they react as "No, it cannot be me!" (*On Death* 42). In the works, Ma and Jack build a fantasy world as a denial mechanism. Miles refuses to socialize as other people do and Elinor is shocked daylong because her brother kissed her lips. In the anger phase, Kübler-Ross states that after the patient accepts what happened, denial "is replaced

by feelings of anger, rage, envy and resentment” and “anger is displaced in all directions and projected onto the environment at times almost at random” (*On Death* 50). Because she is enslaved, Ma projects her anger only onto her son through rejecting his wishes to play, to eat or to watch TV. Miles manifests his resentment by locking himself up. Elinor projects her anger directly onto her brother, but it remains inconclusive because of her family’s indifference. Kübler-Ross thirdly argues that the person facing trauma attempts to negotiate with God to postpone the reason of grief (*On Death* 82). Ma and Jack look at the sun through the skylight to plea and they also try to be nicer to Old Nick to get more food. Miles reverses this phase as people come up with the negotiation offers to set himself free. Elinor does not directly contract with God, but she postpones the traumatic grief by focusing on her art. In the penultimate phase, the traumatized person cannot deny the loss any longer and undergoes depression (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 85). Jack and Ma emancipate from their prison-like room, but they cannot recover from the ongoing impacts of the protracted closure. Depression comes when they realize that they cannot fit in the public life. Miles is depressed when he is alone in a single room with the thought that he cannot bring Jennifer back. Elinor sinks into depression after the incest. She isolates herself in her room and languishes day by day. In the last stage, the person is not angry or depressed anymore because he/she accepts the loss. However, it does not mean that this stage witnesses happy feelings but rather it comes with a void of feelings (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 113). In this stage, all the characters come across a stimulant that alerts their depression. Ma and Jack revisit the room; Miles imitates the non-presence of Jennifer; and Elinor reoccupies Toby’s room. After this stage, all of them finds the strength of acceptance to cling to life. Concisely speaking, through this model, the traumatic process of the main characters is unravelled step by step

concerning physical, mental and psychological effects. Although the characters accept their traumas in the final stage, their traumatic experiences leave their traces to be cured since they are repressed for a long time in the unconscious. Freud in “Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through” (1914) suggests that psychoanalytic catharsis is reached by bringing the repressed into the focus of conscious through reproducing, which offers to overcome resistances caused by repression (147-148). Likewise, all the characters work through their traumas via a sort of purgation. Jack and Ma revisit the room they are enslaved in and act out their days of captivity; Miles abreacts his emotions through the artistic way of writing; Elinor feels relieved when she hears about the news of her brother’s death, and she also abreacts her repressed emotions through painting portraits. Therefore, how they work through their traumas will also be included in the text analysis to uncover their traumatized bodies more.

CHAPTER II:
BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA in
EMMA DONOGHUE'S *ROOM* (2010)

*Who can find a proper grave for the damaged mosaics of the mind,
where they may rest in pieces?*

L.L. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies*, 1991

Published in 2010, Emma Donoghue indites a fictionalized narration of the Fritzl case⁴ in *Room* (2010) which was shortlisted for the Booker Prize in its publishment year. In the novel, the story revolves around an unnamed woman and her son who are held captives for seven years in a well-secured boxy room. In terms of physical and psychological body politics, the physical abuse of Ma results in the parturition of her son Jack and the psychological abuse ensues the shift in the perception of reality which impels her to find coping strategies. In this sense, these abuses as well as disenfranchisement produce the traumatized bodies in the text. Because a heterotopically controlled space does not offer many chances, subjugating the attacker becomes unavoidable at that point for survival. Although they seek for ways to break out of the room, Jack feels attached there in such a firm way that he yearns for their intense mother-child relationship of the captivity

⁴ In Austria, Josef Fritzl holds his daughter Elisabeth captive for twenty-four years in the basement of his home where he assaults her and has seven children. The case comes to light in 2008 only when their daughter Kersten needs medical treatment due to kidney failure. The medical staff at the hospital alerts the police because they are suspected of the story Josef told. (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7371959.stm>). In an interview, Emma Donoghue states that “From the Fritzl case I took only the basic notion of an imprisoned woman raising her rapist’s child as happily as possible” (Ue 102).

days even after their emancipation. For this reason, the room, which previously functions as a toxic place, later takes on the meaning of intimacy. In this regard, it can be said that the traumatized bodies and space generate an intricate relationship in the novel. The analysis of this complex interaction consists of three steps: In the first section Old Nick's disciplinary politics and Ma's responses will be examined, which is followed by the section focusing on the interior space, its effects on Jack and also the conflict between the private and the public. The third section uncovers how they yield to trauma and how they work through it via the stages of grief. This part is terminated with a final remark on the interlaced relationship of the body and space.

2.1. "Stories Are a Different Kind of True": Traumatic Subjugation and Resilience

Old Nick⁵ deforces an unnamed woman of age 19 in a morning when she goes to the college library. He tricks the girl into his truck pretending his dog needs help, yet he blindfolds and brings her to his home by giving pills to faint. Her days of repeated trauma⁶ begin when she is locked up into a well-secured isolated room. In terms of body/power relationship, Foucault formulates the idea that the repetition of a productive power on individuals keep them under a constant state of docility which turns the body into a manipulable surface "subjected, used, transformed and improved" (*Discipline and Punish* 136). Applied according to the benefits of its practitioner, a body transformed into a docile platform lose his/her

⁵ The five-year-old narrator, Jack, prefers to call Nick as Old Nick since it is a nickname for the devil in Christianity. Besides, he calls him so because he associates Nick with a cartoon character who only comes in the night (Donoghue, *Room* 14).

⁶ Repeated trauma occurs "when the victim is a prisoner, unable to flee, and under the control of the perpetrator" (Herman 74).

own control in the face of the operator's disciplinary drive. To do so, certain coercive disciplinary techniques are applied: the scale of control, the object of control and modality (*Discipline and Punish* 137). While the first points to the power over the usable parts of the body, the second concentrates upon the body as an exercisable surface. The third deals with the uninterrupted process of coercion through time, space and movement. All these tactics induce that discipline possesses a rigorous domination over the body. Likewise, Old Nick systematically exercises the devices of power on Ma and Jack for years to keep them subjugated. His strategy covers both physical and psychological tactics for the sake of total control.

Old Nick holds a young girl captive in a confined space where no way to escape is possible. Being physically trapped within the confines of a single room, the deprivation of being free in the public, the disconnection with other people, the financial dependency on the captor and the disenfranchisement are factors accelerating the process of traumatization. Space politics, which will be minutely analysed in the next section, become more of an issue of discipline in the novel since "in the first instance, discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 141). Because she is the single person in the room, it makes the abductor to discipline and punish the captive easier. Old Nick practises certain regulating strategies as traumatic stressors. In this respect, Kai Erickson differentiates between "trauma" and "stress" by stating that "trauma," in this familiar distinction, refers to a violent event that injures in one sharp stab, while "stress" refers to a series of events or even to a chronic condition that erodes the spirit more gradually" (185). In her case, it is both trauma and stress that affect her. Ma's initial trauma occurs when she is kidnapped and raped, yet the traumatogenic dynamics remain the sources of stress exercised under the guise

of Old Nick's disciplinary devices. Firstly, captivity leads to the direct exposure to the actions, beliefs and discourse of the perpetrator in such a prolonged state that the authority of the captor causes psychological trauma. His methods of discipline rely on inciting terror and fear, because by doing so the purpose is "to convince the victim that the perpetrator is omnipotent, that resistance is futile, and that her life depends upon winning his indulgence through absolute compliance" (Herman 77). Although a shocking event has happened, she does not yield to him immediately. Ma takes the broken toilet lid and smashes down on Old Nick's head. When he falls on the ground, she presses the knife against his throat so as to get the access code of the door. However, he twists her wrist and gets the knife. Next day when he comes back, he enunciates that first, nothing makes him tell the code and second, if it happens again, he will go away so that she will die of starvation (Donoghue, *Room* 120-121)⁷. After her failure to escape, Ma watches her reactions and behaviours because the captor succeeds to establish a fearful atmosphere of control. Lassagne states that "During any period of forced captivity, a captive suddenly finds that his will falls under the control of his captor, that he must control his emotions and that indeed his behaviour must resemble, if not become, an act of submission" (qtd. in Speckhard et al. 122). Therefore, Ma's later behaviours become an act of submission for the sake of survival. She has to accommodate and comply with his demands which results in the reformation of her wills into his wishes. This causes not only to ingrain terror and fear but also damages Ma's autonomy and self. Since "discipline is an art of rank" (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 146), Old Nick regulates her behaviours effectually to place Ma in a subordinate status.

⁷ The ensuing references to the novel will be given parenthetically by only page numbers.

Despite unexpected threats of escape, the captor does not resort to physical violence, but rather inflicts terror repetitively and systematically to harm in another way. For example, the needs of cooking and heating are met via electricity, yet Old Nick switches off the power just because she screams. He punishes her through the deprivation. The second time he cuts the power is when Jack flicks the switch of his jeep while his mother and Old Nick are sleeping. Even the noise intimidates Old Nick:

“Did you try something? Did you? His voice goes downer. “Because I told you before, it’s on your head if—”

“I was asleep.” Ma’s talking in a squashed tiny voice. “Please— look, look, it was the stupid jeep that rolled off the shelf.” (60).

Because Old Nick regards the slightest act of escape as a threat, he cannot accept it is a jeep that made the noise. He perceives it as a danger to his authority and punishes Ma and Jack by cutting the power again. Without electricity and food, they get weak physically and mentally. Therefore, disempowerment as a docility technique is practised both bodily and psychologically with the aim of making the victim lose her own authority and inner strength. Instead of tormenting physically, Old Nick performs his own disciplinary method of cutting the power to make them docile, which reminds them that their life is at his mercy. Contrary to the unexpected noise of the toy, he gets strength from the expectedness of the idea that he is the only one who can control what goes on in the room. Foucault believes that the punishment intends “to supervise the individual, to neutralize his dangerous state of mind, to alter his criminal tendencies, and to continue even when this change has been achieved” (*Discipline and Punish* 18). For this reason, his wilful choice of punishment method does not explicitly intend to punish her offense, but in fact to regulate her actions. Such controlling penalties, therefore,

does not have pardoning tendencies at the end of punishment, but aims to design docile bodies through physical and mental coercion.

As another disciplinary technique, Foucault argues that the timetable, an old heritage, functions in three methods: It “establishes rhythm, imposes particular occupations and regulates the cycles of repetition” (*Discipline and Punish* 149). Likewise, Old Nick makes a timetable for meeting their food and other needs. It is Sunday that he brings them. They call it “Sunday treat” when they would like to have something special, for instance a lollipop for Jack. The regulatory bond he establishes via food can also be regarded as a method to control their bodies as he decides on what they will take into their bodies. In this sense, when he is frustrated, he turns the power off and does not bring any food. Hence, he establishes total bodily control over victims. Foucault states that “normalization is one of the great instruments of power” (*Discipline and Punish* 184). Old Nick normalizes his timetable of food because he makes them accustomed to get food on a particular schedule. Moreover, because he exerts the same punishment in each circumstance, he problematically normalizes his punishment method of the deprivation of food and electricity.

Food as a control mechanism also serves to his psychological affirmation because he has “a psychological need to justify his crimes” (Herman 75). For instance, on Jack’s fifth birthday, when Old Nick would like to have a slice of cake:

“It’s really getting stale. If you really want-“

“No, forget it, you’re the boss.”

Ma doesn’t say anything.

“I’m just the grocery boy, take out your trash, trek around the kids wear aisles, up the ladder to deice your skylight, at your service ma’am...”

“Thanks for that.” Ma doesn’t sound like her. “It makes it much brighter.”

“There, that didn’t hurt, did it?” (45).

He abducts a young girl, abuses her bodily and psychologically, ignores her social needs yet expects kindness and gratitude for meeting the basic needs such as nourishment or taking out the trash. By doing so, as a tactic, Old Nick aims at having a voluntary captive for whom he does a favour, and in return expects a thank. Therefore, her eagerness will normalize his crime and legitimize his power practices. In another instance, when the broken fan does not operate well and the bad smell infests the room, Old Nick anticipates appreciation instead:

“I don’t think you appreciate how good you’ve got it here,” says Old Nick. “Do you?”

Ma doesn’t say anything.

“Aboveground, natural light, central air, it’s a cut above some places, I can tell you. Fresh fruit, toiletries, what have you, click your fingers and it’s here. Plenty girls would thank their lucky stars a setup like this, safe as houses. Specially with the kid—”

Is that me?

“No drunk drivers to worry about,” he says, “drug pushers, perverts...”

Ma butts in very fast. “I shouldn’t have asked for a fan, it was dumb of me, everything’s fine.” (86).

He believes that Ma frequently asks for things to buy or change instead of being in compliance. Costello-Sullivan states that “Ma’s compliance with Old Nick is conditioned by his expectations and demands for appreciation, despite his role as kidnapper” (96). Since he strives for finding a justification for his acts, he expects the victim to be grateful for the opportunities he offers. What is interesting is that Old Nick does not view himself as an assaulter, yet he states that Ma is safe in the room from the dangers of such people outside. This can also be regarded as

an act of suppressing his guilt and relieving himself. In this respect, Old Nick's way of disciplining and punishing presents a coercive correlation between the practicable body and the gesture, because Foucault aptly calls a disciplined body as a "prerequisite of an efficient gesture" (*Discipline and Punish* 152). As Old Nick hopes certain appreciation gesture from Ma, she obeys his expectations. If she is not docile, then it means that she will be punished through the cut of electricity and food.

Old Nick's control over her body is not limited to the above-mentioned circumstances, because first and foremost he is a sexual attacker who rapes a woman for seven years and has a son. Old Nick comes into the room almost every night after nine o'clock. Jake hides in the wardrobe until Old Nick leaves the room. Even though he does not know about their sexual intercourse, he can still understand something unpleasant happened since Ma is not talkative and happy on the next day. Because Jack does not see Old Nick precisely due to the darkness of the wardrobe, he is confused if he is real or even human:

Women aren't real like Ma is, and girls and boys not either. Men aren't real except Old Nick, and I am not actually sure if he's real for real. Maybe half? He brings groceries and Sunday treat and disappears the trash, but he's not human like us. He only happens in the night, like bats. Maybe Door makes him up with a *beep beep* and the air changes. I think Ma doesn't like to talk about him in case he gets realer (22).

Because Jack's knowledge about all things is limited within the confines of their room, the only woman he knows is his mother and the only man he knows is Old Nick. However, Ma does not approve the rapist seeing or talking to Jack, which leads to the confusion whether he is real or not. When he asks why she hides him away, Ma says that she does not want Old Nick to look at him (32). Because she tries to protect Jack as much as she can, she does not want Old

Nick to harm or to deceive her son. Because Jack does not have the faintest idea that her mother is a sex captive, he is preoccupied with the thought that Old Nick may either be a malicious zombie or a vampire to harm, so her mother hides him (33). Tatjana Bijelic claims that “between his reality and unreality, there is a limbo where he places Old Nick as half-real” (119), which is due to the fact that he does not see Old Nick as a whole, but sees his parts between the gap of wardrobe doors, hears his voice and the bed creak. For this reason, he produces an alternative embodiment for him. Kinga Földváry notes that “Jack’s consciousness transforms his experiences into an uncanny universe in which boundaries between the real and the unreal become dangerously blurred” (216). He does not have the ability to differentiate between the real and the unreal and in this sense, the role of TV is undeniable because he bases his assumptions of the real on the objects appear on TV. On the other side of the coin, Old Nick also does not have an apparent figure of his son in his head. In this respect, his word choice is worthy of note since he calls his son as “it” rather than “he”: “I wait for Ma to say, but she doesn’t. “Five.” I whisper it. Old Nick laughs, I didn’t know he could. “It speaks” (45). Because Ma prevents Old Nick from interacting with Jack in any form so as to protect her son, Old Nick in turn does not even know Jack’s age. In another instance when he calls Jack to give a lollipop, he says: “You’ve never let me get a good look since the day he was born. Poor little freak’s got two heads or something?” (90). When Jack and Ma are alone in the room, they feel safer. Hence, Ma does not encourage Jack to speak with the captor in order to preserve the secure atmosphere as possible as she can. Conversely, Old Nick reduces his son to “it” as if he is yet another object in the room. Bijelic argues that “the mother’s insistence on keeping her son out of sight in the presence of Old Nick serves not only prevent confrontation with possibly disastrous outcomes for Jack,

but also to keep a vital part of herself hidden yet flourishing” (123). Because everything about her is controlled by Old Nick in a particular area of traumatic stress, she makes room for a territory not to be corrupted by his authority. For this reason, Jack’s body functions as a space to keep his mother sane. A body severed from Old Nick’s control, which she nourishes, teaches and entertains with games and stories, means that she produces a counter-space where she reclaims her autonomy. It also helps to restore her integrity and to give her hope for breaking the chains of captivity.

Old Nick does not only have sexual and nutrimental control of their bodies, yet he also has medical control. For instance, she gives birth to Jack in the room without medical help (Jack is her second child as she loses the first due to entanglement of umbilical cord). On his fifth birthday, Ma and Jack talk about Jack’s delivery upon his seeing the stain on the rug. Ma states that Jack slid onto the rug, and she cut the cord (4). Old Nick disconnects Ma from the outside in such a way that he cannot even allow her to receive medical care. As he sees any tie with the outside as a danger to the authority, he avoids medical aid. Because they do not get a healthy diet, Ma seeks vitamin pills, but Old Nick considers that it is a

“Highway robbery.”

“You want us getting sick?”

“It’s a giant rip-off,” says Old Nick. “I saw this expose one time, they all end up in the toilet.”

Who ends up in the Toilet?

“It’s just that if we had a better diet-”

“Oh, here we go. Whine, whine, whine...”

Ma’s voice gets mad. “I bet we’re cheaper to keep than a dog. We don’t even need shoes.” (89).

They lack the necessary nutrition and supplements, yet Old Nick enounces, at every turn, the high cost of living since he has been laid off for six months. Let alone medical help, he does not even provide a better dietary. It clearly means that if they have any malnutrition problem, he will not get them treated at the hospital. Ma regularly takes painkillers to soothe the pain of her decayed teeth and her headache attacks. Herman argues that “chronically traumatized people no longer have any baseline state of physical calm or comfort”, which results in “not only insomnia and agitation but also numerous types of somatic symptoms” (86). Because Ma has been exposed to repeated trauma for so long that her body reacts in intense pains in the head and teeth as well as causing insomnia. Being a sex captive, taking care of the son of her rapist, the disenfranchisement and the deprivation of all sorts of basic needs such as security, food, sanitation, health care and education causes not only psychological trauma, but also bodily damages. Her long-standing headache, therefore, can be considered as the result of enduring for so long. Besides, most of the nights Jack finds his mother awake looking through the skylight. As McFarlane and Yehuda point out, when the traumatic stressors affect vulnerability of the victim, it may develop other disorders (163). For this reason, Ma’s body develops other conditions which explicitly shows her disturbance of the circumstances she has to live with. For this reason, the negative somatic reactions are regarded as the consequences of captivity trauma. Even though people may not develop post-traumatic stress disorder immediately after the traumatic event, her body shows a noticeable discomfort.

Although Ma is exposed to traumatizing stressors, she does not completely surrender to depression. Because she has the instinct to protect her son, she develops ways of resilience. Even though Old Nick stigmatizes Ma’s body as a

surface “manipulated, shaped, trained, which obeys, responds, becomes skilful and increases its forces” (Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 136), Ma resists in her own ways. Foucault in “The Subject and Power” (1982) suggests that “in order to understand what power relations are about, perhaps we should investigate the forms of resistance and attempts made to dissociate these relations” (780) because he believes that at the heart of power relations lies insubordination (794). Ma’s physical power does not suffice to compete with Old Nick’s, as it is seen in the instance of toilet lid, yet she develops psychological strategies to resist. Because power relations test the limits of each opposite group, it produces lines of escape for the subordinate. Therefore, resistance comes in the form of psychological resilience in the novel.

Many years trying to disengage herself from Old Nick, Ma has several failed attempts of escape such as writing notes in trash bag to be found by someone, digging a hole, screaming, turning lights off and on continuously (118). However, because she does not have sufficient material resources to escape or to be noticed, she finds psychological devices to clutch onto life. As she indicates at the beginning of the novel, her son becomes a source of solace for her. They watch TV, sing songs, do exercises, have shower and do all other things together. Among their activities, storytelling is the most active catalyst which paves the way to break the mental captivity. Because stories may accommodate the reality in different forms, they render it bearable. In this regard, Herman believes that the captives tend to alter consciousness to cope with the unbearable reality (87). In the novel, Orwellian manoeuvre of “doublethink” comes up as a way to trick the reality. In “Politics and the English Language” (1947) George Orwell states that “political language is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable,

and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind” (2270). In this respect, in the state of political pressure, the negotiation with the reality requires doublethink. In his dystopian novel called *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), he indicates that “Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one’s mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them” (100) and goes on determining its features as follows:

To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies — all this is indispensably necessary. Even in using the word doublethink it is necessary to exercise doublethink. For by using the word one admits that one is tampering with reality; by a fresh act of doublethink, one erases this knowledge; and so on indefinitely, with the lie always one leap ahead of the truth (100).

In the political orders where subjugation is a matter of life, doublethink as a method is necessary for negotiating with the superior; however, it does not mean complete submission, yet it is the accommodation of two contradictory views in order to fight the powerful. For instance, when Old Nick expects gratitude, Ma thanks him. Jack wonders why she thanked someone she hates. Ma explains that “it was a fake thank” (57). Being under the toxic rules of Old Nick, she exercises doublethink in order not to receive any threat of violence. The most efficient way of doublethink is exercised through stories which are helpful to conceal the grim reality from his son. Ma’s reclamation of a vulnerable reality creates an illusion of normalcy and safety for Jack. Apart from the stories she tells him to entertain, she disillusions Jack with the stories which are in fact tales of their captivity. For example, Ma tells the biblical narrative of St. Peter who was put in jail by King Herod. Before the day of his trial, he sees an angel opening a door for him to

leave. However, they are put in a room by Old Nick and no matter how much they pray for to leave, no miracle happens for them. They call the sun as “God’s yellow face”, but when they pray like St. Peter to get out, angels do not succour. In another instance, she readapts her own story into “Little Mermaid”, in which the mermaid is kidnapped by a fisherman and is brought to his cottage. After some time, the mermaid has a baby. Thus, she does not directly expose him with their captivity but she storifies it. This transformation of the real alienates their captivity and produces an illusion of normalcy.

On the one hand, the stories pave the way for the feeling of security, on the other she needs to tell the truth to plan their escape. She tells Jack that she had a family and life outside before her entrapment, but Jack delves into the fantasy world too much to grasp the truth. According to their escape plan, Jack will pretend to be ill, and he will tell their captivity to the hospital staff to rescue Ma in the room. However, Jack is deluded by the illusion of safety in the room which leads him to reject the plan. To persuade Jack, Ma makes use of stories again. First, she tells the story of Alice who talks to her cat Dinah in her head all the time, which will make Jack remember that her mother is with him in his head (134). Then, she reminds him of the story of Count of Monte Cristo who pretends to be his dead friend to escape from the guards. Jack will pretend to be ill to escape from the room (153). Because he still has question marks hanging over, she tells the story of Juliet who drinks a medicine to pretend to be ill but wakes up three days later (153). Therefore, the stories do not only enrich the narrative layers of the novel, but also are functional in comforting Jack. Although Old Nick resorts to different kinds of physical and psychological manoeuvre of subjugation, Ma can only use stories for psychological resilience. Enduring the

repetitive threat for seven years, she focuses on finding psychological ways to keep herself alive. For this reason, she does not sink into trauma during her captivity. Although her experiences are quite traumatic, she adopts an adaptive manner in order not to risk her life. According to McFarlane and Yehuda, “PTSD [Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder] does not develop in the immediate aftermath of a traumatic event” (156). For this reason, after the following section examining the space politics which is the true origin of trauma, the post-traumatic impairment and the step into recovery will be analysed in the final section of this chapter.

2.2. “Room’s not on any Map”: Spatial Features of The Room and The Antinomy of Inside/ Outside

From the time when she is trapped in the boxy room, Ma attempts to escape many times. As she tries, she explores the spatial features of the room. Being in the public space until she is twenty, she can compare how it feels to be both inside and outside spaces. Unlike her, Jack does not have any clue about the life outside since he was born in the room. Therefore, not only the toxic qualities of the room but also the conflict between the private and public will be analysed in this section.

When she first comes into the room, Ma is not fully aware of its spatial qualities, yet she sees a tiny space with only a skylight. After she tells Jack about the life outside, he wonders how Old Nick built the room. Ma replies: “Just a basic twelve-by-twelve, vinyl-coated steel. But he added a soundproof skylight, and lots of insulating foam inside the walls, plus a layer of sheet lead, because lead kills all sound. Oh, and a security door with a code. He boasts about what a neat job he made of it” (106). Besides, when she digs a hole to escape, she realizes

that there is a layer of fence under floor joists, in all the walls and even the roof so she could never cut through (120). The shed he built in his backyard, therefore, is intentionally designed to avoid escape. Firstly, Foucault notes that we do not necessarily take spaces as the containers in which human beings are inserted (“Of Other Spaces” 333), but rather, spaces represent certain meanings. Therefore, the garden shed in the novel cannot simply be taken as a space in which people live because it represents Old Nick’s morbid desires. Hence, the room becomes a spatial-psychological device serving for power and control. Although it has a place in the physical world and is therefore localizable, it does not have any recognition in the outer world because such an illegitimate space contravenes human rights. In this regard, the room can be considered as a heterotopia which subverts the public norms. Foucault argues that heterotopias are localizable counter-sites which invert the other cultural sites. When categorizing heterotopias, he states that “heterotopias of deviation are those in which individuals whose behaviour is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed” (“Of Other Spaces” 334). Being deviant from the norms of society, Old Nick therefore builds a space where he puts his rules into practice. The room becomes an “other” space where Ma and Jack do not have a say or value. Ma functions only as a tool for fulfilling his desires. For this reason, her body becomes a surface on which he inscribes his toxic actions. Losing all the human values, Ma becomes a property to be dominated and controlled. Thus, the room does not represent a neutral space, yet it is a space of crime which inflicts the codes of sexual offence on her body. Hence, the relationship between sexuality and space is highly interwoven in the novel because the female resident of the room means sexuality for the assaulter. To control spatially, Old Nick operates a panopticon-like system. Foucault notes that

We know the principle on which it was based: at the periphery, an annular building, at the centre, a tower; this tower is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; the other, on the outside, allows the light to cross the cell from one end to the other. All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central lower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy. By the effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, the small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery. They are like so many cages, so many small theatres, in which each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible (*Discipline and Punish* 200).

The spatial features of panopticon enable to monitor the imprisoned from many different angles without her/his knowledge of being seen, which guarantees the flawless operation of the order. Thus, the architecture exercises power instead of people. The assumption of being under surveillance, therefore, “automatizes and disindividualizes power” (*Discipline and Punish* 202). For this reason, the role of the architecture in the path to make bodies submissive is undeniable. Likewise, Old Nick disindividualizes and disenfranchises a young girl through the architecture, which results in the trauma of the victim. Being controlled within such a confined space offering not many chances, the architecture surveils Ma on behalf of Old Nick. Since the architecture is a disciplinary modality practised to “reinforce or reorganize the internal mechanism of power” (Rabinow 206), then the architectural organization of the locked garden shed brings the notion of gender into question because the gender determines the internal mechanism of power in the novel. Considering that this dynamism is also built over the stark dichotomy of inside and outside, Old Nick outside and Ma inside can also be relatable to man/woman binary.

In the chapter entitled “The Dialectics of Inside and Outside” in his work *The Poetics of Space* (1957), Gaston Bachelard states that “outside and inside form a dialectic division” (211) and “it is always like that: outside and inside do not receive in the same qualifying epithets that are the measure of our adherence. Nor can one live the qualifying epithets attached to inside and outside in the same way” (215). In this regard, man and woman have different qualifying epithets in terms of the dichotomy of outside and inside. While the feminine sphere as inside is associated with domesticity and confinement, male sphere, namely outside, is linked with mobility and immensity. Basing her argument on the architectural structure of an American home, Laura Mulvey states that

Lifting the roof off the American home, like the lid off a casket, opening its domestic space into a complex terrain of social and sexual significance, the opposition, for instance, between upstairs/private and downstairs/public space, the connotation of stairs, bedroom, kitchen. And this “interior” also contains within it “interiority”, the psychic spaces of desire and anxiety, and the private scenarios of feelings, a female sphere of emotion within the female sphere of domesticity (“Pandora” 55).

While the private upstairs anchor the unspeakable secrecy of sexuality, it also nestles interiority within the interior through the psychic desires which are kept repressed in the unconscious. Because a female body is directly associated with sexuality in the patriarchal psyche, she is regarded as something to be kept in the box. However, a male body is identified with outer space. Ludmilla Jordanova argues that “Women’s bodies and, by extension, female attributes, cannot be treated as fully public, something dangerous might happen, secrets be let out, if they were open to view” (92). Because in the novel the female body is reduced to the notion of secret or private, like in the metonymy of Pandora’s secrecy kept in a box, Ma’s sexuality is locked within the room. While the interiority of the room means

rape and disenfranchisement for Ma, the qualifying epithets are different for Old Nick who unveils his dark desires and relieves his sexual tension. Foucault argues that representation, which produces a hidden space that accommodates and governs all forms of discursive modes and means of the system of identity, also represents itself (*The Order* 209). Therefore, the room becomes such a complex system of representation which hosts binaries signifying different implications for each gender. However, from a feminist perspective, it represents the toxicity of the patriarchal thought and its projection on the female body.

Because the architecture is not a neutral platform, the thresholds in the novel such as the door and the window become the symbol of the binary of inside/outside. The door, especially, functions as an overwhelming regime of control because it can only be open with a passcode. A sound of beep is heard after he dials the code. Because the door is only at his service, it loses the implication of a gate between the public and private for Ma. Instead, it becomes an agonizing symbol of entrapment for her. The windows, on the other hand, function slightly different due to the transparency. Architecturally the windows are meant to be the source of light and it is the glass frame which allows a reciprocal voyeurism.

Jacques Lacan remarks that

The window if it gets a bit dark and if I have reasons for thinking that there is someone behind it, is straightway a gaze. From the moment this gaze exists, I am already something other, in that I feel myself becoming an object for the gaze of others. But in this position, which is a reciprocal one, others also know that I am an object who knows himself to be seen (215).

Although the gaze is reciprocal in the case of a window, it is unilateral in the novel due to the position of the window located in the ceiling. The only thing they see is the sky. If the window is covered with leaves and Ma requests Old

Nick to remove them, he can gaze inside. Because the window dysfunctions the possibility of a reciprocal gaze, it again fulfils the role of imposing psychological confinement for Ma who lacks the authorial power the gaze brings in its wake. For this reason, not only the window but the room as a whole gives its builder the full authority to gaze because gazing as a regime is also under his control. Therefore, the spatiality leads to the fact that the objects in the room have much authority over the victims as they have over the objects.

As the lenses of Jack narrates inside the room, he uses the capitalized names such as Wardrobe, Carpet, Bed, Table etc. Although generic names are used for similar objects of the same kind, Jack lacks the perception of similar, for example the only wardrobe he knows is their wardrobe. Although this technique is used to give human characteristics to the inanimate object, in the novel, contrarily, the mother and son are reduced to the objects in the room. Because Jack is very a common name and Ma does not even have an identity, they do not distinguish themselves from the things in the room. According to Khem Raj Sharma, Jack's name "is a common boy name used in many fairy tales and folk tales such as *Jack and the Beanstalk*. Using a common name for the young protagonist, Donoghue creates the idea of an 'everyman' Jack" (146). Although in traditional narratives the protagonist is meticulously and specifically chosen, in the novel his name connotes that any child could be in his place. As for Ma, she represents any ideal mother who protects, nurtures and teaches her child even in the state of captivity. Thus, instead of giving importance to who they are, the narrative focuses on how they are transformed into being another object in the room. In this regard, the objects and the people in the room come to represent one another. Besides, the residents also begin to transform into each other. Jack cannot individuate

himself from Ma to the extent that he perceives that they almost share one body: “I still don’t tell her about the web. It’s weird to have something that’s mine-not-Ma’s. Everything else is both ours. I guess my body is mine and the ideas that happen in my head. But my cells are made out of her cells so I’m kind of hers” (11-12). Being in a confined space where he does not see anyone else and where he does not even know whether the people outside are real, Jack questions his presence and autonomy. Because of this, having a body becomes a complicated matter for Jack.

Television, as an instrument of entertainment, becomes the most important object in their room but they determine certain periods of time to watch it in order not to let it “rot their brain” (40) or “turn them into a zombie” (75). Laura Mulvey states that after the spread of TV sets at homes, it “becomes a charged with metaphor and connotation linking middle-class interior, motherhood, prosperity and repression” (“Melodrama” 64). Because the interior as the area of the female is reorganized with this new apparatus of financial status, TV turns into a medium of illusion which is supposed “to conceal tensions and contradictions on both sides” of the antinomy of inside/outside (Mulvey, “Melodrama” 69). Because through TV shows new sorts of representation of womanhood is conceptualized, it accelerated the conversion of TV into a possession of female space. However, as an insurrection, Ma rejects spending time with watching shows which makes it an entertainment only for Jack. However, it dissociates his perception of reality. Because Jack is not aware of the fact that there is a world beyond the walls of their room, his cognition is limited to the things in this enclosing space. He accepts that only the things in the room are real. Although his mother explains him that the objects on TV are reflections, he is still confused. For example, when

he sees the pills of Ma on TV, he supposes that Old Nick lives inside their TV and gets out with the pills when Ma asks for. She says:

“Listen. What we see on TV is... it’s pictures of real things.”

That’s the most astonishing I’ve ever heard.

“Dora’s real for real?”

She takes her hand away. “No, sorry. Lots of TV is made-up pictures. Dora’s just a drawing but the other people, the ones with faces that look like you and me, they’re real.”

“Actual humans?”

She nods. “And the places are real too, like farms and forests and airplanes and cities...”

“Nah.” Why is she tricking me? “Where would they fit?”

“Out there,” says Ma. “Outside.” (73-74).

The failure in differentiating himself from Ma as well as the blurred boundaries of the fantasy and reality are the consequences of the spatial-psychological features of the room, yet as he grows older, Ma elucidates him by enlarging his schemata and assumptions of the outside world even if it is hard for Jack to comprehend all these in an instant. Marisol Morales Ladron illustrates that “from the beginning of the novel, reality is presented as a construction whose validity relies on the point of view of the onlooker and not on shared common perceptions” (88). While his knowledge of outside is restricted with the images he sees on TV, Ma knows outside well since she was there before. For this reason, it is not easy for Jack, who lives in a tiny room since he was born, to grasp, for example, how large is outside and where airplanes fit. The reality for him, therefore, is based on his personal experience of the reality. As long as the room exists and he is inside, then all the things around is real. Because Ma and Jack are commoditized, Jack’s cognition perceives the reality of their bodies based also on the experience of the room. When he is in the back of Old Nick’s trunk, he thinks that “I am not in Room. Am I still me? Moving now, I am zooming along in the truck for real for really real” (172). Even though in the room they rehearsed their escape plan many

times, he suddenly questions his embodiment because he identifies himself with inside. According to their plan, Ma stays in the room waiting to be rescued, but he firstly refused it because Ma will continue to be real in the room whereas he will not. However, once he is outside, he realizes that outside is also real. When he jumps out of the trunk running to the first person he sees, he requestions the real: “The tiny one [baby] in the push-thing isn’t a real one, I think, it’s a doll. The dog is small but a real one, it’s doing a poo in a bag like it’s a treasure, I think it’s a he, the somebody with short hair like Old Nick but curlier and he’s browner than the baby. I go, “Help”, but it doesn’t come out very loud (175). On the one hand, he realizes that all the things he saw on TV are real, on the other he confronts with the shock to receive a wide range of real things. Földváry argues that “Jack’s sense of uniqueness, both of himself and of the phenomena of the universe, is shattered in the moment of contact with the outside world” (217). This unusual contact destroying his sense of uniqueness leads him to unspeak his experiences to the officer. When he finally speaks, it does not sound helpful enough because of his limited experience:

“Where is Room?”

“Room’s not in a house”, I say again.

“I’m having trouble understanding, Jack. What’s in it then?”

“Nothing. Room’s inside.”

“So what’s outside it?”

“Outside.” (188-189).

As he is outside for the first time and does not know about the exact location of their cell, it becomes compelling for Jack to share what he knows, yet he succeeds to tell that it is in the backyard and has a skylight, which suffices to find the room and to save Ma. Eric D. Lister argues that “When one is physically vulnerable, fearing further violence or death, this forced silence necessarily shapes

subsequent reaction to the trauma” (872). For this reason, it is not deliberate for Jack to unvoice their room since he worries about being subjected to violence and not being able to rescue Ma. When they find Ma, she is happy to be free, yet Jack is still under the influence of the shock of undergoing too much of outside. When she says “we’re never going back” (193), Jack cries since he needs the calming and comforting atmosphere of the room rather than the sense of liberty. Hannah Arendt notes that “Since our feeling for reality depends utterly upon appearance and therefore upon the existence of a public realm into which things can appear out of the darkness of sheltered existence, even the twilight which illuminates our private and intimate lives is ultimately derived from the much harsher light of the public realm” (51). Because Jack develops his sense of reality depending on the private realm, the public sphere destroys all he knows ranging from objects outside to publicity itself. Therefore, this traumatizing experience forces him to reorganize his sense of reality.

When the toxic private space receded all of a sudden, not only the comforting and secured atmosphere of the room is eliminated but also the sense of perpetuity is ruined in an unsettling way. Because they are now free, all the rules and order of the room die out:

“Let’s get cleaned up.”

“We haven’t had breakfast,” I tell her.

“We can do that after.”

I shake my head. “Breakfast comes before bath.”

“It doesn’t have to Jack.”

“But—”

“We don’t have to do the same things as we used to” says Ma
(213).

From their regular daily routine to the rhyming words said before sleeping, such as “night-night, sleep tight, don’t let the bugs bite” (272), all their habits are

terminated abruptly. While contacting all the stimuli he has not encountered before is already beyond his grasp, all his routine also changes. Physically, he needs to get accustomed to descending and ascending stairs, enlarging his eyesight and acquiring immunity to germs. Psychologically, he needs to become familiar with the social adjustment such as talking to people outside and getting to know his relatives and making new friends. Arendt states that “the reality of the public realm relies on the simultaneous presence of innumerable perspectives” (57). Only when his room-based perspective of reality begins to wane, can his new perception of the public realm accelerate the adoption of the shared values of outside.

Because he is not yet to accept the presence of other perspectives in the outside world, he produces the reality on his own. Once his belief in the reality of the room shatters, he produces alternative captivities to feel safe. Thus, he considers that they are now trapped in the hospital. Producing alternative entrapments is the result of seeing outside without being there. He innocently asks: “Are we a secret again?” (218) or “Are we locked in here?” (238). Because he is now in the hospital ward looking at outside through the window as it is in their room, he cannot remind himself that he is now spatially as free as a bird. Because discipline is highly interrelated with a coded space, he resembles the medical gaze of the doctors to the controlling gaze of Old Nick. Foucault states that “Discipline is, above all, analysis of space; it is individualization through space, the placing of bodies in an individualized space that permits classification and combinations (“The Incorporation” 147). Being transferred from one confined space to another, the hospital disindividualizes them under medical help. In the hospital, the classificatory medical assist and the surveillance of staff medicalize

the gaze, which becomes a disciplinary technique allowing the physician to examine the body in order to diagnose the disease. Foucault argues that

Medical gaze circulates within an enclosed space in which it is controlled only by itself; in sovereign fashion, it distributes to daily experience the knowledge that it has borrowed from afar and of which it has made itself both the point of concentration and the centre of diffusion. In that experience, medical space can coincide with social space, or, rather, traverse it and wholly penetrate it. One began to conceive of a generalized presence of doctors whose intersecting gazes form a network and exercise at every point in space, and at every moment in time, a constant, mobile, differentiated supervision (*The Birth of the Clinic* 36).

Because the medical gaze of the doctor and the medical space coincide with the social space of the individual, Jack makes analogies between the discipline in the hospital and the discipline in the room. Similar to their room, in the hospital they also have a ward with a bathroom. The difference is the placement of the window in the hospital which enables Jack to see around unlike their skylight narrowing his sight. He still looks at outside through a window rather than being there. For this reason, in the hospital room, he does not enjoy being a medical object under the surveillance. The spatial relationship between both rooms, therefore, functions inhibitory, which causes him to feel like Old Nick can be there at any time (218). Although he is told that Old Nick is arrested, what he wonders is if his truck is in jail as well. Hence, as also presented in the previous instances, the confinement as a disciplinary technique diminishes the perception of reality.

Spending most of their time inside their hospital room, Jack still does not feel secure enough to go out and he alleges as pretexts to postpone it. In his first experience of outside, he feels like the wind is going to rip him and his skin is burning off (246). He cannot even breathe which shows that he is physically not ready to be there. In his second experience, Noreen storifies their going out to

soothe him. He pretends that he is watching himself on TV, going for a walk with his mother and friend (262). The stories, which in the room function as a method of breaking the mental captivity, again serves for the purpose of reducing psychological recession. Even though it is a short visit, the storytelling works enough to keep him busy. The third one, however, becomes a puzzling experience. While he is perturbed since he is not with Ma but with his uncle's family, he is bewildered to be in the mall with a crowd of people around. Being outside is already a new and hard-to-inured experience, yet he also notices that the knowledge he learned inside cannot be transferred into outside. If he would like to suck his mother's breasts, people find it odd because of his age. He can shower with his Ma in the room, but people outside find it odd to see other people's private parts. He can grow his hair long inside, however people outside do not find it proper for a boy to have long hair. These features of spatial androgyny emphasized in the novel is also included in the movie adaptation of the novel directed by Lenny Abrahamson. Bijelic states that "the ostensible gender sameness and ambivalence that lead from the seemingly claustrophobic space of the Room into a realm of androgynous possibilities is visibly present both in the Room and Outside parts of the novel and is equally emphasized in the movie scenes that feature gender misunderstandings" (121). The reason that Jack does not know about gender-related norms of society is because in the room Ma sustains gender vulnerability by focusing more on the bond with her child rather than teaching gender norms. However, when they are finally free, it becomes compelling to adapt to a totally new world not only physically, but also culturally since it is drastic to accept, for Jack, a world attaching importance to pre-acquired gender behaviours. When in the mall, his aunt helps Bronwyn to re-wear her pants after toilet, Jack discerns that she has different genitals from him and Ma. When he touches, her aunt bangs his

hand away and the gold bits make his wrist bleed (308). Erving Goffman in *Interaction Ritual* (1967) states that “when the individual senses that he or other participants are failing to allocate their involvement according to standards that he approves, and in consequence that they are conveying an improper attitude toward the interaction and the participants, then his sentiments are likely to be roused by the impropriety” (125). When his expectation of interaction does not match with that of his aunt, she responds in an improper behaviour rather than explaining why he should not touch. Therefore, learning becomes hurtful, and he cries and thinks how confusing the rules of the outside world. Although he has never been abused in the room, outside he gets traumatizing memories, which results in the feeling of alienation and longing for the room. For this reason, when he makes a wish by throwing a coin into the fountain, he wishes to be back in the room with his mother.

The distressful progress of social integration teaches Jack how to behave. He says: “I’m learning lots more manners. When something tastes yucky we say it’s interesting, like wild rice that bites like it hasn’t been cooked. When I blow my nose I fold the tissue so nobody sees the snot, it’s a secret. If I want Ma to listen to me not some person else I say, “Excuse me,”” (254). Working on the manners of outside confuses Jack and he undergoes an adaptation crisis. Learning all forms of social manners alienate him in such a way that he ends up with dehumanizing himself. When he talks with Dr Lopez, he nods at what he says: “everything’s strange, because you’re like a visitor from another planet, aren’t you?” (281). Besides, when he talks with Dr Clay he asks:

What’s humankind?

“The human race, all of us.”

“Is that me too?”

“Oh, for sure, you’re one of us.”

“And Ma.”

Dr Clay nods. “She is one too.”

But what I actually meant was maybe I’m a human but I’m a me-and-Ma as well. I don’t know a word for us two. Roomers?”
(342).

Because Jack finds it difficult to get all the manners of this post-room society, he has a sense of social defamiliarization. Arendt argues that “A man who lived only a private life, who like the slave was not permitted to enter the public realm, or like the barbarian had chosen not to establish such a realm, was not fully human.” (38). A human being is also a socio-political individual who has the right to be in the public realm. With this right taken away, the ways of society make him feel dehumanized, insulating his manners from the rest. Goffman explains the reasons and forms of alienation arising from interaction. In Jack’s case, he is not familiar with the context of communication, therefore, he is alienated from the interaction itself. Goffman argues that

Once individuals enter a conversation, they are obliged to continue it until they have the kind of basis for withdrawing that will neutralize the potentially offensive implications of taking leave of others. While engaged in the interaction it will be necessary for them to have subjects at hand to talk about that fit the occasion and yet provide content enough to keep the talk going; in other words, safe supplies are needed (120).

Jack does not involve in the interaction as he does not know the accepted ways to reply. He withdraws himself and queries on the contrast between the manners of inside and outside. When he finds them disparate from each other, he loses the wish to be a participant, hence he ends up with alienating himself from the rest. Psychologically, what he goes through can be explained through the term “complex trauma” which “involves not only the shock of fear but also, more fundamentally, a violation of and challenge to the fragile, immature, and newly emerging self. Complex trauma often leaves the child unable to self-regulate, to achieve a sense

of self-integrity, or to experience relationships as nurturing and reliable resources that support self-regulation and self-integrity” (Ford and Courtois 16). Noticing the need of readjustment to survive in the public space, he stumbles to build a new self in the new world. As a result, he mainly loses his sense of self-integrity because he already does not feel like being a member of society. He dissociates himself because he feels disconnected like an alien. Because all he learned so far is shattered in an undesirable and unexpected way, he prefers the safety of the room and the continuation of his manners taught by Ma. For this reason, all the conflicts he experiences rip his social identity and selfhood away.

After their room and hospital, the following space is his grandma’s house where he, for the first time, lives with someone else’s interior rules, which are again the general manners of society. He says that

I can go in the bedroom unless the door’s shut when I have to knock and wait. I can go in the bathroom unless it won’t open, that means anybody else is in it and I have to wait. The bath and sink and toilet are green called avocado, except the seat is wood so I can sit on that. I should put the seat up and down again after as a courtesy to ladies, that’s Grandma (328).

Because outsiders also have manners at home, he also needs to learn basic domestic rules. Because in their secured room they do not have much space to set up rules, Ma raises Jack free with less limitations. For this reason, the regulations and rules cause Jack to long for his days in the room. To preserve his sense of nostalgia, he would like to keep Rug brought by the police from the room. He says that “we knowed what everything was called [in the room] but in the world there’s so much” (333). Rather than being subjected to anything new, he prefers to establish his own roomlike environment with the furniture they used there because he wants to release the tension of outside manners through a spatial connection

with the room. Herman states that “prisoners tenaciously seek to maintain communication with a world outside the one in which they are confined. They fight to preserve physical tokens of fidelity. They may risk their lives for the sake of a wedding ring, a letter, a photograph, or some other small memento of attachment” (81). Even though Ma never had a token to reconnect to her parents or friends, Jack considers the rug as a token reminding him of the safety of the room, which is also a symbol of life and death: Being delivered on the rug and rolled in it pretending to be dead in order to escape. Getting a brand-new start in this new space as a final resort, Jack does not feel like at home and says that “How is it home if I’ve never been here?” (377). Therefore, he finds it difficult to orient to the new space. Instead of having a boxy room, the new flat offers separate rooms for Jack and Ma, yet he does not want to lose his attachment to his mother because he is used to spend most of his time with Ma. As the room turns out to be a coded space, they carry these codes into the spaces they reside. For this reason, the shadow of the room follows everywhere. This interwoven relationship between the room and the bodies come to the point of representing one another. Because outsiders inscribe the captivity codes of the room on their bodies, this dual representation causes a spatial conflict in their new start. Although Ma cannot stand cagelike spaces and seeks for more room, Jack still finds the cure in the confinement. Her desire for separation stems from the violent forms desire that Ma is subjected to in the room. René Girard in *Violence and The Sacred* (1979) argues that the nature of violence is irrational, and it always finds a surrogate victim (2). Because Old Nick’s sexual drive is violent which is materialized on Ma through the methods of oppression, his illogical instinctive behaviour leads her to label the room as poisonous. From Jack’s part, he is protected from molestation, physical abuse and face-to-face interaction. Therefore,

what he feels is a close mother-son attachment which causes him to ascribe healing qualities to the room. Because the room holds the features of being both poison and remedy, it can be considered within the concept of pharmakon. Derrida argues pharmakon's ambivalence takes its source from holding both edges of the binary. As the "*différance* of the difference", contradictions and pairs "are lifted from the bottom of its diacritical, differing, deferring, reserve." (Derrida, *Dissemination* 127). The privileged position of a group in pairs is therefore destroyed. With the deconstructionist method of reaching the meaning through the chains of signifiers, pharmakon functions as a *différance*. Although domestic spaces are associated with security and comfort, this meaning is postponed in the novel through the signifiers bearing both poisonous and curative implications for the same space. Ma and Jack attributes the texture of pharmakon to the room with their perspectives diverting from each other. Therefore, featuring both pairs paves the way for the spaces to be read as the influencers of the psychological well-being. When they decide to revisit the room to deconstruct the pharmakon and to have an agreement on the room in one direction, the room changes their understanding of spatial acceptability. Being one stressor of trauma, hence the heterotopic room in the novel turns out to be the marker of the psycho-spatial codes which affect not only their spatial perceptions but also their room-oriented stigmatization of the body. Even though this labelling does not disentangle at once, they at least have an attempt to step into a new life which will be examined in the next section.

2.3. "It's like a Crater, a Hole Where Something Happened": Trauma and Working Through

As it is minutely examined in the previous sections, Old Nick exercises certain physical, psychological and spatial tactics of domination. Ma does not sink into the trauma directly in the room but seeks ways to cope with it. She strives against the toxic atmosphere of the room. No matter how she adapts to this compelling life, she fails to cope with it when she is outside. Although she anticipates empathy to go on her life, people engrave more pain. In this regard, this section focuses on how their life outside unveils her trauma and how she works through it.

Expecting to be totally free, Ma feels alive when they are rescued. Her first encounter with outside life is therefore full of hope. She always motivates Jack by promising better days. However, people do not respect or understand it was an anguished captivity. In the instance when the nurse, Noreen, asks:

“Probably a bit homesick, aren’t you?”

“Homesick?” Ma’s staring at her.

“Sorry, I didn’t—”

“It wasn’t a *home*, it was a soundproof cell.” (258).

Although she was trapped in a shed where she has no control over what happens, Noreen calls such a bleak space as home. Although home is not only a shelter but a space where a cosy atmosphere is shared by its members, their captivity in such a room cannot be called home. Instead of understanding her suffering, Noreen treats the cell as a homelike place where she had good days. In another instance, one of the friends of Grandma says “Well, I don’t know. I spent a week in a monastery in Scotland once. It was peaceful.” (350). Because she thinks that outside is chaotic and people gain inner peace in such monasteries, she compares this to the captivity of Ma and Jack. Being away from the chaos of the world,

however, is not equal at all to being a captive and being systematically abused by a captor.

On the one hand, while she gets therapy for what she had endured, people outside are not helpful to recover and reintegrate. As she successfully managed to control the shadow of the archon in the room, this balance shifts outside. Derrida states that the archon as the authoritative figure of memory “are first of all the document’s guardians. They do not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited and of the substrate. They also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archives” (*Archive Fever* 2). Because her archon interprets all the traumatizing experience in the room as requiring resilience, she intentionally represses the memories to reinforce stamina. However, repressing does not mean that she can easily forget and move on. The other element that triggers her archon to unearth the trauma is media. Because their story attracts the attention of people, the press, they call “vultures”, needlessly chases and bothers them everywhere. Even when they visit dentist, they see a helicopter full of paparazzi trying to take pictures (265). As Jack is used to watch TV in the room, he watches it in the hospital as well and hears the voice saying: “The malnourished boy, unable to walk, is seen here lashing out convulsively at one of his rescuers.” (205). The gaslighting language of the news tramples Jack to such a degree that the media do not even realize that he is under the instant shock of being outside. Instead of empathizing the tragedy of people, the media prefers to belittle and to pity with the purpose of attracting more attention of the viewers. Likewise, the papers also opine in the same line with a headline saying “HOPE FOR BONSAI BOY”:

The haunting long-haired Little Prince is the product of his beautiful young mother’s serial abuse at the hands of Garden-Shed

Ogre (captured by state troopers in a dramatic standoff Sunday at two a.m.). Jack says everything is “nice” and adores Easter eggs but still goes up and down stairs on all fours like a monkey. He was sealed up for all his five years in a rotting cork-lined dungeon, and experts cannot yet say what kind or degree of long-term developmental retardation— (269).

Falling wide of the mark, Jack is humiliated by being identified as “bonsai” and “monkey” for the sake of sensational journalism. He cries out against being a tree, a monkey or being haunting. Neither tool of the media appreciates their escape and supports their eventual retrieval of freedom and all rights. Instead, they attribute pejorative codes to their bodies which stigmatize their presence in society. Therefore, Old Nick’s insulting attributions to Ma’s body are followed by that of the media. Although Jack learns manners, social adaptation and rules of integration, such news demotivates him in a way to overthink about these stigmas. In another instance, Jack is excited to be on TV because something he watched for a long time now offers his own image. He reassures that he is real and people on TV can also be real. He comes across with his name in a program where people talk about him on a metaphorical level:

“We’re all Jack, in a sense,” says another man sitting at the big table.

“Obviously,” says another one.

“The inner child, trapped in our personal Room one oh one,” says another of the men, nodding.

I don’t think I was ever in that room.

“But then perversely, on release, finding ourselves alone in a crowd...”

“Reeling from the sensory overload of modernity,” says the first one.

“*Post-modernity.*” (366).

On the one hand he wonders what they talk about him, on the other what he hears does not make any sense. People even bring their tragedy to the fore in a discussion program which has no benefit for their recovery strife. People take their

captivity only in the light of popularity because they do not gather to discuss how society can support them, yet they speak of a postmodern condition of individualistic estrangement based on their story. Keeping their story on the agenda of the media in different contexts affects their life so negatively that the doctors do not advise even going outside, which produces another form of captivity for them. Hoping to be free and leaving hard times behind become even more painful than Ma expects. The manipulation of the media to produce an audience for their profit harms the victims, yet “production for profit means that the executives of the culture industries attempt to produce artifacts that will be popular, that will sell, or, in the case of radio and television, that will attract mass audiences.” (Kellner 16). Therefore, their story becomes a media artifact that aims to reach maximum people, which results in a group of fans coming into existence sending gifts and donating money. When their lawyer Morris visits at the hospital, he even suggests her to write a book before anyone else steals their story (249). He encourages her to commercialize the captivity days as an artifact, which shows the undeniable relationship between popular media and consumer culture. Douglas Kellner proposes that “Consumer culture offers a dazzling array of goods and services that induce individuals to participate in a system of commercial gratification. Media and consumer culture work hand in hand to generate thought and behaviour that conform to existing values, institutions, beliefs, and practices.” (3). While the media produces such an artifact, it also brings along new consumers who keep up with the popularity. Due to this understanding, the popularity reaches to the point of people taking autographs from Jack. Although he is a five-year old who does not even sign his name, the media attracts people’s attention in such a way that their identities do not remain hidden as the doctors advise. On the one hand, her identity is already sold beyond her control into the serve of

Old Nick, on the other, people now expect to sell her identity to the mass media. However, because Ma is fed up with the media vultures following and harassing them everywhere, she decides to attend an arranged interview assuming that replying all their questions will help leave them alone so that they can recover and move on. Nevertheless, the questions are geared towards attracting more audience instead of letting her talk about her days of captivity. The reporter asks such questions: “If you ever found herself emotionally dependent to your captor?”, “Did you feel bad about deceiving Jack?”, “When you think about your captor now, are you eaten up with hate?”, “Do you think you’ll be able to bring yourself to forgive him?”, “Is there a sense in which you miss being behind a locked door?”, “Did you ever consider asking your captor to take Jack away for adoption?”. Although an interview is supposed to develop in a question-and-answer format, the interviewer begins to interrogate in such a disturbing manner that she neither waits for her answer nor asks neutral questions. Although she was expecting to tell her story once and for all, she does not even have the ground to talk yet finds herself involved in an atmosphere that accuses her of raising Jack in bad conditions. After the interview, Ma questions herself a lot and falls into depression which digs her traumas up. Despite her well-care in the hospital, she begins to neglect Jack and also rejects seeing her family. She feels that not only she lost seven years in the room without any recognition, but also was blamed for stealing a good childhood from Jack by removing the option to give him up for adoption. The shadow of these losses falls onto her ego and absorbs her in such a way that she sinks into melancholia. Freud defines the traits of melancholia as “painful dejection, cessation of interest in the outside world, loss of capacity to love, inhibition of all activity and lowering of the self-regarding feelings” (“Mourning and Melancholia” 244). Ma loses her interest in going outside, spending time with

Jack, having her personal care and even getting out of bed. She reproaches herself because her archon steps into the action of evoking traumatic memories happened in the room. Because the nurses do not notice her state, she attempts to commit suicide by taking too many pills. After Jack comes back from the mall, he sees his mother lying still in the bed. An urgent call to the nurse helps them save her life and undergo a long course of treatment. The archon strongly reminds her of the grief in the room that she realizes she has endured for too long. Even though she delayed it with the help of resilience, at some point it bursts onto a scene of melancholia. Therefore, the traumatic bereavement and Kübler-Rossian stages of grief are provoked by the archon. The first stage called denial comes with the questions such as “Is it true? Did it really happen?”, “How did this happen?” (*On Grief* 10). Like an external narrative mode, the patient is not ready to face the loss. Because people are unconsciously tended to view that it never happened to them, their first reaction becomes a state of shock and a feeling of numbness (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 54). To deal with their captivity, Ma creates a fantasy world for Jack in which the fact and fantasy are too entangled to sort out which is which. After he confronts with the suddenness of outside, he says that “When I was four I thought everything in TV was just TV, then I was five and Ma unlied about lots of it being pictures of real and Outside being totally real. Now I’m in Outside but it turns out lots of it isn’t real at all” (345). Because the reality and fantasy are not sharply differentiated from each other in the first place, he gets confused in his mind. Although she expected him to separate it once he is outside, it did not work as she wanted because the denial mechanism continues to work until they receive trauma recovery treatment. Denial also works for the acquaintances. One of Grandma’s neighbour says that “I still can’t believe it. I remember saying to Bill, seven years back, how could something like this happen

to a girl we know?" (349). Because the unconscious mind avoids negative things happen to us or to our acquaintances, her statement also involves Kübler-Rossian denial.

The second phase is anger which is more difficult to cope with since it can be "displaced in all directions and projected onto the environment at times almost at random" (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 64). The nature of the anger, therefore, is not necessarily logical. Because the person cannot project it onto the direct source, it can even be self-directed because "you may also be angry with yourself that you couldn't stop it from happening. Not that you had the power, but you had the will" (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 12). Because Old Nick used the pretext that his dog needs an urgent help, Ma blames herself for believing him. When she is brought into the room, her desperation exasperates her, yet the projection of her anger does not help to be rescued. Besides, after Jack's birth, the boy's demands of spending time together by watching or playing is left unanswered at times when Old Nick rapes her the night before. Although Jack is protected from the reality of what is going on, he predicts that Old Nick maltreated and hurt her in some way. Jack describes such days she rejects her son's wishes as "Ma's gone". He says: "Today is one of the days when Ma is Gone. She won't wake up properly. She's here but not really. She stays in bed with the pillows on her head" (74). Because Jack does not have an idea that his mother is in the middle of a catastrophe, he is insistent to force her to do things. Some days she rejects Jack and speaks with him in an angry tone. Because she cannot find a solution to their captivity and because her attempts to attack Old Nick fail, she projects her anger onto Jack. For example, when Jack wants her to read the book about the adventures of Dylan, she says "Oh, Jack—I just can't stand the

book, OK, I don't—it's not that I can't stand Dylan himself" (68). Because he is the only person around, Jack is exposed to her anger.

Thirdly comes the stage of bargaining which is “an attempt to postpone and it has to include a prize offered for good behaviour” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 95). When the patient sees that neither denial nor anger helps him to get over this bereavement, he attempts to make pleas to God with the hope of a reconciliation. Bargaining is an important step because it “can help our mind move from one state loss to another. It can be a station that gives our psyche the time that it may need to adjust. It allows us to believe that we can restore order to the chaos that has taken over” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 19-20). No matter how much she denies or gets angry, Ma realizes that she is still a captive. However, it does not mean that she totally gives up being free. She carries her hope up to be rescued one day. When the yellow face of God, as they call the sun, shines up they make pleas to God to be saved. Although they do not directly contract with God, they establish a religious bond. Praying as she obviously sees in the seven years of captivity does not help to be saved but still it provides spiritual relief. Bargaining happens with the captor because she thinks if she is nicer, then Old Nick may not deprive them of food or electricity. Despite her kindness, even if it is a fake one, he still punishes them with starvation and freezing.

After the failure of these three stages, the face of depression comes with a sense of great loss. This sort of depression is not a sign of mental illness but a reaction to the loss. Ma's depression in the room can be sorted as a reactive depression because she reacts his rape and disciplinary techniques with heavy and bleak feelings. However, the depression after the interview is a preparatory one

since she cannot deal with the trauma any longer. The grief prepares her to suicide. “When the depression is a tool to prepare for the impending loss of all love objects, in order to facilitate the state of acceptance, then encouragements and reassurances are not as meaningful” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 99). Even though in the room the reactive depression passes somehow to keep Jack protected, in the outside world she now experiences her past resilience as trauma. She chooses to sleep immediately after the interview to avoid the somatic remembering which “fuels trauma-related emotions of terror, dread, helplessness, hopelessness, shame, and rage. Attempting to describe traumatic events thus brings the past suddenly into the present” (Ogden et al. 35). However, when she faces with the traumatic remembering, she also faces with all the previous insecure feelings. What gives her the strength inside, her resilience, is now perceived as a mistake. She undergoes a process of grief that confronts her with all the negative things happened in the room. The past grief is suddenly brought into the present and the seven years of disenfranchisement begins to haunt. The time when she needs empathy and understanding the most, she encounters intolerance. In this respect, her suicide after the interview is a reaction to the expectations of society disregarding individual experiences. She voices her sickness of the media attention in the interview and also says that she is not the only one who underwent something terrible:

I mean, of course when I woke up in that shed, I thought nobody'd ever had it as bad as me. But the thing is, slavery's not a new invention. And solitary confinement— did you know, in America we've got more than twenty-five thousand prisoners in isolation cells? Some of them for more than twenty years. As for kids— there's places where babies lie in orphanages five to a cot with pacifiers taped into their mouths, kids getting raped by Daddy every night, kids in prison, whatever, making carpets till they go blind—” (295).

Because she hates the media pathologizing the situation by calling Jack “idiot, freak, feral” and thus attributing derogatory codes, she has to deal with this aggression rather than the trauma she experienced. Striving against Old Nick’s attacks in the private turns into the strife against social attacks in the public. For this reason, her suicide attempt underlies the fact that it is a reaction against society that inconsiderately follows the intolerance channelled by the media.

Although her depression inside is different from that of outside, she reaches the final stage of acceptance in both spaces. This stage does not mean that the patient solves the reason of grief and overcomes it soon afterwards. After all these coercive periods the reached stage is the one “during which he is neither depressed nor angry about his fate” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 123). In the room, her grief is repressed with the motivation to protect Jack. However, it does not mean that she accepts Old Nick’s overpowering behaviours. What she accepts is her current situation because she is not able to reverse it. Enduring all these stages of grief in the room has already lowered her resistance for the coming depression and acceptance which require additional “remembering, recollecting and reorganizing” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 25). After her suicide attempt, she stays in the hospital for some weeks to get therapy while Jack is at his grandma’s home. Van der Kolk and Van der Hart states that “traumatic memory has no social component; it is not addressed to anybody, the patient does not respond to anybody; it is a solitary activity” (163). Because she resists remembering the trauma, she needs to be alone to face the memories. Although the therapy includes the recognition of the sites of resistances and the encouragement to reconnect, Freud states that remembering and abreacting should be brought into the focus like a

catharsis moment which exposes the repressed through acting out. While her mother resists repetition, Jack resists reintegration. Van der Kolk and Van der Hart states

he ease with which current experience is integrated into existing mental structures depends on the subjective assessment of what is happening; familiar and expectable experiences are automatically assimilated without much conscious awareness of details of the particulars, while frightening or novel experiences may not easily fit into existing cognitive schemes and either may be remembered with particular vividness or may totally resist integration (160).

While her mother gets recovery at the hospital, Jack mentally goes through the stage of assimilation and integration. The fact that there are fewer assimilated experiences than those required to be integrated intimidates him and causes him to take refuge in the memories of the room. Jack has a totally different viewpoint than his mother's. He rejects integration but Ma supports it. One rejects the room, the other clings to it. In this regard, while analysing Freudian method of analytic therapy and cathartic treatment Güzel Köşker states that "Compared to forgetting, remembering forms the basis of the purification of the soul from trauma and similar disorders"⁸ (4), which is also the basis of the different perspectives Ma and Jack have. While Jack opts for remembering and repeating, Ma is responsive to the treatment through forgetting. However, they need to find a common denominator to survive the acceptance stage. Ma resists acting out until she can no longer deny Jack's longing for the room. After stating that "no memory can be as a rule be recovered" (149), Freud goes on arguing:

There are some cases which behave like those under the hypnotic technique up to the point and only later cease to do so; but others behave differently from the beginning. If we confine ourselves to this second type in order to bring out the difference, we may say that the patient does not *remember* anything of what he has forgotten and repressed, but *acts* it out. He reproduces it not as a

⁸ The translation of the quotation from Turkish into English belongs to the author of this dissertation.

memory but as an action; he *repeats* it, without, of course, knowing that he is repeating it (“Remembering” 150).

In the process of working through their traumas, Ma adopts the method of forgetting whereas Jack prefers to repeat. Hence, it can be said that people undergoing the same ordeal may get traumatized in a different way and also may need different sorts of treatments. For their new start, Ma wants to set up a home with new furniture, yet Jack insists on using the same rug in the room and also sharing one room as in the past. He seeks for the previous attachment to feel secure. For this reason, Ma accepts his offer of revisiting the room because she cannot start a new life until Jack wants to. The police accompany them on the way to the room, but Jack demands to be alone with Ma. When they get there and see the yellow tape of crime scene, Ma feels triggered and says that she cannot do this (397). She remembers all the horror and also the dead baby he buried in the backyard. She makes a strange noise that makes Jack uneasy. Meanwhile, he is surprised to realize how small the room is:

“I don’t think this is it,” I whisper to Ma.

“Yeah, it is.”

Our voices sound not like us. “Has it got shrunk?”

“No, it was always like this.” (399).

Although Jack repeatedly remarks that he is familiar only with the room rather than the manners of people outside, it seems that his experience outside helps him develop a new perspective. He sees the room in a different light, which shows that it is now a new start for him. It is also the first step for Jack to recover which indicates that acting out avails him to work through. Freud states that “The greater the resistance, the more extensively will acting out (repetition) replace remembering” (“Remembering” 151). Remembering the safety of the room does not help to move on; however, when it gives its place to acting out, according to

Freud, it abreacts through repetition. When mother and son repeat the repressed, it reveals that Jack has gained a new identity with the new experiences. He reaches a sort of maturity which makes the novel a coming of age. He, at the end of the novel, states that “I look back one more time. It’s like a crater, a hole where something happened” (401). He can now sort out that something terrible happened in the room. Although he previously attributed intimacy to the room, now he sees it from a different light, which helps him accept the space as toxic. Tied to each other with the bonds of captivity and trauma, Jack and Ma now build a consensus on the impression of the room. Although it is not easy to fully recover from trauma-related diseases, they enter a new phase in their lives after the acceptance stage.

The stages of grief show the post-trauma process step by step, yet trauma is not an easily recovered illness. Stigmatized under the captivity of Old Nick, the codes he inscribes on their body are so powerful that Ma’s and Jack’s selves are shaken to the point to affect their start for a new life. Because the social codes written on the bodies in the novel are almost impossible to break, the traumatogenic codes written by Old Nick coincides with the media prescribing negative codes to their bodies. Therefore, such inscriptions, on an individualistic level, reveal how they push the individual psychologically into trauma. On the societal basis, they present that it is not easy to get out of the roles and stigmas assigned to the person. When the origin of the attributions and trauma is centred on the room, the self-restrictive nature of the space loses the implication of neutrality. Instead, it becomes a space that transforms its residents by transferring its negative codes onto their bodies. Therefore, merged with the toxic codes of the room, the bodies are gathered around the same vein of stigma. Holding all these imprints, therefore,

the bodies of Ma and Jack intertwine with the traumatogenic codes of the room,
which portrays that the room as a space has an interlaced dialogue with the bodies.



CHAPTER III:
BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA in
ALI SMITH'S *THERE BUT FOR THE* (2011)

Words, words, words.

W. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 1603

It all began just like that. I had said nothing I hadn't said a word.

Louis-Ferdinand Céline,
Journey to the End of the Night, 1934

William Faulkner's *The Sound and The Fury* (1929), a prominent representative of modernist tradition, tells the story of the Compson family from the perspectives of different characters. Faulkner notes that "I wrote the Benjy part first. That wasn't good enough so I wrote the Quentin part. That still wasn't good enough. I let Jason try it. That still wasn't enough. I let Faulkner try it and that still wasn't enough" (qtd. in Matz, 219). Similar to Faulkner's fiction, Ali Smith's *There but for the* (2011) is the story of a silent man named Miles Garth narrated from four different perspectives. Modernist fiction emphasizes the epistemology that truth varies with different perspectives and therefore to reach it, the voices of different perspectives should be heard. However, the irony in Smith's novel, diverting it from modernist convention, is that the insufficiency is not for the sake of modernist scepticism but rather due to the fact that the people narrating their acquaintance with Miles barely know him. Therefore, highlighting the unseen face of his life, the chapters respectively convey Anna Hardie's, Mark Palmer's, May

Young's and Brooke Bayoude's perspectives. Referring to the idiom "There but for the grace of God go I"⁹, the title of the novel also addresses to the composition of first words of each chapter. Longlisted for the 2012 Orange Prize for Fiction, the novel begins with the enigma of Miles' locking himself up, without uttering a single word, into an upstairs spare room of a bourgeois family whose "annual alternative dinner party" (Smith 18)¹⁰ he uninvitedly attends. Although the hosts and the other guests have no idea about why he isolates himself, the narrators unearthing their memories with Miles are the ones who lay bare the traumatic factors enhancing his disconnection with the community he is in. His refuge in the room, therefore, produces a new spatial meaning by transforming the neutral into a zone of escape from traumas and artificial bourgeois hospitality. Despite seeming an inactive resistance, Miles contrarily produces an active schizo body through which he refuses the familiar territories of society. Therefore, this chapter aims to analyse the novel mainly in light of Deleuze and Guattari's concepts by concentrating on the traumatogenic stressors which caused his spatial withdrawal and in relation to this, how the codes written on his body transforms his traumatized body and the room into a single meaning of disenfranchisement. In the first section of this chapter, the capitalist strategies of the hosts and the regular guests will be examined as well as the schizo body of Miles as a form of resistance. The second section tackles the space politics of the novel which is followed by the third section scrutinizing the trauma and recovery.

3.1. "There was Once a Man": Capitalism and Body Politics

⁹ An expression meaning that one feels lucky and relieved because the misfortune he hears did not happen to him.

¹⁰ The ensuing references to the novel will be given parenthetically by only page numbers.

There but for the (2011) starts with the sentence: “There was once a man who, one night between the main course and the sweet at a dinner party, went upstairs and locked himself in one of the bedrooms of the house of the people who were giving the dinner party” (3). Although the sentence basically summarizes the plot of the whole novel, the narratives of Anna and Mark reveal the fact behind his isolation. Therefore, in this section the artificial hospitality of an upper middle-class family and the shallowness of the guests will be discussed with a focus on how these have an impact on Miles’ physical withdrawal and psychological disconnection. By doing so, how a desiring machine is produced as a new mode of escape will be examined in light of Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophy.

Traumatic events which are not rooted in the universal traumatic experiences call to mind human relationships because “they breach the attachment of family, friendship, love and community” (Herman 51). For the belief system that is built on the experiences with other people, the violation of it causes an existential crisis which shatters the self. Miles goes through such a trauma triggered by the artificiality of the class-centred community he is in, as it is presented in Anna’s and Mark’s narrations. After Miles barricades himself, Gen seeks ways to move out the unwanted tenant. When she fumbles his jacket, she finds his phone where Anna’s e-mail is saved in the address book. With the hope that Anna can get him out, she sends an e-mail inviting Anna to her house. The e-mail is noteworthy in terms of its typing errors, syntax mistakes and use of the public language. For example, she writes “singe” for “single”, “indefinitely” for “indefinitely” or “imstance” for “instance”. Instead of correctly writing the phrase “to cut a long story short”, she makes a syntax mistake as “to cut a long short story” and most

importantly the mail is addressed to “Anna K.” instead of “Anna Hardie” (10-11). She also makes short and grammatically simple sentences which are all characteristics of the public language according to Basil Bernstein who maps the sociology of language by arguing that the language used points to the codes of a particular class and the public language is the one referring to the unskilled and semi-skilled strata (31). Although she foregrounds bourgeoisie in any case, she opts for the public language of the lower class. No matter how many mistakes she has made in the mail, the column published in a paper written also by her does not have any as it is reviewed by an editor beforehand. It is written with the frequent use of adjective and adverbs. It has more complex sentences and it has even a figure of speech. These traits make her column belong more to the formal language which is a mode making “the meaning logically explicit and finely differentiated” (Bernstein 34) with the use of an elaborated language. To contrast the two applied modes, she, for instance, writes in the e-mail that “we do not however wish to be unpleasant. We are at present using a softly-softly approach, also on the advice of the police advisers” (10-11). For the same meaning, however, she writes in the column that “I am a peaceable person who abhors violence of any sort, so I am uneasy when I consider we may have to resort to force” (107). The syntactical difference between the two sentences points in fact to a certain mode of social behaviour. When it is considered that the e-mail is read only by its receiver, but the column attracts more people, the artificiality of the formal language discloses that it is preferred for the sake of “cutting the individual from his traditional relationships and perhaps to alienate him from them” (Bernstein 40). Gen clearly aims to alienate herself from the lower class which is therefore a signifier of bourgeois arrogance.

The artificiality of bourgeoisie is also unfolded at the party, yet before the analysis of that, food as a means of hospitality, also becomes an issue of class-based sociology because Gen mentions the menu before she talks about Miles' barricade. She says that "I have planned a menu including a seared scallops with chorizo starter, a main course of lamb tagine and a dessert of crème brûlée with home-made chilli-vanilla ice cream" (104). Pierre Bourdieu in his meticulous excavation entitled *Distinction: A Social Critique of Judgement of Taste* (1979) presents the cultural taste and its relation to the hierarchies in French society. He states that

Sociology endeavours to establish the conditions in which the consumers of cultural goods, and their taste for them, are produced, and at the same time to describe the different ways of appropriating such of these objects as are regarded as a particular moment as works of art, and the social conditions of the constitution of the mode of appropriation that is considered legitimate (Bourdieu 1).

A variety of cultural behaviours such as eating, clothing and social activities are directly linked with a mode of class appropriation which legitimizes the taste. For this reason, cultural behaviours are regarded as a marker of class and as a matter of rank. When one's cultural acts are complied with that particular class, the taste subsequently is hierarchized. In the novel, rather than serving, for example any traditional English food for dinner, she plans a menu of fine dining which is political from a class-based viewpoint that these courses are not about eating or hospitality, but rather it foregrounds the appropriation to the legitimate structure of bourgeoisie as the holder of financial capital. Mary Douglas argues that food can be a social code which deciphers "hierarchy, inclusion and exclusion, boundaries and transactions across boundaries" (61). Encoding bourgeois values, the served food, in this regard, reminds the guests that they are in an upper-

middle class home and therefore their behaviours should draw correspondence with theirs. Using the festive food as a vehicle of class-based communication, therefore the hospitality of the hosts turns out to be an artificial one. Although she says that “among our friends we’re [they are] renowned for the hospitality” (103), during the meal Mark waits for his empty water glass to be topped up, but instead his wine glass is always full. Miles is served meat although he is a vegetarian. Because Brooke is another unwanted guest, she is also served with the same meal, some salad and blue cheese, as Miles. Like the artificial hospitality of the hosts, the regular guests of the annual party are also artificial in the sense that Hannah suggests Miles to take the sausage off and eating the fish before he is offered vegetarian food. She either does not know that fish is not vegetarian, or she intentionally forces him to eat what is served. Nevertheless, Miles is kind to reply that “I’m an interloper. Happy just to eat salad atone. Happy not to eat if it’s a problem. Happy just to have an enjoyable evening sitting here” (123). Although before his self-barricade he keeps his face positive at the table and although when he is isolated in the room, he slips a note written “Fine for water but will need food soon. Vegetarian, as you know. Thank you for your patience” (22) on it, Gen who communicates through food serves ham and turkey saying to Anna that “beggars can’t be choosers” (22). Because she thinks that Miles will not leave the room soon, the food speaks on behalf of Gen compelling Miles to unlock. Hence, as the food becomes a system of codes, it cannot be a joking matter for Gen. When she talks about the dinner party to Anna:

[...] Of course he’d already locked himself in our spare room.
He virulently disliked what you’d served for starter and main course,
then, Anna said.
Genevieve Lee got quite excited.

He's like that, is he? she said. Other people eating scallops and chorizo would have upset him that much?

Ah, well, I've no idea, no, I was just, you know, making a joke, Anna said.

It's not a laughing matter, Genevieve Lee said (20).

Because the food is a matter of bourgeois arrogance, therefore Gen as the leading representative of this view, who deliberately alienates herself from other people out of her class, takes it seriously. On the one hand, her reply preserves her class values, on the other emphasizes her discontent with Miles' isolation.

Even the name she calls this invitation "annual alternative dinner party" is a way of class aggrandisement. Firstly, this invitation calls to mind the banquets bourgeoisie host to demonstrate their grandeur in the former times where "representation was still dependent on the presence of the people before whom it was displayed" (Habermas 10). In this regard, she states that they usually host this event before people leave for their vacation in the summer and once a year they would like to gather with people "different from they usually saw" (18) as well as the friends they see all the time such as Hugo, Caroline, Richard and Hannah. While they include their couple friends into their zone of bourgeoisie, they classify the rest in the category of "different". She goes on saying that last year they invited a Muslim couple; the year before they had had a Palestinian man and his wife and a Jewish doctor and his partner (18). This year the "different" people are Mark, a friend of Hugo and Caroline, a gay photo researcher and his friend Miles. Their neighbours, the Bayoudes, are also "different" because they are black. Pekşen argues that "the party is a microcosm of the whole society, where the hosts and the regular guests carry out social sorting process" (678). In this regard, positioning "different" people opposed to bourgeoisie produces a dividing society which is a paralyzed and corrupted one because "individuals experience different

forms of oppression” (Vernon 55). Thus, this society holds the full control from the beginning as the party is designed to be a class-oriented and a hierarchizing one. For this reason, it is not surprising that the regular guests function as domains taking over the sorting process of the hosts. They firstly judge people on their look whether their clothes are proper or not (163). Later, they either make artificial comments or ask undue questions. Both ways disturb the guests. For example, the Bayoudes are asked by Hannah if they have ever seen a real tiger at home just because they are people of colour (127). They reply that they are from Yorkshire, and they live in Harrogate and work at the University of York which is where they met (127). While their racialized target is the Bayoudes, the gender-based scapegoat is Mark who is asked if he likes children:

Um, Mark says.

I mean, I don't know that you don't have any. I was just assuming. I didn't mean to sound patronizing.

Is it possible now for you lot to adopt, isn't it? Hugo said.

What lot, sorry? Mark says (124).

Hugo seems to make gender-based comments easily and offensively, since he is also the one who says women use their selective memory only after shopping spree which is endemic among them (141). Mark is firstly asked how long he and Miles have been together assuming that Miles is also gay. Being a friend of Mark, Miles is easily labelled as gay. After they find out that they are not partners, this time Mark receives a question which subsumes a person's private boundary. Hugo uses a discriminating expression by referring to him as “you lot”. Therefore, Mark as a “different” person also becomes a subject of the bourgeois sorting process which is followed by another one centred around profession. Richard in the sitting room boasts about his job all through their drinks. He produces microdrones, a device designed to monitor without being seen, which are sold to

the police (118). When he hears that Mark is a picture researcher, he asks that “Can you more or less do it with your eyes shut?” (121). He replies that “You do actually need your eyes to be open for it” (121). Because he thinks his profession is more effortful and dignified than others, he belittles Mark’s occupation.

Inviting people from different social backgrounds, the hosts artificially aim to efface all forms of differences between people by producing a festive atmosphere once a year. This ambience echoes Mikhail Bakhtin’s carnivalesque which aims to liberate the limits of the dominant order temporarily. He states that “one might say that carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order” (Bakhtin 10). While a true carnival has the essence of breaking the boundaries temporarily, the hospitality of the hosts turns out to be for having an unusual, even an exotic experience on their behalf. They impose their snide perspectives on race, gender and profession; therefore, the party eventually comes out to be a means for class discrimination. Hence, the bodies are reduced to a surface on which bourgeoisie practises the capitalist values. Fredrick Jameson in “Postmodernism and Consumer Society” (1988) correlates modernism with classical bourgeoisie individualism, and postmodernism with late capitalism. He believes that the private identity supported by modernism has transformed into the death of the subject through a postmodernist culture which effaced the strict boundary between the high and the popular. Following the same trajectory, culturally the group emerged after World War II effaced the adopted dichotomies of the previous capitalist legacy. He defines the traits of this society as follows:

New types of consumption; planned obsolescence; an ever more rapid rhythm of fashion and styling changes; the penetration of advertising,

television and media generally to a hitherto unparalleled degree throughout society; the replacement of the old tension between city and country, centre and province, by the suburb and by the universal standardization; the growth of the great networks of superhighways and the arrival of automobile culture (Jameson 19).

While the first generation of the capitalist society featured in the forms of “mercantile, agrarian, industrial, monopoly, financial, imperial and so on” (Eagleton 2), the post-war society with the impact of globalisation has changed its spots. Although Eagleton calls the classical thought of Marxism outdated (x) because in the new world market is deregulated, society is decentred, and class allegiance is weakened with the insistence of marginalized groups for their own voice (2), the traits drawn by Jameson show that this momentum’s obsolescence is a planned one since today’s world definitely requires adaptation to the pace of consumerism. For this reason, Marxist thoughts centred on capital-holding unclothe the traits of today’s society. Although the class boundaries in the Western societies are not as strict as it was before, still, discrimination is inflicted through socially contested terrains of race, gender and profession as it is shown in the novel, which in the end transforms the different bodies into a platform where arrogance is practised on. Bourgeoisie in the novel takes its power from the classical view of holding the capital which is laid bare also in the subsequent conversations of the community. For example, they start a discussion in which Caroline advocates that internet offers beautiful images of tigers, therefore they do not need a real tiger ever again. Hannah approves her by saying “personally I wouldn’t mind if they become instinct” (127). Marx and Engels argue that through holding the capital, the bourgeoisie activities rooted in the financial is presented as “revolutionising the instruments of production” (38). For instance, the bourgeoisie “has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far

surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades” (Marx and Engels 37). The bourgeoisie differs from the earlier industrial classes in terms of “constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation” (Marx and Engels 38). Likewise, the internet is viewed as a revolutionising instrument with its production of real-like images. Although the technological production does not hold the same essence of the classical working-class production system, but still, it transhistorically dwells its root in the financial. Just as they are not bothered by the artificiality of their conversations, the artificial images produced on the internet do not disturb their sense of seeing the real either. For this reason, they take people for granted by uninterruptedly annoying with questions and by agitating them because of their different backgrounds of class, religion, gender or race. In another instance between Terence and Hannah, she asks:

How do you know stuff like these things?

I read them, Terence says. In books.

No, but *why* do you know them? Hannah says.

Why? Terence says.

I always think it’s so funny what people know and why they do, Hannah says (134).

During his talk with Hannah, Terence shows his interest in music and film. When he drops his knowledge on these, her questions denote the fact that she is actually disturbed, which is disclosed in her following comment: “I’d have thought you would know about, you know, your own culture, before you knew other things about cultures like Lancashire and places like that” (134). Therefore, her intention reveals that she waits in ambush for a racialized disparagement. However, this time, the other uninvited guest, Brooke, cannot take it anymore: “Have you not

met any or very many black people before or are you just living in a different universe?” (134). Her question explains why she, a nine-year-old girl, is uninvited although her parents are. For this reason, as the extracts from their conversations portray, all the discussions during their meal fail to be a fruitful one, but they goal to make their class dominant among others, thus resulting in an artificial hospitality. Because neither of the hosts and regular guests counsel for a peaceful atmosphere but impose their views, therefore these are attempts to normalize such class-centred attitudes of the bourgeoisie. For this reason, although there is an inevitable change in the centre spots of the capital, the discriminating attitude of the ancestors is transhistorically kept alive in the fictional period of the novel which takes place in 2009. In this sense, in his work *The Political Unconscious* (1981), Fredric Jameson begins the preface of his work with the slogan of “Always historicize!” which he views as an imperative for transhistorical thought. He suggests that transhistoricity is not only essential to understand the historical origin but also to comprehend the “interpretive categories and codes” (Jameson, *The Political Unconsciousness* ix). If the political codes are transhistorical, this continuity in history points to a space where “the traces of that uninterrupted narrative, in restoring to the surface of the text the repressed and buried reality of this fundamental history” are detected in the political unconscious (Jameson, *The Political Unconsciousness* 4). In this regard, transhistoricity follows a path in the unconscious which suggests a flux of time with both changing and unchanging capitalist codes. For example, Marxist origin of the anti-capitalist views enable Eagleton and Jameson to identify what remains unchanged in the changing spots of capitalism. In this respect, transhistorical approach in conjunction with the novel shows that the former financial ambition of the capitalist has transformed into a new one, which is dealt with in the novel through racial, occupational and gender-

based discriminatory lenses of the hosts and regular guests, exulting their privileged status and attributing codes to the “different”. While the classical bourgeoisie values are preserved and the manner of self-boasting brought along by the power of holding the capital is passed on the latest generation, the source behind the return of this ingratiation can be explained through the concept of machine. Deleuze and Guattari argue that “Everywhere it is machines- real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and connections” (*Anti-Oedipus* 1). While they define machine as “any system that interrupts flows”, Deleuze adds that machine “goes beyond both the mechanism of technology and the organization of the living being, whether in nature, society, or human beings” (*Desert Island and Other Texts* 219). In this respect, the operation of machinery system requires decoding the values so as to recode with a new adaptative version through the product of the decoded flows. Recoding the classical capitalist values in the novel both the notions of private property with an extra spare room and the pompous menu reinforce the financial-based superiority, which shows that the capitalist machine is a transhistorical and diachronic one with its new means of space and food. Secondly, because everything is a machine connected to one another, it produces a flow. This flow as a result produces a product identity. In the novel, the hosts and the regular guests are capitalist machines connected to one another and their operative flow results in systematic artificiality and discrimination. Because neither of the “different” guests utter any sort of words serving for the capitalist machine, for example Mark’s mother is a well-known painter yet he does not even mention it, it is the capitalist machine defines itself. For example, Hugo says that

I’m very big on the choice of toothpaste we have these days. That’s what I call global choice. It’s great, living in such a multivalent universe

and having so much choice. I am what I listen to on my iPod. And I love it that so many databases can find out at the flick of a button just exactly what my favourite toothpaste or music is, as well as all the other things they can know about me, like my date of birth, how much money I have, how I spend my money, who I phone, where I go, things like that (147-148).

Starting from the progress civilization has made so far, he bases his argument on the surveillance effect of technology on the individual through which the choices defining a person produce a personal pile indicating a particular status and taste. Hugo, therefore, self-defines his place in society, as these means are directly associated with the financial profile of its holder, thereby becoming a medium to manifest the product identity. Because it is the nature of the capitalist machine to seek ways to proclaim its identity, it creates its own flow to be exhibited. However, it does not mean that this flow does not have its own limits. As an exterior limit, Miles' displacement interrupts the flow and its codes carried through the agency of transhistoricity. While transhistorical legitimization of the attributed codes as "different" sustains the continuation of the capitalist territorialities, transhistorical flux of this machine is blocked by the schizophrenic retreat of Miles because he brings out a counter-flux which falls outside of their known territorialities. Locking himself up in the spare room and thereby unbecoming an object of the capitalist machine, he also rejects transhistorical codes prevailing successively for generations. In this sense, deterritorialization can also be interpreted as stepping out of transhistorical line because it features the newly produced identity in its new historical status.

What motivates Miles to barricade himself is desire. However, because desire is a much-debated term, it is necessary to explain it first through Freud and later through Deleuze and Guattari since the desire drives the hosts and the

regular guests is different from the desire that drives Miles to isolate himself. Referring to the title of *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari believe that Freud asserts the concept of Oedipus based on the desire a son has for his mother, which later became an agency to be attributed to all familial issues. By this way, Oedipal machines became always present since it paved the way to “reduce everything to the Oedipal scene” (*Anti-Oedipus* 55). When this process is inserted into the social orbit, it becomes evident that psychoanalysis neuroticizes the individuals to carry Oedipal imprints by producing two groups: the dominant and the subjugated (*Anti-Oedipus* 64). Because Oedipal drive is a strong desire which is not a mere psychic desire, yet a construct taken to the social arena, Deleuze and Guattari argue that “Oedipus is the figurehead of imperialism” (*Anti-Oedipus* xx). Therefore, the hosts and the regular guests are neuroticized through Oedipal yoke by regimenting against the subordinate through their financial power. Because oedipalization is in a way about desiring what is repressed, in the novel it is embodied in artificial hospitality no matter how they conceal their being capitalist machines. Therefore, their desire brings to surface the necessity of a subordinate group of “different” people to externalize the repressed. Deleuze and Guattari state that “Capitalism is the only social machine that is constructed on the basis of decoded flows, substituting for intrinsic codes an axiomatic of abstract quantities in the form of money” (*Anti-Oedipus* 139). For this reason, the hosts plan to substitute hospitality to speak for their financial status, yet in their case it only becomes a manifestation of arrogance and artificiality since Gen talks about the value of their home and the menu she served. At a point where a machine only desires the continuation of its flow, they do it through the way of practising the oedipalization on the subjugated to enable their capitalist machine to flow. Every machine needs organs to operate well, as Deleuze illustrates, “Once the organs are

connected to a power source, once they have been plugged into flows, the organs then comprise larger machines” (“Schizophrenia and Society” 17). Therefore, when the “different” guests take part in the flow of the capitalist machine, they function as organs organizing a larger structure. However, the flux is broken through Miles’ being a desiring machine.

Although the hosts and the regular guests are driven by the Oedipal neurosis, Miles resists the forced oedipalization through psychosis which is “a regaining of the reality appears along with the delirious reconstruction” (*Anti-Oedipus* 123). From a capitalist view, schizophrenia is historically taken as a sickness of modern man, yet Deleuze and Guattari formulate schizoanalysis on the liberating power of the process, because according to them, the schizophrenic is not oedipalizable as he lacks it in the unconscious (*Anti-Oedipus* 123). Therefore, the desire drives the schizo is different from Freudian desire. Desire, for Deleuze and Guattari, is the productive and revolutionary impulse which psychoanalytically does not lack anything (*Anti-Oedipus* 26). It establishes an explicit connection with the machine which “causes the current to flow, itself flows in turn, and break the flows” (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus* 5). Such desire, in short, produces reality (Holland 56). Likewise, Miles breaks the flux of the capitalist machine by his desire which is to isolate himself in the terrain of the capitalist machine itself. Interrupting their flow by taking refuge, he produces a desiring-machine who rejects the known codes of the capitalist machine by generating a counter-continuum. For this reason, although he seems quite passive in his acts in the isolated room, he, in fact, creates an active body with a new product identity. The key point of this idea lies in his unexpected act of locking himself in the room of the strangers, which is a behaviour outside the scope of the preestablished role attained to any

guest. Leaving the known codes of being a guest, he invests his own flux which makes him a schizo character. The schizo is not simply a form of resistance as it is defined as follows:

The schizo knows how to leave: he has made departure into something as simple as being born or dying. But at the same time his journey is strangely stationary, in place. He does not speak of another world, he is not from another world: even when he is displacing himself in space, his is a journey in intensity, around the desiring-machine that is erected here and remain here. [...] But such a man produces himself as a free man, irresponsible, solitary, and joyous, finally able to say and do something simple in his own name, without asking permission; a desire lacking nothing, a flux that overcomes barriers and codes, a name that no longer designates any ego whatever (Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti Oedipus* 131).

Miles, as a schizo, leaves the party without any permission to the upstairs. Although at the table he is disturbed by the manners of the hosts and the regular guests, he is still kind and helpful, for example to Hannah who is bothered due to the same dream she sees every night. No matter how much he seems involved in the conversations, he does not feel the sense of belonging in that atmosphere due to the artificiality which engenders his escape since not only at the table but also in his career he deals with artificiality. He is an ethical consultant who combs the profiles of firms and suggests possible rebranding in order to make them sound more ethical. Therefore, his isolation is an escape from all kinds of artificiality he endures. As a desiring-machine he simply goes upstairs to the spare room and starts his stationary journey by displacing himself into a zone where only his flow prevails. Being such a free and unsolicited man, he does not even mind Mark seeing him while measuring the floor by stepping and counting. Locking himself up, he does not only break the codes of being a guest but also the codes of the capitalist machine. Therefore, to do this, the desire drives Miles does not succeed

an Oedipal path, yet a revolutionary desire which bears its own identity. Because one of the “different” people is decreased in number, the capitalist circle is broken which pleases Mark more since he overhears all the capitalist machines talking behind him about his late mother. It is the same moment when the idea, that Miles is safe behind the closed door, rushes to his head. Miles is safe since he takes an action to cease the designation of their ego. Although he does not have much to do in the room, he now speaks for his own name and for his own flux. For this reason, the invisible class-based barriers produced by the subjugating atmosphere of the table leaves its place to an active departure to freedom.

At a dinner party where Gen boasts of her home and menu; Hugo makes gender-related offensive comments; Richard humiliates others’ occupation and Hannah and Caroline takes over the duty for the racial harassment, the “different” people are victimized for the drive of preserving the capitalist machine. Each one becomes docile platforms to be submitted to their superiority, yet Miles is the one who takes an active audacious step to confuse the smooth flux of them. Subverting the accepted behavioural codes of society, therefore the schizo body pioneers to break the strict norms of the capitalist machine. Although nourished by the diachrony of Oedipal legacy, the capitalist desire is broken through the schizophrenic desire of Miles to step out of artificial hospitality without uttering a single word.

3.2. “It is a Really Outstanding Spare Room in There”: Capitalist Terrains, Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization

While the capitalist machine guises itself under hospitality, not only the “different” bodies but also the space politics are brought to the agenda in terms

of holding financial power. The spatial values are unignorable both from the view of the capitalist and the desiring machine because it is directly linked with their flow. As the capitalist machine appraises itself by the medium of a home with a spare room, the spatial mechanism for the desiring machine revolves around deterritorialization and reterritorialization alongside with the impact of what both of them have on the public and private spaces. Because Miles not only breaks the routine behaviourally but also spatially, his refuge means disenfranchisement, yet the capitalist machine operates to benefit financially from his popularity. Therefore, losing its neutral status of being a simple spare room, the reassigned meaning of disenfranchisement becomes a symbol merging Miles' body with the room. In this regard, this section examines the space politics from the perspectives of both the capitalist and the desiring machine.

To follow a path from the public to private, the first spatial location to mention is that the novel takes place in Greenwich which is accepted as the location of prime meridian line dividing the eastern and the western hemispheres. Like this invisible man-constructed border, there are invisible boundaries between the characters. However, Greenwich connecting the east to the west also unites people who are slightly connected to each other: For example, Anna comes to Greenwich to persuade Miles to go out. Mark and Miles have met in London but come to Greenwich for the party. The Bayoudes and the couple of Gen and Eric live there and the regular guests visit for the place for the party. Therefore, Greenwich is the location which becomes a melting pot for these people from different social backgrounds. In this regard, not only people who barely know each other but also the separate narratives of the four characters are tied to one another through this location.

The home of the couple, Gen and Eric, is located in Greenwich which is a space dating back to 18th century. Boasting of their home in every instance as expected from the capitalist machine, the compound of Gen and Eric's name constitute "the generics" which is a term used for indicating the characteristics of a whole similar group. Therefore, the couple synecdochically becomes the representative of their circle who endorses a pattern of living relied on the capitalist modes. This perspective firstly shows up in the e-mail sent to Anna through which Gen has the opportunity to speak highly of her home: "Our spare room door, in fact all the upstairs doors in our house are believed 18th century although the house itself dates from 1820s you can understand my concern and the hinges are on the inside side. I have reason to believe he has jammed one of our chairs under C18th door handle too" (10). Firstly, she emphasizes the status of her home as a site of historical heritage because "historic homes work to generate and sustain powerful ideas about how ideal homes are to be imagined, presented and experienced" (Chambers 22). By producing a phantasmagoria of the ideal stately home through history, she implies that her home is not an ordinary one but an ideal one embracing an ideal nuclear family. Secondly, like feudal capitalism bragging the owned land, fief and manorial authority, the capitalist machine gives details about the financial value of the home making people estimate the costliness. When it is considered that one can have less authority in the public domain than the private, it is not surprising that she holds the full authority in her home with everything she possesses. Like the meal served being a medium to communicate, therefore, the furniture can also be considered to be a medium of the capitalist representative of privateness. Joseph Schumpeter states that "old forms that harnessed the whole person into systems of supra-individual purpose had died and that each family's individual economy had become the centre of its existence, that

therewith a private state was born as a distinguishable entity in contrast to the public” (qtd, in Habermas, 19). The market which goes through an expansionary contraction through the emergence of state economic is the reason for the rise of the private. Such a transformation of the privatization into the public economy also produces its own dynamics. Because this small units are economic wholes in itself, the capital and its repercussion, therefore, become the organs of the public authority. In this respect, the financial status of the couple is connected to a larger chain of capital authority, yet the privatization of their economics and its repercussion are represented through a home with a spare room. In a world where population density increases every day, having a spare bedroom can be viewed as a luxury when it is considered that housing shortage and dwelling are the problems of the modern man. Therefore, a spare bedroom itself is a manifestation of the private wealth. Ben Davies states that “In the UK, perhaps the most provocative piece of legislation concerning housing is what is popularly known as the “bedroom tax”. As a result of this legislation “working-age tenants living in social housing who have a “spare” bedroom face a choice: see a reduction in their housing benefit payments or relocate” (509). Having a spare bedroom requires an extra charge or the tenants are forced to move out. For this reason, having such a space becomes a financial concern which shows the financial power of its owners. Likewise, Gen pretentiously confesses that this space makes herself consider lucky as they afford to “sit in different rooms in this house” (155). Although accepting to hold such an unoccupied space seems about the privatization of life on the surface, it is in fact an exhibit of financial power to be showed to the public. Habermas argues that the privatization can be observed in the architectural style and some of the rooms of a house has more public character than a domestic one (44-45). For this reason, the spare bedroom and the dining room where the party

is hosted are places open to the discussion of deprivatization. The former place does not only serve to the hosts but to society since they aim to regale “different” people, and the latter place becomes a public concern as a symbol of disenfranchisement. Therefore, instead of a sharp public/private dichotomy, the space politics are intertwined in the novel.

Since the capitalist machine deprivatizes their living spaces, the details signifying the expensiveness become an issue. For example, when Brooke plays with the pebbles, the host says that “Leave my stones alone. They cost money. Scottish river pebbles” (18). In another instance, Anna looks through the door at the lounge and thinks that “it was like a contemporary chic lounge in a theatre performance would be. She looked at the geometric arrangement of logs next to the fireplace. She looked at the ceiling, at the huge beam of wood which ran all the way from the back of the lounge and above her head into the hall” (27). Gen seizes the opportunity to talk about the finance of the interior space: “It was believed to be a piece of a ship which fought at Trafalgar, and it was why the lounge had been renovated and extended” (27). She is a host talking about the value of the furniture without even being asked. In this respect, she shields the circulation of capitalist hints at her home by generating a class tension. Deborah Chambers states that such homes with aristocratic and elitist beliefs “reflect and amplify class aspirations, class divisions and fantasies of status within stratified societies that function as an idealisation of the higher strata” (24). Idealising the bourgeoisie, the capitalist machine builds its sanctuary by accumulating and coagulating its own values against those whose flows jeopardize their presence. They continually stratify by reorganizing their limits with the aim to produce an organism fully operating for preserving their coherence. To do so, Gen builds

capitalist terrains. For this reason, she mentions the value of the furniture in order to set boundaries against “different” people. The bounds drawn through religious, racial, professional or gender segregation are supported by the ones conducted in the private space. Deleuze and Guattari argue that if the capital does not point to a direct economic instance, it may fall back on the “production without interposing extraeconomic factors that would be in the form of a code” (*Anti-Oedipus* 249). This code, imposing superiority, is a living organism with all bodies operating well. In *Tales of Power* (1974) Carlos Castaneda proposes the concept of tonal which “was thought to be a kind of guardian spirit, usually an animal, that a child obtained at birth and with which he had intimate ties for the rest of his life” (121). This innate side of human nature seems to cover many things:

It is the organism, and also that is organized and organizing; but it is also significance, and all that is signifying or signified, all that is susceptible to interpretation, explanation, all that is memorisable in the form of something recalling something else; finally, it is the Self (Moi), the subject, the historical, social, or individual person, and the corresponding feelings. In short, tonal is everything (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* 162).

This innate drive has the power to forge a lifetime link. It produces a well-contained stratum which organizes and takes over everything. Therefore, a plane of consistency is produced which fabricates and regulates the other. This organism echoes the capitalist machine who is driven by the Oedipal desire. A consisted plane, which operates in different venues, produces its own and the other’s limits. Gen as a capitalist machine driven by the Oedipal structure urges other people to operate perfectly. This organism as a whole engorges itself with the presence of another strata in order to produce her own. Hence the stratified person formulates her own capital-based terrains to be submitted. Getting familiar with these terrains brings along territorialization. Because it is not easy to oppose such a well-

functioning organ, therefore in turn, not every resistance seems to work. However, Miles driven by the schizo desire produces his own line of flight to deterritorialize the capitalist terrains.

Miles' flight line is an uprising against the constructed territorialities, yet he displaces himself into the spare room of the same territoriality. By doing so, he does not give up the struggle, but rather he actively stands against their flow in their own territoriality. However, because he does it without saying any word, it brings up different questions as voiced by Anna:

Had he closed the door on himself so he would know what it feels like, to be a prisoner? Was it some wanky of middle-class game about how we're all prisoners even though we believe we're free as a bird, free to across any shopping mall or airport concourse or fashionably stripped back wooden floor of the upstairs room of a house? (67).

Although his refuge evokes several questions in its wake, the first question signifying an existential crisis ends up with the one questioning if it is a middle-class game to lock himself upstairs. Because Miles was there for the first time to dine, it is neither a part of a game nor a deliberate pre-planned act, yet he has a purpose. On the surface he seems bored and annoyed with the manners of the hosts and the regular guest, but he does not simply leave the house since he aims to break the implemented order. However, he only leaves the familiar territoriality to wander in the unfamiliar one as he goals to reach a body without organs through deterritorialization. Body without organs is a concept formulated against psychoanalysis which "translates everything into phantasies, it converts everything into phantasy, it retains the phantasy" (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* 151). In contrast, this concept has raised around "what remains when you take everything away" (Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* 151). Therefore, it

is a set of practices, a limit to be attained, driven by the circulation of intensities. Rather than a body, it is a space free from all organized codes, restrictions and stratifications of society. Therefore, the spare room functions as a body without organs through the actions of a schizo body. Although the hosts and the regular guests take over the label of the capitalist body and they cast the role of the docile body on the “different” guests, the subjugation is violated by the irresponsible schizo body of Miles who dismantles all the signifiers and signifieds organized in the path to pre-establish fixed roles. Refusing to be an organ of the capitalist organism, his deterritorializing movement depersonalizes him by absolving him from gender, racial, religious and profession-based sorting process. Besides, this depersonalization process operates in the positive direction by taking over new meanings.

While at first it was a room five steps wide and seven steps long (107), then it becomes a room for Gen “with rowing machine and my [her] husband’s wine making kits and DVD collections of sci-fi classics of the fifties and sixties, a room which we [they] were about to turn into a badly needed study for our [their] daughter who has important school exams this coming year” (105). Even though it was spare for a long time, she is aggrieved by the occupation of Miles as an unwanted tenant and she is worried about her valuable belongings. Among the stuff, DVD collection is an unignorable one, as Susan Stewart argues that “The collection presents a hermetic world: to have a representative collection is to have both the minimum and the complete number of elements necessary for an autonomous world—a world which is both full and singular, which has banished repetition and achieved authority” (152). Historicizing the collection, she emphasizes its nature of fixed autonomy which implies the bourgeoisie’s unchanging authority

in a changing world. Therefore, possessing such a collection represents her power and authority. However, the things symbolizing capital-based structure are out of Miles' interest. Nevertheless, Anna thinks that he "invented the perfect rent-free way in a recession to be regularly fed, at least for a while" (29), because Miles is thought to be doing nothing but benefitting from the hosts' resources. However, Miles neither damages their stuff nor aims to batten on their generosity. Because the hosts as the representative of the late capitalism rely on the productive measures, it is the seeming inactivity of Miles that bothers them. In a capital-based world where productive activities are also a means of control, Miles falls out of these dynamics. On the one hand his job is based on pretentiousness, depicting a brand sound ethical, which is parallel with the manners of the hosts, on the other their jobs "directly uphold the norms and workings of present-day capitalism" (Davies 511). Gen is a "freelance Personnel Welfare Coordinator for people who worked in Canary Wharf" and Eric works "at the Institute for Measurement and Control" (15). For Davies, "one partner keeps the financial sector operational; the other enhances methods of measurement and control" (511). Because their jobs are directly linked with calculations and conformity, Miles seems unproductive and improper for such a capitalist mode of living. Although the only instrument he uses in the room is the bike, he cycles without going nowhere, therefore it is "an image of activity without productivity" (Davies 511). For this reason, Miles also breaks the capitalist code which imposes on the individual to produce. A milieu where the expectation is to conform to capitalist territorialities, therefore, the deterritorialized denial of the pre-ordained venues works in the positive way. Deleuze and Guattari propose that deterritorialization can either be in the negative or positive way depending on its relationship with reterritorialization (*A Thousand Plateaus* 508). First, to distinguish the two terms,

deterritorialization is the active process in which a schizo body leaves the social boundaries, whereas reterritorialization pulls the schizo into where social norms and limits prevail, which is therefore a stationary process. Deterritorialization is positive “when it prevails over the reterritorialization” and it is negative when it is “overlaid by a reterritorialization obstructing the line of flight” (*A Thousand Plateaus* 508). In Miles’ case it is positive since he prevails over the familiar stations of the community. His displacement blocks the flow of the capitalist machine by opening up a new mental and physical station.

Even though the schizo’s line of flight ensures escape from the codes prevailing outside, the capitalist machine finds other ways when one vein is blocked. Miles is suddenly materialized as a popular media product, which is first initiated by “Real Life” column written in the paper *Guardian*. Because the news of an unwanted person refusing to leave the space for three months attracts attention, the audience assign different meanings to his isolation. Strinati argues that “the class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production” (120). Therefore, the dominant ideology is shaped by the ideas of ruling class. Gen’s column in the paper guides the audience with her aggrievement since people do not know the unseen reasons behind his refuge. The other motive to capture people’s glance is the individualized act of Miles. Philip and Tomlinson suggest that in the popular culture of the post-war period

One very important dichotomy becomes impossible to ignore: the public/private dimension. Much of contemporary leisure has inclined towards the expansion of ways of consuming in individualized and privatized forms *in the home*, and this has matched the rhetoric and ideology of the New Right/Thatcher years, as well as the marketing

strategies of the new industrial barons of late twentieth-century Britain, the leisure retailers (11).

In the post-war period, British habits for popular media are centred around individualism and as a result individualized and privatized activities are promoted by the media. For this reason, the media having coverage to Miles' privatized stay-within-the-room act in a stranger home aroused the attention of a mass who later alters the perception whatever purpose they pursue. First, they call him as 'Milo' because it is catchier and because 'Miles' sounds "a bit middle class" (191). When people evolving Miles into a symbol of whatever they want, Brooke thinks that "But that lady doesn't know. That lady has no idea, like everybody else way out of the loop, because first, everybody who knows anything knows that Milo isn't Mr Garth's real name" (316-317). It is because they are wholly absorbed in his isolation. People gather outside the bedroom window carrying banners that say "Milo For Palestine and Milo For Israel's Endangered Children and Milo For Peace and Not In Milo's Name and Milo For Troops Out Of Afghanistan" (315). Because he is disenfranchised inside by rejecting all the familiar codes attached on his body, people give multiple new identities to shape his story as they want, which materializes his body as a popular media artifact. Elliot Gaines defines identity as "the essence of embodied consciousness, providing the location of experience and the origins of the self in relation to others" (76-77) and he goes on saying that "Media create certain illusions that have powerful effects on audiences because production techniques and media distribution play with time and space in order to entertain, inform, and persuade audiences" (77). Miles' own identity is wasted for the sake of gathering a wider range of audience from every ideological background around the illusion produced by the media. Highlighting his staying in a single room for months, therefore, both time and

space are benefitted for this aim. Spatially, his isolation in a restricted space is used and temporally, the mainstream events are adapted to his isolation. Thus, the initial codes inscribed on Miles' body by the hosts and the regular guests in the private space are extended to the public, which turns his body into an ideological platform shaped by the capitalist values.

Not only his identity is disregarded, but also, he suddenly becomes a commodity for the merchandise of the capitalist machine. Like the artificiality of the hosts in the dinner party, again Gen pretentiously complains about his locking up since she makes money from the situation. After finding out that the door is not locked, Brooke considers that “anybody who is anybody in this history knows what the real fact is about Mr Garth, the one that was making Mrs Lee cry on the stairs yesterday because all the badges and the T-shirts and the caps and key rings and the inscribed Easter eggs that she organized and invested thousands and thousands of pounds in will soon maybe not be worth money any more” (317). Because the capitalist machine transferred the blocked vein into another way to ensure fluidity, she “returns to capitalist norms, strategies and ends, turning Miles into a brand” (Davies 512). Therefore, Miles transforms a neutral space into a place of capitalist concern by locking himself up. When the title of their work, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, is asked by the interviewer, Guattari replies that

We wanted to emphasize the extremes. Everything in human existence is brought back to the most abstract categories. Capital and, on the other extreme, or rather, the other pole of nonsense, madness—and within madness, schizophrenia. In our view, it was these two poles' common tangent of nonsense that seemed to have a relation. And not just a contingent relation making it possible to say that modern society drives people crazy (*Desert Islands and Other Texts*, 233).

The schizophrenic madness of Miles coincides with the capitalist madness of Gen, which establishes an axis for two extreme poles suggesting the opposite drives of modern man. Although Miles searches for an exit from her capitalist values, Gen nourishes her financial ambition by battenning on his bodily withdrawal. When he was outside, her home was the central capitalist concern yet after his isolation it is the room that is opened up to the public for making money, which again preserves the capitalist terrains by showing the fact that the capitalist machine reterritorializes its values in every instance.

Because people outside his window are a mechanised product of mass culture, it is also important to mention their acts. Without knowing the fact behind his isolation, the news on the papers and TV produces a Milo Mass who are sitting and standing, playing guitars, and eating their lunch. Gen runs The Milo Merchandise stall. Two women claim to be Miles' wives. The cameras from America and France film outside to globalize his isolation. Some people hold Milo banners. A man sells a message thought to be sent from Miles because he is now a well-advertised product holding a higher saleability. Therefore, a mass society is emerged through the popularity of Miles. William Kornhauser criticizes mass society as follows:

(a) growing atomization (loss of community); (b) widespread readiness to embrace new ideologies (quest for community); (c) totalitarianism (total domination by pseudo-community). Mass society is objectively the *atomized* society, and subjectively the *alienated* population. Therefore, mass society is a system in which there is *high availability of a population for mobilization by elites* (33).

Because this mobilization is created by Gen, the bourgeoisie can be said to rule and make use of availability of people. Terence says that people outside feel so disenfranchised that they situate Miles as their leader (313). The other related

reason is that in mass societies people tend to adopt mainstream popular patterns easily because they fail to develop an identity. John J. Macionis states that “mass-society theory suggests that so much social diversity, widespread isolation, and rapid social change make it difficult for many people to establish any coherent identity” (504). Because their identities are not a coherent one, they idolize Miles. In fact, Miles as an individual seems to be ignored because it is the idea that a man behind doors away from the chaos of the world seems attractive to the people outside. For this reason, the deterritorialization process he started in the room transforms the room and Miles’s body into a social gathering platform for the disenfranchised mass. Merging the space and his body into one symbol, therefore the only link these atomized groups of people are connected to is an artificial and a loose one which can easily be terminated with Miles’ stepping out. Dominic Strinati describes atomisation as a mass society which consists of “people who lack any meaningful or morally coherent relationships with each other” and he states that “These people are clearly not conceived of purely and simply as isolated atoms, but the links between them are said to be purely contractual, distant and sporadic rather than close, communal and well-integrated” (5). Likewise, people outside Miles’ window do not meet the criterion of having a close relationship in a community, yet they are together through the meanings they attribute to Miles’ isolation. Therefore, turning into a commodity to be consumed by masses and turning into a market for the capitalist machine, the initial codes written on his body at the party and the initial position of the room as a spare room are altered to be unified around the meaning of disenfranchisement, which at the end equates his body with the space.

Because this group gathers for an artificial goal, the reterritorialization of Miles disperses the crowd. The capitalist machine rallied through a new way of profit is also scattered by his reterritorialization. Although for months many people call out his name behind the closed door, he remains silent yet replies only to Brooke who is another unwanted guest at the party. As in the Romantic era which celebrates the image of child and childhood (for example, Wordsworth calls the child as the father of the man in “My Heart Leaps Up” or Blake compares the progress of innocence and experience from the perspective of children), the novel praises nine-year-old Brooke as she is conscious of what the capitalist machine aims for. For this reason, Miles responds “why not?” when Brooke outside asks if he wants to hear a joke. After her joke of “Knock Knock”, the voice says “come in” and therefore Brooke finds out the door open. Miles says that “It hasn’t been locked for months, not since last summer, but nobody’s knocked on it till now” (338). Briganti and Mezei suggest that while “open doors represent conviviality and good life but also lack of privacy” (262), “closed doors are interpreted as the visual expression of entrenched archaic traditions and social stagnation” (263). Miles closes the door for his privacy to produce his own rebellious flow within a space which interrupts another flow, namely capitalism. Although on a societal basis the closed door represents his social withdrawal, this self-imposed confinement creates a tension between the exterior and the interior through the pattern of interiority within an interior. This interior space constitutes a *micrographia*¹¹ against the microcosm outside, which on a psychoanalytical level represents a psychic inner world to be displayed as a private identity. Therefore, the inner space of Miles merges with the inner space of the house as a body

¹¹ “A display of a world not necessarily known through the senses or lived experience” (Stewart 44).

without organs. In this regard, the home he visited for an enjoyable party firstly functions as a space of healing, but later turns out to be a poisonous space unearthing his unseen memories through the traumatogenic stressors employed by the hosts and regular guests. After his psychic journey of releasing the emotions in an artistic way, the room cures and allows him out. This pharmakon ambivalence of the house containing the opposed poles reveals *différance* by eliminating the superiority of one pair (Derrida, *Dissemination* 127). This process, as Derrida argues, would not be possible “if the pharmako-logos did not already harbour within itself that complicity of contrary values, and if the pharmakon in general were not, prior to any distinction-making, that which, presenting itself as a poison, may turn out to be a cure, may retrospectively reveal itself in the truth of its curative power” (*Dissemination* 125). Because Miles, before coming to the dinner party, does not know about how the house of a couple of strangers as a capitalist terrain will empoison him, his line of flight, therefore, goes parallel with the healing trait of it because it is his psychic journey that reverses the capitalism and the negative component of the pair. Therefore, the notion of pharmakon proceeds linear. Hence, to summarise, the architectural space can be interpreted in different and changing insights so as to put forth the interrelated connections through deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Because the architectural space is analysed in this section from mainly Deleuzian and Guattarian light, the psychic line of flight and the unseen traumas will be examined in the next section.

3.3. “The Head Has its Coffins”: Trauma and Working Through

Although at the dinner party Miles does not seem depressed, yet his locking himself up and refusing to talk to others hint that he is disturbed for some reason.

Because in the novel people hardly know him, they have no idea about what affected him so negatively as to self-isolate. What they do not know about his melancholic state is that he mourns for his girlfriend who died a long time ago when she was sixteen. Visiting her mother, who suffers from dementia, at the hospital every year on 29 January (the day she died), this year Miles postpones the date by locking himself up. Therefore, this section analyses how Miles is traumatized and how the trauma is worked through with Brooke's assistance.

Although externally trauma has considerable impacts on individual, its internal operation affects more. In the novel, because the characters do not even know about what Miles goes through, the memories in his head constitute the unseen face of the trauma. Firstly, his physical retreat from society also results in his psychological retreat which is related to his melancholic state. Freud states that "in one set of the cases it is evident that melancholia too may be the reaction to the loss of a loved object" ("Mourning and Melancholia" 245). This loved object for Miles is his girlfriend Jennifer who died at a young age, which is given in the chapter "But", the one narrated from the perspective of Jennifer's mother named May Young. The chapter begins with the definition of the word conjunction: "simultaneous occurrence in space and time a word that connects sentences, clauses and words one of the aspects of the planets, when two bodies have the same celestial longitude or the same right ascension" (195). The definition itself equates the bodies in the consolation of being one day at the same time and space. The pain is such an intense one that causes the character to hope to be united in another world. The melancholia of a lost beloved so absorbs his ego that the pain he feels inhibits him from appearing in the public. Freud describes the mental features of a melancholic person as "profoundly painful dejection, cessation of interest in the outside world, loss of capacity to love, inhibition of all activity and

a lowering of the self-regarding feelings” (“Mourning and Melancholia” 244). Likewise, Miles interrupts his existence by locking himself and refusing to talk to a single soul until Brooke speaks to him. This social withdrawal prevents him from all the activities he fulfilled once. However, most importantly, he reproaches himself through ceasing to be in the world and mimicking the non-presence of his girlfriend Jennifer. Anna firstly reflects that “Imagine the relief there’d be, in just stepping through the door of a spare room, a room that wasn’t anything to do with you, and shutting the door, and that being that” (66) and later thinks that “Did he want to know what it felt like to *not* be in the world?” (66). Although the reason for Miles’ seclusion is never clearly given in the novel, her question calls to mind the option that he mimics the non-presence of Jennifer in order to experience the conjunction. By doing so, he aims a spatial and temporal reunion which proves that the past is not resolved in his head. In this respect, Eng and Kazanjiyan note that “we might observe that in Freud’s initial conception of melancholia, the past is neither fixed nor complete. Unlike mourning, in which the past is declared resolved, finished, and dead, in melancholia the past remains steadfastly alive in the present” (3-4). In melancholia, the lost object is intensified in such a way that the past loss persists in the present. Having such a psychological background of a loss, Miles therefore, transfers the history of the loss to the present in the form of melancholia. The persistence of the past happens through the persistence of memory. In this sense, while May Young says that “The head has its own coffins” (203), she clearly displays the death of someone beloved as the main reason of trauma. However, “the head has its confines” (203) as well, which is ruled under the archon’s guardianship. According to Jacques Derrida, the concept of archive, both commanding and commencing, “shelters in itself, of course, the memory of the arkhe” (2) which is a domicile under the reservation

of entrusted archons. The archontic power lies in the fact that the archon is the one who “has the power to interpret the archives” (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 2) and who also “gathers the functions of unification, of identification, of classification” paired through the act of consigning, namely “gathering through signs” (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 3). Consignation, in this regard, prevents dissociation and keeps the memory alive. Therefore, the archon contributes to the melancholic remembering of Miles who never forgets Jennifer. This traumatic reoccurrence through memory can also be thought within Freudian “traumatic neurosis” which enacts itself through repetition of the perplexing experience (*Beyond* 7). Although Freud tackles the concept as repetitive in the case of dreams, Miles repeats remembering in his head through the impelling power of archon keeping the memories about Jennifer alive because in Freud’s words “'Forgetting' becomes still further restricted when we assess at their true value the screen memories which are so generally present.” (“Remembering” 149). Because he can no longer resist remembering, he repeats the experience of being-not-in-the-world without uttering a single word. When the fabric of neurosis captures the memories, Freud states that “If we confine ourselves to this second type (the neurosis) in order to bring out the difference, we may say that the patient does not *remember* anything of what he has forgotten and repressed, but *acts* it out. He reproduces it not as a memory but as an action; he *repeats* it, without, of course, knowing that he is repeating it.” (“Remembering” 150). Likewise, Miles repeats Jennifer’s non-presence as an act of self-isolation and he does it without noticing. He confines himself within a room just as she is confined within a coffin. He refuses to speak just as she cannot talk anymore. This reproduction of a traumatic event shows that firstly, he resists remembering; secondly, he transfers the past to the present; lastly, he replaces remembering with acting out. In her work entitled *Unclaimed Experience* (1996) Cathy Caruth defines

trauma as “an overwhelming experience of sudden or catastrophic events in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, uncontrolled repetitive appearance of hallucinations and other intrusive phenomena” (11). Focusing on the unexpectedness of a shocking experience in her definition, trauma is temporarily delayed until it is repeated in different forms. She names this temporal delay as “latency” (*Unclaimed* 4) which lasts until trauma haunts back. For this reason, Miles, under the influence of a traumatic event, experiences the latency until he faces the trauma in the room. Although Jennifer died when they were sixteen, it haunts Miles back at the age of forty-six. Therefore, trauma is not a simple wound to be assimilated in the past, yet its effects can be observed in the long run which makes trauma a matter of history as Caruth points out that “The traumatized, we might say, carry an impossible history within them, or they become themselves the symptom of a history that they cannot entirely possess” (“Introduction” 5). Rooted in the unconsciousness as a repressed material of personal history, therefore, the nature of trauma is self-referential. The history intruding after the latency period shows that memory is not a storehouse where trauma is locked in for ever, yet a fluid reconstruction bringing the recollections back as it is seen in the case of Miles who is traumatized after thirty years. As Caruth illustrates that “Traumatic experience, beyond the psychological dimension of suffering it involves, suggests a certain paradox: that the most direct seeing of a violent event may occur as an absolute inability to know it; that immediacy, paradoxically, may take the form of belatedness” (*Unclaimed* 91-92). Such an experience, which is a state beyond experience, affecting consciousness for years produces an enigma at the linguistic level as well. Miles’ refusal of speaking is not only a part of imitating Jennifer’s non-presence, but also refers to the unspeakability of the traumatic narrative. Balaev points to the fact that “since traumatic experience enters the psyche differently

than normal experience and creates an abnormal memory that resists narrative representation” (364). This inability of narrative representation takes place in the latency period in which the traumatized body develops resistances. Even this stage is sufficient to portray the coercive power of dissociation in one’s life. Van der Kolk and Van der Hart, in this context, approach neurobiologically towards trauma’s effects on memory and state that “When people are exposed to trauma, that is, a frightening event outside of ordinary human experience, they experience “speechless terror” and the experience cannot be organized on a linguistic level” (172). The trauma damages the psyche in such a way as to leave the body unable to speak of the terror. Because Miles also remains silent to whoever speaks to him, Anna thinks:

What would happen if you did just shut a door and stop speaking? Hour after hour after hour of no words. Would you speak to yourself? Would words just stop being useful? Would you lose language altogether? Or would words mean more, would they start to mean in every direction, all somersault and assault, like a thuggery of fireworks? Would they proliferate, like untended plantlife? Would the inside of your head overgrow with every word that has ever come into it, every word that has ever silently taken seed or fallen dormant? Would your own silence make other things noisier? Would all the reject bouldering up and avalanche you? (66).

Because Anna does not know the reason behind Miles’ isolation, the questions rushing to her head ponder the nature of language and its function for someone who refuse to talk. For Miles because it is an escape from the noise of the world so as to hear Jennifer better, he does not choose to be silent, yet he is unable to speak out loud. Although in the novel, he does not directly voice the trauma, the story he wrote in the room speaks for him, which hints the disruption of the ability to represent his trauma. Despite those who think he is having fun spinning the rowing machine in the room, he confronts with the repressed trauma coming

out of the unconscious. In the short story he wrote, he portrays a man on a cycle whose eyes and mouth are covered by grey rectangles like the censorship strips used to block one's identity as a protective measure. He writes that these rectangles indicate "something underhand, or seedy, or dodgy or worse, had happened; they were like a proof of something unspeakable" (2). Employed for avoiding exposing the identity, the strips announce a misfortunate event has happened to the bearer. It is also the strips that makes one say "there but for the grace of God go I". Representing his own condition of unspeakability in his short story, Miles actually narrates something unspeakable had happened to him by divulging the confrontations within the confines of his head. Therefore, he acts out the repressed in his short story and it abreacts Miles through bringing the repressed into the focus. Freud argues that "The greater the resistance, the more extensively will acting out (repetition) replace remembering" ("Remembering" 151). Miles replaces remembering with acting out in his story giving voice to the unspeakable loss. As it works as a way of purification, Miles manifests the loss which abreacts him from the trauma of Jennifer's death.

Traumatic bereavement of a loved one is "unmatched for its emptiness and profound sadness" (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 29) since it affects both physically and psychologically. Miles physically retreats himself from the rest, yet he also emotionally experiences a wide array of feelings of grief. As the loss of someone also means the loss of the role attached, it causes a void inside. Although it is hard for Miles to accept the loss of Jennifer, it is even harder for her family. The grief, consisting of five stages for Kübler-Ross, is therefore experienced by both of them. The first step to grief is denial which is "more symbolic rather than literal" because the denial is not the denial of death yet the denial of saying

“I can’t believe he is dead” as at first “it is too much for his or her psyche” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 8). This stage “functions as a buffer after unexpected shocking news, allows the patient to collect himself and, with time, mobilize other, less radical defences” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 52). Miles cannot believe that “last year she had gone to bed one night and the next morning nobody had been able to wake her up” (76). When he was seventeen and visited his grandpa at an alms-house where he expressed his longing of his wife, Miles thinks that “no one had yet solved the way of communicating with the dead” because “she had been young, like him, and not yet been onced by life” (76). He denies her death by questioning that such a person at a young age cannot be dead. He keeps on thinking that although it was the other boys who always wanted to see Jennifer’s live eyes, he never wanted to look in any other’s girls eyes and now because she is dead there would be no point in to look in her dead eyes (76). Because his thoughts show the reader the inner feelings and attachment he feels for Jennifer, it is indicated that Miles did not remember the death of Jennifer years later, yet he was shaken and traumatized by her death from the beginning. Therefore, trauma of the death of a beloved is not an experience that one can easily get over.

Secondly comes the step of anger which does not have a logical ground as it can be directed either at the loved one or, for example, at doctors for not being able to save him/her. Sometimes the anger is projected onto oneself because he/she is left behind. Therefore, after denial stage, the partial acceptance leads to anger rising from the fact that one cannot stop it from happening because “you may be angry at this unexpected, undeserved, and unwanted situation in which you find yourself” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 12). Anger is an essential stage to

release the feelings and Kübler-Ross and Kessler think it as a part of the healing process: “the more you truly feel it, the more it will begin to dissipate and the more you will heal” (*On Grief* 12). In the novel, although Miles is not portrayed in anger, Jennifer’s family projects their anger onto God who does not save Jennifer. Her brother Patrick says:

And he’d not gone to the church himself, not for years, not since Jennifer. Well, that was definitely understandable. I’d have believed in God if God’d done something about it, Patrick said. But who or what lifted even a finger? Who sees the sparrow fall? Nobody. It just falls. She just went. Nobody saw. There’s nobody there to see (239).

Despite being a regular churchgoer in the past, after Jennifer’s death he blames God for not saving Jennifer’s life: “there’s definitely no God in that church” (239). As anger is an illogical feeling, it causes him to deny God. After going to the church for years and performing religious service, he expects a reward, but instead God takes her life too young. For this reason, he questions God’s role in his life and thinks that God is deaf to his prayers. On the one hand the grief takes the full control of his religious belief, on the other hand, it is a necessary stage to release his feelings in order to move on to the next stage. Thus, it bridges the gap between the grief and healing, at the end of which “the anger will subside, and the feelings of loss will change form again” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 16).

The stage of anger gives its place to bargaining, the third phase of the stages of grief, in which “we become lost in a maze of “if only...” or “what if...” statements” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 17). These statements also steer the patient to the pre-acquired childhood behaviour of behaving well in order to get a reward at the end. In the first two phases, the patient observes that neither denial nor anger helps to get a positive response. For this reason, he

chooses to negotiate by thinking “God has decided to take us from this earth and he did not respond to my angry pleas, he may be more favourable if I ask nicely” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 93). This pre-learned behaviour is an attempt to postpone the acceptance although it seems to be about changing the perspective into positive to unburden the pain. Therefore, it is the pain bargained in order to “give our psyche the time it may need to adjust” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 19). In the novel, the feeling of anger to God is replaced with the negotiation of viewing God in a different light. May Young, Jennifer’s mother, believes that God is in anything even in the eye of a rabbit. Because Miles visits May in every January on the anniversary of Jennifer, she believes that God is also in the eyes of Miles (240). Through this idea, she not only relieves the anger of the loss, but also proves that she negotiates with God by appointing Miles’ presence as a substitute for Jennifer’s absence. Hence, she postpones the idea of the pain of the loss by searching for life in the eyes of different beings. Although she holds onto the life through postponing the idea of death, she still identifies Miles’ visit with the death of Jennifer as he sees her in every January on day of her anniversary. On Miles’ part, the negotiation with Jennifer’s death happens through the postponement of seeing May. Once, he sends a postcard instead of visiting her at the hospital. He writes “Dear Mrs Young, I’m sorry not to be there in person this year, I’m in Canada on secondment and won’t be in the UK again till the end of February” (273). He fails to fulfil his annual visit, but still, he remembers the day. When he locks himself into the room, he slides a note under the door written “Hello. I’m hoping it will be possible for someone to visit and sit with Mrs. Young, we Belleville Park, Reading, for some of the day on 29 January, on my behalf. Very grateful for your help. Thank you” (304). It is obvious that Miles postpones his visits because he has difficulty in dealing with the pain of facing

the loss. Even though May and Miles postpone the pain in different ways, the common ground they share is remembering Jennifer in their memories within the confines of their heads. Although May suffers from dementia, the streams of her narrated thoughts show that she always remembers certain memories from her infancy until she dies. For this reason, this stage, in a way, is the one the sufferer clings to memories and endures through bargaining and postponement until s/he yields to the heaviness of depression in the next stage.

After bargaining, grief and empty feelings invade the mood of the sufferer, which feels as if the pain will last forever. This sort of depression is different from the clinical one because it is a response to a loss. The person withdraws from daily activities and care, yet it is still a necessary step in the process of healing because depression “is a way for nature to keep us protected by shutting down the nervous system so that we can adapt to something we feel we cannot handle” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 21). For this reason, for such a compelling process, Kübler-Ross and Kessler proposes to approach depression in a paradoxical manner:

See it as a visitor, perhaps an unwelcome one, but one who is visiting whether you like it or not. Make a place for your guest. Invite your depression to pull up a chair with you in the front of the fire, and sit with it, without looking for a way to escape. Allow the sadness and emptiness to cleanse you and help you explore your loss in its entirety. When you allow yourself to experience depression, it will leave as soon as it has served its purpose in your loss. As you grow stronger it may return from time to time, but that is how grief works. (*On Grief* 22).

Rather than avoiding negative feelings, Kübler-Ross and Kessler view depression as an essential step towards recovery. As the postponed feelings in the previous stage do not solve depression or bring back the loss, embracing the flow of grief and seeing it from a different light works as a confrontation method to empower

the sufferer. Likewise, Miles yields to the operation of depression driven by Freudian melancholia as previously mentioned in detail. His physical and psychological retreat do not point to a clinical depression, yet to the one based on the grief of losing Jennifer. He refuses to communicate with other people and prefers to be alone within the confines of his head. This process is the one carrying him a step further for the acceptance stage, the final stage, which paves the way for healing. However, the depression stage spatially operates differently for May Young because her isolation in a room stems from her suffering from dementia. She stays at a care home called Harbour House. On her hospital file written she is admitted with “general collapse, delirium and high fever” (206). DSM-5 includes dementia under the category of neurocognitive disorders and describes that “in some individuals, particularly elderly persons, a major depressive episode may sometimes be the initial presentation of an irreversible dementia” (164). For May, losing her daughter is the reason for her suffering from dementia as she is portrayed remembering the memories of Jennifer and talking to her daughter in the head. As the comorbidities of the trauma are cognitive and in language delays, May’s depression stage is the presentation of dementia processing since the death of Jennifer. Although she does not speak out loud, she speaks to herself in her head to prove that she is not dead yet:

She could prove for sure she was not dead because there, sweaty in the old claw of an old hand, whose hold hand? *Her* old hand, her own, go on, open it, proof: the balled-up tissue which held what she’d managed to get out of her mouth of the stuff they gave her to make her forget to remember the day, the month, the prime minister, make her drop her bowl with the custard in it, stuff which she had not swallowed, *would* not swallow, which she’d held under her tongue when the nurse, Irish-Liverpool, always a cheery word, gave her, and if it wasn’t Irish-Liverpool it was Derek the male nurse, lovely boy from the Caribbean, with May nodding and sending them on their way with a friendly eye (208).

She proves her existence through thinking about the tissue she uses for getting out of the custard. Before this, she is self-alienated in such an extreme way that when she looks at her hand, firstly she proves that it is her own hand holding the tissue. Therefore, such a delay in language giving its place to inner monologue shows that she goes through dissociation, which is seen, according to DSM-5, as a risk factor after traumatic event (278). Although memory deficit may accompany dementia-related disorders, her memory is well enough to remember the details such as where the staff are from. She does not forget the memories of Jennifer either. She even considers on how Miles' visits bring back the years that made him grow into an adult, but Jennifer missed. In such a state of mind where questioning her existence is a matter, she remembers nine-year-old Jennifer asking every member of the family about what human beings are for:

For having a good time RICK

For making the world a better place NOR

For looking after each other MUM

For building things that will last DAD (259).

May is stuck with her daughter's memories to the extent that she does not need any sort of external trigger to recollect her memories. What is well worth mentioning here is the particular memory she remembers in which Jennifer questions the reason for the people's existence. When May's present condition is considered, a person whose mental faculties decrease day by day, she feels like it is also her presence which decreases. She says she would rather die and go to hell than wake up one day and find herself in a guesthouse (211). However, she is at a care home, a place where the presence of people staying there makes no difference. Hence, it makes her question her own presence as she recalls the

memory of Jennifer questioning the existence of humanity. This existential crisis stemming from depression not only presents the devastating results of the trauma, but also shows how depression as a tight spot affects personal well-being by decreasing self-worth.

In this respect, the fifth and the final stage of grief is acceptance, which is confused with a happy stage, yet it is about “accepting the reality that our loved one is physically gone and recognizing that this new reality is the permanent reality” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 25). The previous feelings of denial and anger are now replaced by a “void of feelings” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 124). Leaving all the feelings behind and accepting the loss is another compelling stage which paves the way to healing. Although the pain is gone, healing is also painful since it is about “remembering, recollecting and reorganizing” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 25). When the sufferer reorganizes his memories, it brings acceptance which leads to the understanding that the loss is forever lost and therefore readjustment is necessary. With this understanding, the sufferer admits that although one relationship with our loved one is broken up, a new form begins because “as we move through grief, healing brings us closer to the person we loved” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 25). Getting close to the loss through remembering as suggested by Kübler-Ross, Freud also notes that “no memory can as a rule be recovered” which shows that a complete healing is a hard-to-attain ordeal yet remembering enables a psychoanalytic catharsis by bringing the repressed into the focus of conscious in order to overcome resistances (“Remembering” 149). This process provides a sort of purification through abreaction (Freud “Remembering”, 145-146). Therefore, remembering forms the basis of working through trauma. Although in the novel Miles barricades himself to take a spatial

refuge from the crowd outside, this act brings him closer to the voice of the loss. He remembers the memories of Jennifer and also, he does not forget about the annual visit he pays for Jennifer's mother. Thinking about the loss for months in the room alone, he does not find any sort of motivation or positive triggering factor to go out and continue his life outside until the final stage of acceptance which is an essential lease of working through his trauma proceeded by the help of Brooke. After discovering the door unlocked, she asks:

“Do you not want to come out of here? Could I? Mr Garth said. I don't see why not, Brooke said, I mean, I think so. What I mean is, it's not as if there's very much a person can do to keep himself or herself occupied in here. Oh, I don't know, I've been pretty busy, Mr Garth said, and he showed how many miles he'd done on the exercise bike speedo, which said 3,015.78 (340).

The row machine in the room, not only offers a new mode against the capitalist machine as mentioned in the previous section, but it also implies the unseen in the novel. Although all the people outside believe that he just wastes time idly, what is unseen is the fact that he cycles more than three thousand miles. For this reason, he criticizes the judgemental attitude of people outside who also do not know about the trauma he goes through. He reinforces this idea by saying that “Think how quiet a book is on the shelf, he said just sitting there, unopened. Then think what happens when you open it” (345). Brooke, in this sense, sees what others cannot and encourages him to write a short story with the first sentence beginning with “There was once a man who lived in a small room, managed to cycle his bike three thousand miles” (346). Writing a short story helps him to manifest his repressed traumatic feelings so that he can accomplish the phase of acceptance and step out of the room. Therefore, this artistic way of abreaction functions as a cathartic purification. The story firstly draws a figure of man whose eyes are covered with grey rectangles which are later folded into the

shape of a paper plane with a good aerodynamics flying all over the room because the small boy in the room teaches the man how to make one. Since Brooke is also the one who leads Miles to produce a creative artistic piece that positively affects his ability to self-express and communicate through the work, the abreacting process for both Miles and the man in his story unloads their burdening inner trauma. Although the novel does not give an explicit hint about Miles' later life, his unlocking the door and going out imply that he achieves all the stages of grief and wends his way of recovering from the trauma.

In conclusion, the initial codes written on the guests bodies as "different" serves for the capitalist satisfaction of the hosts and the regular guests, yet their racial, occupational, gender-based bias annoy Miles in such a way as to trigger his previous trauma and to barricade himself. This act subverts the veins of the capitalist flow by deterritorializing the accepted ways of their community as well as taking Miles' body out of being a practice platform. However, this process leads him to be labelled as disenfranchised which intertwines and merges the room and his body around the same codes. Turning over one code by the capitalist machine causes him to take over another which shows that it is not easy to get out of the roles and stigmas assigned to the person. Besides, this also leads to the extension of the private norms to be employed in the public space. This stigmatization goes parallel with the pharmakon statues of the house, turning it from a neutral one to the poisonous and from the poisonous to the healing one. Miles' deterritorialization is a curative act since he goes through the stages of grief from where he successfully reaches the acceptance way. Initially being in a melancholic state with the aim of getting close to Jennifer, Miles confronts with the loss step by step. Finally making a move outside to fulfil reterritorialization,

he, therefore, completes his psychic journey by shattering both the capitalist flow and all other labels. Writing a short story based on his experiences inside, the novel assumes a hopeful future for Miles who works through abreaction.



CHAPTER IV:
BODY, SPACE AND TRAUMA in
PAT BARKER'S *TOBY'S ROOM* (2012)

*Everywhere you shut me in. Always you assign a place to me.
Even outside the frame that I form with you...
You set limits even to events that could happen with others...
You mark out boundaries, draw lines, surround, enclose.
Excising, cutting out. What is your fear?
That you might lose your own property.
What remains is an empty frame. You cling to it, dead.*

Luce Irigaray, *Elemental Passions*, 1992

Pat Barker's novel, *Toby's Room* (2012) takes place during the years of WWI, which begins with the incident of Elinor's rape and follows what happens to a group of students studying at Slade School of Fine Arts. Although the novel is set under the shadow of the dreads of war, this study focuses merely on Elinor's personal trauma of incest. Elinor is grown up in a family where the patriarchal norms are highly praised and practised by her sister Rachel and her mother, which causes them to be on strained terms as Elinor non-conforms with their perspective of being "proper". As another family member turning against her, his father's attitude contributes to the predicament. Therefore, it is only Toby from the start who supports Elinor, cares about her, and spends time with her. However, when the current domestic constrains are combined with Toby's rape, Elinor's family ties are further loosened. Filling with hate inside due to the rape trauma, Elinor emotionally goes through an array of distressing periods ranging from alienation to self-reproach or from resistance to languishment. Fluctuating between Lacanian

Symbolic and Kristevan semiotic, Elinor is overwhelmed by the traumatizing incest in such a way that the death of Toby relieves her for only a short period of time. Only after her father sells the home, can Elinor step forward to recover. Therefore, in the first section, Elinor's being torn between the Symbolic and the semiotic in terms of her familial and social relations will be examined. The second section tackles space politics from the lenses of Freudian cave and Kristevan concept of the *chora* and also in this section the function of landscape in an artistic creation will be discussed. The third part analyses her trauma and working through in the light of Kübler-Rossian model of grief.

4.1. “Yet Again, She was Being Treated Like a Child”: Patriarchal Modes of Domination and Elinor's Social Relations

The novel is divided into two parts called respectively as “1912” and “1917”. In the first one, taking place before the outbreak of WWI, the familial affairs of The Brookes are revealed. Elinor harbours against her family because they endorse a Lacanian mode of patriarchal discourse. However, Elinor finds solace in the thoughtful attitude of Toby with whom she studies in London. Not only her family but also her social circle in London adopts similar views on the inferiority of women. In this section, firstly the discursal oppression of her family and social circle from Lacanian perspective will be discussed and then, in response to this, her resilience taking its source from Kristevan understanding will be examined.

From a feminist perspective, language can be defined as one of the strongest patriarchal tools of oppression designed to subordinate women because language acquisition is the simple gateway to the normalized usage of socially accepted

norms. When a child encounters language, which comes with the pre-regulated cultural rules, s/he also learns the phallogentric structure of it. This structure stems from the signifying process of language consisting of the relation between signifier and signified which designates, according to Kristeva, two modalities as the Symbolic and the semiotic determining the dialectics of modes of articulation (*Revolution* 24). To understand the operation of signifying process, it is essential to interpret language from both Lacanian and Kristevan perspective in order to analyse Elinor's oppression and her later reclamation of identity.

For Lacan, "the unconscious is structured like a language" (*The Four Fundamental*, 149) and therefore the significance of language, in terms of its unconscious transference to social structures, is undeniable in his three stages of psychosexual development which are the Real, the Imaginary and the Symbolic. In the first stage, occurring between 0-6 months of age, the new-born cannot distinguish itself from the mother as all the needs, without the necessity of using a language, are met by the primary caretaker. Although the body is perceived as fragmented, the baby forms an Ideal Ego through the unity of mother and child bond which is stated by Lacan as follows: "This jubilant assumption of his specular image by the child at the *infans* stage, still sunk in his motor incapacity and nursing dependence, would seem to exhibit in an exemplary situation the symbolic matrix in which the *I* is precipitated in a primordial form, before it is objectified in the dialectic of identification with the other, and before language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject" (*Ecrits* 2). This identification with the mother, however, is shattered by "the libidinal dynamism" (Lacan, *Ecrits* 2) of the next stage where the infant between 6-18 months of age differentiates the image of the self in the mirror. This differentiation takes its source from the realization

that the mother lacks phallus in contrary to initially developed thought that she has one. Positioning the mother as “the other”, therefore, the infant identifies the self with its reflection in the mirror. At this point, Elizabeth Grosz argues that “she is positioned in relation to a signifier, the phallus, which places her in the position of *being* rather than *having*” (Jacques Lacan 71). Although the specular image is firstly perceived as a positive one due to the symbiotic unity, at the end it works against the mother. From the infant’s part, the specular “I” turns into the social “I” (Muller and Richardson 33), the importance of which lies in the fact that

The *mirror stage* is a drama whose internal thrust is precipitated from insufficiency to anticipation—and which manufactures for the subject, caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of phantasies that extends from a fragmented body-image to a form of its totality that I shall call orthopaedic—and, lastly, to the assumption of the armour of an alienating identity, which will mark with its rigid structure the subject’s entire mental development (Lacan, *Écrits* 4).

While the former version of the fulfilled image of the self paves the way for a narcissistic claim, the latter separated image is traumatic in the sense that the misidentification alienates the infant through the production of an imaginary order. This stage is essential because it proceeds the infant to the next stage of the Symbolic where h/she enters the cultural dynamics of language through gaining unconsciousness. Being a speaking subject now means to acquire the language of the Symbolic Father because after the discovery of the mother’s lack of phallus, the castration anxiety of the child is triggered by the presence of the phallus-owner. Therefore, the child does not fluctuate between the polar edges of the binary (mother/father) but becomes a subject of the Law-of-the-Father. The paternal signifier, the Name-of-the-Father, is therefore located at the centre of language acquisition process. The Symbolic register in the language of the father culturally

means to enter into the paradigm of socially constructed patriarchal structures. As illustrated by Kaja Silverman “the phallus is a signifier for the cultural privileges and positive values which define male subjectivity within patriarchal society, but from which the female subject remains isolated. It is thus closely aligned with two other very privileged terms within the Lacanian grammar, "symbolic father" and "Name-of-the-Father." All three are signifiers of paternal power and potency” (183-184). Therefore, on a larger scale, the phallogocentric culture intentionally designs a hierarchical order where female subjectivity is subordinated. The parallel of this idea is echoed from the beginning of the novel by the family figures as the representatives of the Name-of-the-Father. They adopt and internalize the patriarchal values in such a way that they exercise its protocols zealously to interfere with Elinor’s choices in life. The novel starts with Elinor wearing a red dress tugged the neckline up. When her mother sees the dress, she says “Elinor, go upstairs at once and take that ridiculous dress off” (4)¹². In the family dinner, her mother expresses her disapproval of a red dress which makes Elinor feel “hurt and humiliated” as she thinks she is again “treated like a child” (4). From her mother’s comment is seen the unsupportive family atmosphere between Elinor and her mother. In this respect, Andrew Mullender divides domestic abuse into three categories as physical, sexual and emotional, and goes on describing emotional abuse as another tactic “to break the woman’s spirit and destroy her self-image and self-esteem” (24). Elinor already feels discomfort because of a possible personal attack and her mother contributes to her restlessness with a humiliating remark only to exhibit her control over Elinor. Her discomfort shows that emotional abuse is not something new, but she is already familiar with such abusive comments

¹² The ensuing references to the novel will be given parenthetically by only page numbers.

because they are repetitive. Judith Herman problematizes the American Psychiatric Association's definition for traumatic events indicated as "outside the range of usual human experience" because the forms of domestic violence are "so common a part of women's lives that they can hardly be described as outside the range of ordinary experience" (33). Laura S. Brown also criticizes the definition by stating that "The range of human experience becomes the range of what is normal and usual in the lives of men of the dominant class; white, young, able-bodied, educated, middle-class, Christian men. Trauma is thus that which disrupts these particular human lives, but no other" (101). Therefore, the definition is problematic also in the sense that it is only based on "white male human experience". In Elinor's case, the emotional form of domestic abuse is not outside the range of her family relations, which is expressed with the sentence "yet again, she was treated like a child" (4). The source of the emotional abuse she goes through is her family's adoption of the Symbolic Order, which is also depicted by Rachel's asking question after question about her life in London, "who she met, who she went out with, did she have any particular friends?" (4). When they hear the name of Kit Neville, another art student, her mother and Rachel ask such questions:

"What does he do?" Mother asked. Predictably.

"He's a student."

"What sort of student?"

"Art. What else would he be doing at the Slade?"

"Have you met his family?"

"Now why on earth would I want to do that?"

"Because that's what people do when—"

"When they are about to get engaged? Well, I am not. We're just friends. Very good friends, but ... *friends*."

"You need to be careful, Elinor," Rachel said. "Living in London on your own. You don't want to get a reputation..." (5).

Living in London on her own as a student and as an independent woman threatens the established patriarchal hegemony. The patriarchal discourse internalized by her mother and Rachel speaks for the Law-of-the-Father which embeds the patriarchal standards in female consciousness in such a strict way as to police the appropriateness of behaviours of others. Question after question they ask about Kit Neville by using the patriarchal codes meanwhile, because being a friend of the opposite sex is not appropriate for them. She must engage with him in order not to be a notorious woman. For this reason, they check in on Elinor through a language originally oriented from male consciousness which is acknowledged also in female one so as not to fall outside of the phallogentric realm. By doing so, they aim to inflict the patriarchally-approved codes on her body. As stated in Lacan's views, the patriarchal discourse invades and dominates from a very early age to manoeuvre into the male-centred structures that determine the borders of superiority. In the case of women, the internalization of the patriarchal construction of female propriety catalyses the secure and predetermined sense of identity for the conformists. For this reason, both Elinor's mother and sister secure their places in the matrix by using a patronizing patriarchal tone in their conversation. In this regard, Sandra L. Bartky argues that "Something is "internalized" when it gets incorporated into the structure of the self. By "structure of the self" I refer to those modes of perception and of self-perception which allow a self to distinguish itself both from other selves and from things which are not selves." (77). In this sense, her mother and sister incorporate the patriarchal trajectory of language for the sake of the structure of a self which is accepted within the frames of patriarchal society and also of a self which is not the thing patriarchy condemns. Their attitude is supported by her father saying only "Elinor, that's enough" (6), which again shows the effective operation of the patriarchal rules by the females at their

home. While explaining the sociological basis of sexual politics, Kate Millet suggests that “patriarchy’s chief institution is the family” (33) and “the chief contribution of the family in patriarchy is the socialization of the young (largely through the example and admonition of their parents) into patriarchal ideology’s prescribed attitudes toward the categories of role, temperament, and status” (35). For the permanency of their status in patriarchy, therefore, the young ones should follow the same codes. Elinor’s behaving accordingly not only mirrors the conformity of her family in the Symbolic, but also guarantees on a larger scale her family’s connection with larger society because “the family not only encourages its own members to adjust and conform but acts as a unit in the government of the patriarchal state which rules its citizens through its family heads” (Millet 33). To exist in such an intercorrelated system, therefore, her family members adopt the patriarchal codes so as to inscribe them on Elinor’s body.

Rather than encouraging Elinor as a young artist, they practise the way that a girl should be proper. Elinor’s internal speech says “All this nonsense about young men... It was just another way of drilling it into you that the real business of a girl’s life was to find husband. Painting was at best, an accomplishment; at worse, a waste of time.” (7). Although her ability to paint is not appreciated in her family because it is out of the scope of the prescribed duties of a girl, she perseveres in painting as a revolt in which she builds resilience. Because she does not submit to the lure of the Symbolic, unlike the other female members of the family, she is easily blamed for lacking chastity and purity. Although she is expected to yield to the Name-of-the-Father, she clings on to Kristevan semiotic. The first line of resistance can be considered when she says “I do want to get a reputation, as it happens. I want to get a reputation as a painter.” When Lacan

presumes that “language is structured in the consciousness”, he predicates on male consciousness to design the structures of language which therefore eliminates female subjectivity to voice her own consciousness as it is also observed in the instances of her mother and sister. However, Kristevan semiotic takes its grounds from the marginal and the heterogeneous “which can subvert the central structures of traditional linguistics” (Moi 161). She subverts the gender-based structure of the established Symbolic linguistic order when she says that she does not want to get a reputation as a “female” artist but only as a “painter” regardless of gender. It is Kristevan insight that envisages the pre-oedipal mother transcending the boundaries of both masculinity and femininity and encompassing all gender divisions. Therefore, her sentence is a revolt against patriarchy in the sense that Elinor dwells not on gender-related discursal norms, but instead on her ability to paint as an artist. By doing so, Elinor adopts Kristevan semiotic despite the dominant Lacanian Symbolic prevailing around her. Kristeva begins to define the semiotic as follows:

We shall call this disposition *semiotic* (*le sémiotique*), meaning, according to the etymology of the Greek *sémeion*, a distinctive mark, trace, index, the premonitory sign, the proof, the engraved mark, imprint-- in short, a *distinctiveness* admitting of an uncertain and indeterminate articulation because it does not yet refer (for young children) or no longer refers (in psychotic discourse) to a signified object for a thetic consciousness (*Desire* 133).

In spite of having a bond with the Symbolic, Kristevan semiotic points to the preverbal stage where the signification is absent. Although Lacanian Symbolic refers to the stage of entrance into language, Kristevan semiotic is not a language because it is preoedipal in which all the necessities of the infant are met by the mother. Because the infant is not a speaking subject yet, the way of expression is with intonations, gestures, and imitations of rhythm which are signifying part of the semiotic (McAfee 18). Because the Symbolic imposes the familial and social

structures on the individual, it is a stage dominated by the Law-of-the-Father. However, the semiotic is linked with the mother where sexual differences, language, or norms do not exist. Therefore, although her family relations are compelling due to its father-identificatory ground, Elinor resides in the semiotic which fuels her struggle against her family's values. Similar to the productivity of the rhythmic pulses of the semiotic, her principle to be a well-known artist originates from the productive power of the semiotic. Therefore, for Elinor, the semiotic becomes a method of subverting her family's expectations to be "proper".

Her determination of being a famous artist gives the strength to stand not only against her family but also against her lecturers and male peers. Since the family as the smallest unit mirrors larger society and other larger institutions (Millet 33), it is not unpredictable to observe the oppression of the private extending to the public. The patriarchal agency at home views an independent and successful woman as a threat against its values which is also echoed at the college she studies. Because she is a painter, it is essential for her to be familiar with human anatomy and for this reason she is recommended by one of her professors to take a dissection course from the medical school. The lecturer of the course, however, states

Dissection was not for everybody, he said. Women, in particular, found the long hours of standing difficult. Any young lady who discovered she'd been mistaken in her aptitudes should come to him at once—there'd be no disgrace in this, mind, none whatsoever— and he'd arrange for her to transfer to a more suitable course: biology or chemistry or— his face brightened— botany (31).

The lecturer, Dr Angus Brodie, by saying "dissection is not for everybody" actually intends to say that it is only not for female students. Mansplaining as a sort of manipulation means "to explain something to a woman in a condescending way

that assumes she has no knowledge about the topic” (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mansplain>). Because it is another form of oppression and abuse, therefore, it can be regarded that the violence both in the private and the public is a systematic one. In response to the lecturer, Elinor says “I don’t know what effect it had on the others, but it made me more determined to stick it out, no matter how hard it is” (31). Elinor is well aware that she goes through such sorts of constraint simply because she is a woman. She has analytical lenses to observe the happenings which is clearly seen in her comments. For instance, in a conversation with Paul where she acts confidently, she realizes “how surprised men were when girls spoke directly or behaved confidently. Almost as if they were so used to simpering and giggling they didn’t know how to react” (70). In another instance with her brother and friends, they talk:

“Do you think time spent teaching women is wasted?” Toby said, with a sidelong glance at Elinor.

“Present company excepted, yes. Well. Largely.”

“I don’t think Elinor wants to be that kind of exception, do you, sis?” (47).

Although Elinor is a promising young artist who even won a prize for one of her drawings before, the Symbolic discourse around her ignores her talent because people, the representatives of patriarchy, view the primary responsibility of a woman as her home, husband and children. Therefore, Elinor intimidates the present systematic oppression not simply with her gender, but with her talent, confident attitudes and determination. In this vein, Elinor is a Kristevan abject body which is defined by Kristeva as: “It is thus not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite” (*Powers* 4). Elinor also shakes patriarchy and its systematic devices by developing a “self” depending

on the semiotic, which makes it easier for her to analyse “the other” within the Symbolic yoke. Kristeva argues that the infant even breaks the symbiotic unity through rejecting embrace, crying or spitting out the milk and therefore builds subjectivity by positing the difference between the self and other. By doing so, the infant separates the self from “unclean” which is not a part of the self. McAfee states that

What is abjected is radically excluded but never banished altogether. It hovers at the periphery of one’s existence, constantly challenging one’s own tenuous borders of selfhood. What makes something abject and not simply repressed is that it does not entirely disappear from consciousness. It remains as both an unconscious and a conscious threat to one’s own clean and proper self. The abject is what does not respect boundaries. It beseeches and pulverizes the subject (46).

The abject violates the established norms, disturbs the identity, jeopardizes the subject, and remains as a threat to the Symbolic and its instrumentalities. The presence of the abject does not submerge in the consciousness in a Freudian sense of repression, yet it floats vaguely in-between the surfaces of “clean” and “unclean”. Therefore, it is not a temporal stage in the development yet accompanies for life. Elinor can be regarded as an abject body who differentiates her subjectivity from the rest of “other” consciousness, namely the representatives of patriarchy both in the private and public. Because the abject sense of self hovers between, Elinor’s site of resistance shows that her discrete self outweighs on the part of “clean” because she disrupts the systematicity of the Symbolic realm by threatening its order. Therefore, the emotional abuse in the private combined with the oppression in the public is what Elinor can seem to handle in her own semiotic-oriented way.

No matter how she deals with the emotional abuse through the semiotic, it is the sexual assault, another form of domestic abuse, which leads her to yield to trauma and cross the region of “unclean”. Elinor, in a way, accepts all the family

members, professors and friends threatening her independent self, yet she still seeks solace in the intimacy of her brother Toby because he was the one in the past who “shielded her from mother’s constant carping, the comparisons with Rachel that were never in her favour, the chill of their father’s absence” (15), but he is also the one who inflicts sexual violence on her. Before the incidents, Elinor defines their relationship as close as to keep no secrets from each other (5). Therefore, it is obvious that they trust each other more than anyone else. However, in the first incident he kisses her and in the second he rapes her. After the second one, Elinor describes the violence as “a catastrophe that had ripped a hole in the middle of her life” (11). When he grabs her in the first, she thinks it as a part of some childish game, but suddenly he kisses her. She struggles to escape, but she “felt herself softening, flowing towards him, as if something hard and impacted in the pit of her stomach had begun to melt” (11). She explodes with anger at Toby, but at herself as well. When she sneaks into his room at night to pour a jug of water on him, he wakes up and rapes her. She says that he “pressed her clenched fists hard into the pit of her stomach where she’d felt that treacherous melting. Never again. She would never, *never*, let her body betray her in that way again. A little self-consciously she began to cry, but almost at once gave up in disgust. What happened was too awful for tears” (14). As it is stated, the abject hover around “clean” and “unclean”. While “clean” is associated with the construction of a subjective self, “unclean” is linked with filth such as human effluence, bodily fluids and corpse. Kristeva notes that “excrement and its equivalents (decay, infection, disease, corpse, etc.) stand for the danger to identity that comes from without: the ego threatened by the non-ego, society threatened by its outside, life by death” (*Powers* 71). Although the notion of abject is featured as ambiguous due to its nature of being in the middle of the dichotomy, its

closeness to “filth” threatens the identity, the order of the society and even life itself. Similar to Kristevan vigorous figure of abject, Mary Douglas also focuses on the power dirt holds: “As we know it, dirt is essentially disorder. There is no such thing as absolute dirt: it exists in the eye of the beholder. If we shun dirt, it is not because of craven fear, still less dread of holy terror. Nor do our ideas about disease account for the range of our behaviour in cleaning or avoiding dirt. Dirt offends against order” (2). On the individual level, defilement disrupts the norm of “proper” body. On the societal basis, because dirt is the marginal, it puts the dominant order at risk. Hence, it becomes a powerful notion revolting against the continuity of the privileged. Elinor, in her conflict against patriarchy, turns “filth” into an advantage by behaving a “lily on the dung heap” (54), which again disturbs the gender-based perspective of her professors. However, the sexual abuse shatters her abject identity. In psychoanalytic theory where the unprivileged polar of the binary is always attributed to femininity, for example masculine rationality favours reason, order, unity and lucidity, yet irrationality, chaos, and fragmentation has come to represent femininity (Moi 160), therefore it also identifies filth and unclean with female body. In this regard, Elinor, being once a Kristevan abject who dwells on the semiotic to struggle with the systematic oppression, now thinks her body betrays herself twice with the bodily liquids melting inside. Because she immediately associates the fluid with “filth”, she does not even cry because tear is another liquid that will flow towards Toby. Although her gender-based bodily codes put patriarchy at risk at the beginning, now she falls into the Symbolic by regarding her body as “treacherous” due to the shock of trauma. Being labelled in accordance with the dominating culture, Elinor now views her betrayer body at an inferior status. In her room she thinks that “she thought she looked a bit like a moth herself, fluttering to and fro in front of the mirror as she undressed and

brushed her hair” (14). Similar to Kafkaesque transformation of Gregor Samsa into an insect, Elinor metamorphoses into a moth when she sees her reflection as repulsive in the mirror. In this regard, Kristeva points out that “Like an Alice in distressland, the depressed woman cannot put up with mirrors. Her image and that of others arouse within her wounded narcissism, violence, and the desire to kill—from which she protects herself by going through the looking glass and settling down in that other world where, by limitlessly spreading her constrained sorrow, she regains a hallucinated completedness” (*Black Sun* 74). The mirror functioning as a threshold to Elinor’s psyche produces “a hallucinated completedness” through the reflection of a moth-self which clearly crystallizes the dissociation she goes through. In another instance, the narrator expresses that “Lying between the sheets, she felt different; her body had turned into bread dough, dough that’s been kneaded and pounded till it’s gray, lumpen, no yeast in it, no lightness, no prospect of rising” (24). She is traumatized in such a way as to reject the previous perception of her body in human skin. Being a part of “unclean” now, this transformation shatters her previous identity. Feeling disembodied, she can no longer connect with the semiotic self. Because the trauma of incest is a devastating experience, she inserts the previously rejected codes on her body which results in a sort of disgust with her body. The perimeters of in-betweenness of the abject work against her body because the trauma changes her once functional, undocile and resistant body into a passive, liminal and filthy form. This sudden transformation situates her former self directly in the heart of the “other”, which no longer suggests “the integrity of one’s ‘own and clean self’” (Kristeva, *Powers* 53). As Richard Kearney states that “we have been known to turn the Other into a monster” (5) which “defies our accredited norms of identification” (4) and “occupies the frontier zone where reason falters and fantasies flourish” (3). Transcending the familiar, her body

opposes the semiotic through the fantasy of monstrosity. By dehumanizing her body like having a fracture in the psyche, she disconnects with the self which is interpreted by her mother as the disconnection with all the family because she regards Elinor's closeness with Toby is the only thing that ties Elinor to the rest. For the first time "her mother's face softened, as it never did when she looked at Elinor" (17). She asks whether some quarrel between her and Toby happened because she detected a bit of an atmosphere. When her mother says "I want to tell you something, Elinor", a sentence starting a mother-daughter chat, Elinor thinks that "she and her mother never had a mother-daughter chat. That was Rachel's province. The bare minimum of information that had been imparted to Elinor when she reached the age of thirteen had been conveyed by Rachel, in this, as in all other things, their mother's deputy" (18). Even when she reached adolescence, the instructions were conveyed by Rachel instead of her mother. For this reason, she is puzzled to have such a private conversation. However, the reason behind having the talk is because her mother is worried about Toby who "is a bit of losing you [Elinor]. He hasn't been happy recently" (21). She tells how Toby gave up having an imaginary friend after Elinor's walking around him as she could do when she was small. As her mother speaks, Elinor sees jealousy and resentment of their closeness (20). Therefore, their conversation turns out to lack mending and understanding. The strained relationship between the mother and the daughter portrayed at the beginning remains the same until Elinor leaves home for London.

The familial relationship presents how Elinor is ostracized because she does not obey her family's patriarchal values. Although every member follows The Symbolic approach that imprisons the individual in a certain matrix, Elinor

overcomes the emotional abuse by relying on the semiotic. Instead of keeping up with the existing order, she stands against through Kristevan abject who disturbs the prevailing system with building a resilient identity. The oppression in the private extends to the public because it is systematic and political. No matter how she remains strong, the sexual violence drops her guard by shifting the status of “clean” into “unclean”, which leads her fluctuation between two polar edges and thereby shaking her identity.

4.2. “Taking up More and More Room Until There was No Space Left for Her”: Spatial Paths and Choraic Flights

The enclosure of women in domestic spaces brings along the investigation of the norms which turns the dwelling into a space of duty. Elinor is expected to fulfil her duties in such a space by her family. When she is in her hometown, the spatial limitation is noteworthy in the sense that the occupied spaces get more entrapping, which represents Elinor’s psychological confinement. Therefore, starting in a house, the novel later follows an old mill and a room until she returns to London. The spatial alterations, therefore, shows the vicious circle she resides in, which also affects her sense of art and the representation of space in her portraits. Although personally she experiences the trauma of incest, the ongoing war is another distressing condition that prompts her to paint landscapes, which becomes a choraic flight for her. Therefore, this section analyses the spaces in relation with Elinor’s state of mind.

Luce Irigaray in *An Ethics of Sexual Difference* (2003) argues that philosophically time is associated with masculinity because time and eternity belongs to God, while femininity is linked with space. However, the historical

association of women with domestic spaces is inaccurate also in the authorial sense that men have their own spaces at home like a room to study or a room to leisure, or even a chair to relax; however, women do not own an occupiable space on her own. “She is attached to spaces of service. She is a hostess in the living room, a cook in the kitchen, a mother in the children’s room, a lover in the bedroom, a chauffeur in the garage” (Weisman 2), which means that she is volatile between spaces without owning one. Because she devotes her time to every sort of chore and errand, therefore her existence is also about time. Kristeva also criticizes this monolithic segregation celebrating masculinity and she suggests that “As for time, female subjectivity would seem to provide measure that essentially retains repetition and eternity from among the multiple modalities of time known through the history of civilization” (“Women’s Time” 26). On the one hand, “there are cycles, gestation, the eternal biological rhythm” that imposes temporality, on the other “there is the massive presence of monumental temporality, without cleavage or escape, which has so little to do with linear time (which passes) that the very word “temporality” hardly fits: All-encompassing and infinite like imaginary space [...]” (“Women’s Time” 26). Therefore, the rhythms of the semiotic produces temporality which encompasses other spaces by generating an imaginary one. In this respect, Kristeva deconstructs the conventional views of time and space by calling it as “women’s time”. Similarly, Irigaray defies the conventional understanding about temporal and spatial roles and goes on suggesting that “The transition to a new age requires a change in our perception and conception of *space-time*, the *inhabiting of places*, and of *containers*, or *envelopes of identity*” (7). The reason why women are historically perceived to function as “space” lies in the idea that male subjectivity builds spatial representations in its favour. Elizabeth Grosz states that

Men produce a universe built upon the erasure of the bodies and contributions of women/mothers and refusal to acknowledge the debt to the maternal body that they owe. They hollow out their own interiors and project them outward, and then require women as supports for this hollowed space. Women become the guardians of the private and the interpersonal, while men build conceptual and material worlds. This appropriation of the right to a place or space correlates with men's seizure of the right to define and to utilize a spatiality that reflects their own self representations (*Space* 121).

Men form a universe for themselves in which the systematic effacement of women and female subjectivity can be seen through the materiality of their self-representation. Encapsulating the opposite sex in the limited prisonlike domestic areas, men produce their own autonomous representations of exteriority and interiority by attributing outside as their sphere and by controlling inside, a seemingly feminine area. Home becomes a space of endless chores, of no human recognition, of isolation and of domestic violence for women. The paternal privilege erases the feminine self and inserts its own codes instead. As it is also observed in the novel, the interiority is surrounded by the phallus in such a way as to make Elinor anxious and annoyed rather than offering a homely and cosy atmosphere. Because Elinor is expected to be a housewife like her sister Rachel, her family think that she disobeys the patriarchal notion that women should inhabit in interior private spaces. Studying in London on her own, therefore, she violates the gender-based assumption of spatiality as she spends time more in the public. She hears the oppressive remarks at home due to this contradiction, which leads to her spatial uneasiness. Although traditionally house is a symbol of haven¹³, this

¹³ Lee Rainwater expresses that historically homes are built for the purpose of sheltering from external treats and later they are attributed the role of representation of the family. He states that "There is...a long history of the development of the house as a place of safety from both nonhuman and human threats, a history which culminates in guaranteeing the house, a man's castle [we], against unreasonable search and seizure. The house becomes the place of maximum exercise of individual autonomy, minimum conformity to the formal and complex rules of public demeanour. The house acquires a sacred character from its

conventional idea neglects the interpersonal dynamics of power exercise which makes home a site of conflict. In this context, David Sibley states that “What is missing from ‘the house as haven’ thesis is a recognition of [...] tensions which become a part of the problem of domination within families” (94). In the novel, Elinor loses her sense of belonging to the home because the excessive practice of the oppressive power is what makes their home a locus of tension and conflict. Therefore, the gender discrimination at their home shows that a domestic space can also be a site of exclusion. She is excluded from the rest as they occupy more space. For this reason, in her hometown, the house is the first space which has poisonous status leaving no room for her so-called unruly identity.

After the house, the distress is transferred to other spaces as she moves from one to another. When she is in her hometown, the spaces she appears in gets narrower and more vicious, which portrays her psychological confinement. In this regard, the next station is an old mill, forbidden when they were child, that is followed after the den. Rudolf Arnheim interprets Freudian symbolism in artistic creations, and he suggests that vases, boxes, pockets, caves, rooms are associated with womb because psychoanalytical theory regards both as “containers” (94). Because cave is both associated with womb and also symbolizes the repression of dark desires in Freudian context, their first visit to the den foreshadows the upcoming harassment. As for the old mill, as it is a dysfunctional space with rotten floors and boards alongside with almost collapsing ceilings, this forbidden space stands for the incest taboo. In the mill, although Elinor thinks that it is a part of a childish game, Toby kisses her passionately and leaves her only when she is struggling (11). This incident is a simple mistake for Toby, yet for Elinor

complex intertwining with the self and from the symbolic character it has as a representation of the family.” (23-24).

“it wasn’t an incident, it was catastrophe that ripped a hole in the middle of her life” (11). The assault is compelling also when her family relations are considered. Even if she tells the molestation, she knows that her family will not support her due to their patriarchal stance. She thinks that “Elinor knew that even if there were any family discussion of the incident she would be made to feel entirely in the wrong” (13). What upsets her the most is the fact that it is a crime of impunity from her family’s lenses because she knows she will be found the guilty one eventually. When they return home, her mother notices that she does not seem well:

“What’s the matter with Elinor?” Mother asked Toby.

“Not feeling very well. Bit too much sun, I think.”

That made her angry too: the cool, rational, *accepted* explanation which emphasized her weakness, not his. She slammed her bedroom door, stood with her back to it, and then, slowly, as if she had to force a passage through her throat, she began to cry: wrenching sobs that made her a stranger to herself (12).

The first thing about her mother’s attitude is that she does not ask Elinor directly what the matter is, but instead asks Toby about Elinor, which again presents the lack of communication between the mother and daughter. Because Toby as a male is the rational one and Elinor as a female is the weak one, her mother believes that Toby can explain what happened rationally. Her mother turns a blind eye because the patriarchal codes in the house are set with very sharp boundaries to protect the man. Elinor cries also because she does not have a ground to explain herself and because she is forced to accept what is attributed to her. As a result of such a spatial-patriarchal oppression, she feels stranger to herself. In the dichotomy of “the self” and “the other”, she is, all of a sudden, estranged from her familiar self and is pushed towards the zone of “the other”. When it is already

hard to recognize and admit “the other”, it becomes even harder to be in the middle of such an unfamiliar territory. In this respect, Kristeva argues that “strange indeed is the encounter with the other—whom we perceive by means of sight, hearing, smell, but do not “frame” within our consciousness. The other leaves us separate, incoherent; even more so, he can make us feel that we are not in touch with our own feelings” (*Stranger* 187). Similarly, incest is something out of the frame of Elinor’s consciousness which causes her self-otherizing. The experience of “the other” leads her to lose the contact with the sense of unity in such a way that she is not able to relate “wrenching sobs” with herself. Even though the mill was where they frequently visited in their childhood, now it gains the negative codes of abuse as it functions as an extension of the home. Therefore, the spatial alienation beginning at home continues in the old mill and later is carried into Toby’s room worsening.

After the first incident, her frustration guides her to Toby’s room where she is sexually abused by her brother. Already labelled home as “the other”, now she also stigmatizes Toby’s room and her body with the codes of shame and guilt, which merges her body and the space into one negative inference. Therefore, the vicious spaces function as a negative melting pot which also represents her body. In other words, the stigmatized codes of the spaces in the hometown are transferred onto her body, which builds a corporeal and spatial union with the negative codes centring around the stigma. In this regard, the interior and exterior in her hometown function as psychic spaces which affect psychological boundaries. Occupying Elinor’s embodied space, Toby begins to devour her physical and psychological space until no room left for her. However, it is not the first time that Toby intrudes on a uterus space. The mother tells Elinor that Toby had a twin who

died in her womb in the sixth month. It was a girl, a papyrus twin, who is compressed into a parchment-like status by the dominant one. Because Toby wins the fetal competition for more space, Elinor identifies herself with the displaced one:

Floating between her and the glass, she saw the flattened, scroll-like body of the little female thing Toby had killed. Oh, what nonsense, of course he hadn't killed it; he hadn't killed anybody. It had died, that was all, it had died, and he went on growing, as he was bound to, taking up more and more room until there was no space left for her (23).

When she looks at the mirror, she sees the flattened fetus who is left no space of growing. Her ironical tone in the sentence that "he had not killed but she died" reveals her resentment for the lost spaces due to his intrusion. For this reason, she thinks that he poisons all the spaces. Even though she, at first, psychologically withdraws herself from the rest of the family, the incest leads to her physical retreat as well. At this point, the poisonous status of the spaces in the hometown goes parallel with the psychic archive. Derrida argues that archons as the guardians of documents shelter memories and keep them alive. The role of commanding and commencing is accompanied with the power to interpret documents (Derrida, *Archive Fever* 2). Elinor's archon gathers the traumatic events as signs and recognizes the related spaces as poisonous. Because the hometown is poisoned by the codes of trauma, the only thing she can do is to suspend the stigma by moving to another space. Although she and Toby go to London for their studies, they live in separate places. She is relieved in London until the outbreak of the war. After Toby is recruited into the army, Elinor heads back to the hometown. The war affects all the citizens' lives in some way, yet the news of Toby's death dissolves the family. At their home, each member has their own way of grief, but it is again Elinor who is condemned: Because the father is away for the job, he

remains absent. The mother “became a white slug lying on the sofa on the living room” (87). Rachel with her two children wants to return home because “she had a house to run, two small children, who were so much easier to manage at home with their own toys and beds and a garden to run around in, this garden doesn’t even fenced in, and the pond, for gods sake, ten feet deep at the centre if it was an inch...” (87). Rather than grieving, Rachel fulfils her duties as patriarchy imposes on her. As for Elinor, she is expected to be at home looking after her mother to free Rachel. Because an excessive spatial pressure is burdened from the beginning, she is again supposed to be at home. Elinor, however, goes back to London to paint. The reason for her visit to London is to find out the details of Toby’s death since she is already going through Kübler-Rossian stages of grief. Because her family has no idea about the trauma, they blame her for being selfish:

“You are so selfish,” Rachel said. “I don’t think I’ve ever met anybody as selfish as you.”

“Yes, I am selfish. I need to be.”

Their father said very little, but Elinor knew he agreed with Rachel. Everybody—the aunts, the uncles, the second cousins second removed, Mrs. Robinson, the village, the farmer, the farmer’s wife, for all she knew, the farmer’s dog—agreed with Rachel, but it was only her father’s opinion that hurt (87-88).

The ever-lengthening chains of patriarchy agrees with Rachel on the idea that Elinor should stay at home as Rachel is the ideal representative of a “proper” woman. Patriarchy even decides on the way grief is experienced. For this reason, her mother, who is hardly moved since the news, is taken normally yet Elinor’s moving to London is out of the grief map. On the one hand, Elinor feels guilty because society already puts the frame on how to grieve, on the other she thinks that “She couldn’t bear the weeping and wailing that punctuated her mother’s long silences. Elinor was determined not to grieve, and particularly not to grieve like

that” (89). Because now the house turned into a locus of grief which has its own assumptions, Elinor’s rejection of grieving like the rest is interpreted by patriarchy as she does not grieve enough although Toby is her beloved brother. Elinor is ostracized once more at home because they have no clue that she is still in the middle of her own grief crisis. Because trauma is not a transient state, her archon still reveals the unearthed assault committed by Toby. Therefore, the poisonous status of the home continues due to the operability of patriarchy in each discrete circumstance with its own dynamics.

The house gets the pharmakon status after everyone but Elinor leaves there. As she does not look after the mother, Rachel takes her to her home. Elinor stays alone with Hobbes, the dog. She steers her own understanding of art through painting more and more, which becomes a sort of healing for her damaged self. Derrida states that “if the pharmakon in general were not, prior to any distinction-making, that which, presenting itself as a poison, may turn out to be a cure, may retrospectively reveal itself in the truth of its curative power” (*Dissemination* 125). The poisonous space marked by the strict norms of patriarchy shifts into a curative space with the abandonment of the fervent representatives which enables Elinor to change the space into her own studio for painting. The curative power takes its source from the semiotic *chora* where she connects the productive energy. Kristeva states:

Discrete quantities of energy move through the body of the subject who is not yet constituted as such and, in the course of his development, they are arranged according to the various constraints imposed on this body—always already involved in a semiotic process—by family and social structures. In this way the drives, which are “energy” charges as well as “physical” marks, articulate what we call a *chora*: a nonexpressive totality formed by the drives and their stases in a motility that is as full of movement as it is regulated (*Revolution* 25).

Lacan's Symbolic puts structural burdens when entering into language which later keeps on regulating the individual. The semiotic process, contrarily, is nonexpressive and full of movement which transcends the stabilizing boundaries of the Symbolic. Kristeva borrows the term from Plato's *Timeaus* "to denote as essentially mobile and extremely provisional articulation constituted by movements and their ephemeral states" (*Revolution* 25). Plato defines the *chora* as "an invisible and formless being which receives all the things and in some mysterious way partakes of the intelligible, and is most incomprehensible" (qtd. in Roudiez, 6). Therefore, the *chora* is not a position but a space that can accept all the things, thereby also a space that is hard to comprehend. The preoedipal and preverbal semiotic *chora*, constituting endless pulsions, includes not only heterogeneity but also dichotomies in life. Plato, in this regard, associates this space with a mother's womb which can receive and produce. Due to this resemblance, women are regarded as closer to the semiotic. Although this analogy embodies the *chora* in a corporeal space, Kristeva states that "it can never be definitively posited: as a result, one can situate the *chora* and if necessary, lend it to a topology, but one can never give it axiomatic form" (*Revolution* 26). However, if Elinor's *chora* is associated with her womb, it is noteworthy to highlight that she loses the touch to the semiotic after her womb is invaded by Toby who absorbs the semiotic within. She represses the semiotic and she can reconnect to it only after the news of his death. Plato characterizes the *chora* also by being a receptacle. The openness of her womb as a receiving material helps her not to be closed to the semiotic totally but gives the chance to reattach. Therefore, she produces art with the help of her choric flight like a womb conceives a new life.

The *chora* is a powerful spatial instrument because it “precedes and underlies figuration and thus specularization and is analogous only to vocal or kinetic rhythm” (Kristeva, *Revolution* 26). Kristeva draws a parallel between the rhythm of the *chora* and the rhythm of poetic language as both use a productive language of female subjectivity where the patriarchal structures are decomposed. Likewise, after the first stage of breaking the norms by living alone, Elinor has the chance to concentrate on her productive power to paint. The initial fluctuation between the Symbolic and the semiotic stemming from the spatial transference of patriarchy from the private to the public is now deconstructed with the artistic rhythm of her subjectivity. Freudian concept of “the return of the repressed” is proposed by Kristeva in relation to the semiotic in artistic forms as “in spatial terms of eruption, effraction, displacement” (West-Pavlov 45). Similar to the rhythmic eruption in the semiotic, the Symbolic is subverted spatially through the eruption in the semiotic. Therefore, her artistic output is the return of the repressed semiotic in the form of productive eruptions. These spatial eruptions in the *chora* also enable her to develop her own perspective on the understanding of art. If she connects to the semiotic, she can show off her talent because as Kristeva suggests “the instinctual *chora*, in its very displacement, transgresses representation, memory, the sign” (*Revolution* 102). Since it is Elinor’s time to present “monumental temporality” encompassing like “an imaginary space” in Kristeva’s words, she transgresses the pre-written negative codes, norms, or memories on her body, which betters her talent by transcending all the Symbolic spatial representations and by producing her own imaginary artistic space. While appreciating her talent, one of her friends, Kit Neville assumes that “she was one of the young ladies who attended the Slade as part of their finishing, girls whose interest in art would fade as soon as the duties of marriage and motherhood claimed them. Quite a few of the women were

merely filling in time till the right man came along. Not Elinor, though. He couldn't have been more wrong about that" (180). Elinor's interest in art is due to her talent and an internal drive to paint rather than time-wasting until she marries. She takes more courses to improve her skills. For this reason, similar to Kit, her friend Paul also reacts when he sees the finished paintings: "he worked through the finished paintings, admiring, doubting, more than one feeling a stab of envy at what she'd achieved" (120). Elinor devotes herself to painting so resolutely that she improves her skills even more. He goes on commenting that he sees the place from Elinor's lenses in the painting, but it is clearer than he has seen it on his own (121). When Elinor is alone with her semiotic identity and subjectivity, painting becomes a choric productive space in her life. Ann Rosalind Jones suggests that "Kristeva sees semiotic discourse as an incestuous challenge to symbolic order, asserting as it does the writer's return to the pleasures of his preverbal identification with his mother and his to identify with his father and the logic of paternal discourse" (249). Along with the dominant paternal discourse at home, the trauma of incest drags her self into the Symbolic realm, yet she does not establish an incestuous connection with her mother due to her adoption of patriarchal logic. She eliminates the poison of incest and clings onto the rhythms of her own body. The result is the considerable development in her artistic skills. Therefore, the newly produced curative choric space contributes to both her art and her reunion with the self.

Not only her friends, but also one of her professors, Tonks, praises her ability who later offers a job of medical illustration of soldiers with terrible facial disfigurements at the hospital. She accepts the offer, but before accepting it, Elinor adopts the refusal "to acknowledge the war, or to play any part in supporting it,

through charity work or even through conversation. Instead, she prioritises her art over what she calls the ‘bully’ of war” (Gildersleeve 115). She refers to Virginia Woolf’s essay entitled “Three Guineas” (1938) by stating that “as a woman, it didn’t concern me. To be honest, I was coping something I’d heard Mrs. Woolf said last night after dinner; about how women are outside the political process and therefore the war’s nothing to do with them” (80). Even though, as a war artist Paul says that her thought is a bit theoretical because she ignores all the suffering (175), she thinks that anything war-related feeds it. This idea fashions her artistic perception of representing the space and time. She resists to paint about battlefields. Because battle scenes turn the landscape into brutality, she does not want to aestheticize the wartime through her art and to contribute to it in any artistic form. As she thinks that painting should be about celebration, when she is at home in her choraic shrine, she paints landscapes of the hometown. Professor Tonks in his courses teaches the idea that “drawing is explication of the form”, therefore you can only draw what you can understand and explicate. War is something she cannot explicate. She states that “it’s evil, Total destruction. Of everything. Not just lives, even. It’s like one of those combine harvester things, you know? Only it’s not cutting wheat...” (161). Even though she adopts the anti-war view, she paints a soldier, a figure of Toby, in every painting to negotiate with the past. The trauma of incest on the one hand, and the shocking news of Toby’s death on the other, her anti-war views channel her into painting the countryside Toby grew up in. She says that Toby “would never be dead while she was alive and able to hold a brush” (90) and she wants to paint what made him, not what destroyed him (107). She writes in one of the letters addressed to Kit: “Katherine Mansfield, who, after her brother was killed, started to write stories about their childhood in New Zealand. Best things she’s ever done, apparently.”

(236). Like Mansfield contributed to the canon with the stories she wrote about their childhood, Elinor aims to do the same in her art. Therefore, avoiding war and painting only the landscape in her hometown creates a comfort zone in accordance with the healing trait of the *chora*. However, the countryside she paints is unsettling as every landscape is a potential battlefield under the shadow of the war. As illustrated by Joanna Bourke, in the novel “Landscapes are a heaving mass of bodies; these bodies are ploughed into landscapes” (716). Therefore, a traditional representation of landscape turns into a reminiscent of the front line at the moment it is filled with men. Neville comments that “nameless English woods became, in the blinking of an eye, Devil Wood, High Wood, Sanctuary Wood. It took no time at all to blast craters into these fields, splinter the trees, and blow up the farmhouse over there. And as for trying to take that ridge...” (229). The *chora* as the localization of femininity hosts spatial eruptions which are constructive for the production process of her art. However, the military eruptions in the battlefield ruins lives. When she first sees the portraits of the crushed bodies at the hospital, Elinor deems:

Were they portraits, or were they medical illustrations? Portraits celebrate the identity of the sitter. Everything— the clothes they’ve chosen to wear, the background, the objects on a table by the chair— leads the eye back to the face. And the face is the person. Here, in these portraits, the wound was central. [...] There was no point of rest, no pleasure in the exploration of a unique individual. Instead, you were left with the question: How can any human being endure this? (158).

Even to take a glance at such portraits disturbs Elinor as they remind of the grimness of the war, which is unendurable on different levels. On the part of the survivor, the disfigurements are hard to compromise because the face is the public representation of one’s identity and at some point, the new look means the loss of it. As for the audience, seeing such illustrations instantly exhibits the violence

which is therefore a shocking experience. From Elinor's point of view as an artist, facing with the fact that the purpose of a piece of art can also be condemnation, agony or death is a totally challenging experience as she previously advocates the celebratory role of art. However, ironically people like Elinor and Tonks who hate the war, spend hours to draw ruined faces afterwards. The anti-war perspective turns into the adoption that "it's only thing they can do to help" (235). Ignoring the war for a long time means ignoring the grief it causes. Elinor now changes her mind and states that "Grief is a strange and savage thing. I'm thinking about the ancient Britons—or the ancient somebody, I'm not sure—who used to eat their father's liver because that's where his courage was, and his sons had to make it part of themselves" (236). She gives an example from the primitive times, yet she also metaphorically eats the liver of the patriarchal discourse not to integrate it into her personality but to demolish its effects totally. As for her military art, readmitting the violence helps her to mirror the grim realities of the trenches and to convey it to the audience as it is the only war-related thing she does to contribute to her country's artistic wealth. Making the once repressed issue visible in her art, she familiarizes the audience with the horrible conditions of the war. While she reclaims her identity with the help of the *chora*, she does it through painting unsettling landscapes with full of soldiers and also through the illustrations of the ruined faces. Therefore, she does not only subvert traditional understanding of spatial and discursal patriarchy, but she also challenges the conventional aestheticism which depicts the romanticized beauty and sublime of countryside, and also depicts the idealised bodily versions in the anatomical sketches. Based on her personal trauma and war unrest, the spaces she represents in her paintings change over time with a sudden confrontation with her traumas. For this reason,

the spatial analyses are also related to the spaces represented in her art and the change of her artistic perspective.

To summarize, the novel presents a variety of vicious spaces such as the home, the mill and Toby's room, all of which force Elinor to submit to the Symbolic. As a result, her alienation emphasizes her psychological confinement. Her artistic drive awakes after the news of Toby's death and synchronously her family's leave. When the effect of the Symbolic decreases, the semiotic flourishes. Leaving all the spatial poison behind, she produces her imaginary space by dwelling on the choraic flight because now it is Elinor's time to produce spatial and temporal representations through her art. Although she ignores the war at the beginning and paints only the landscapes in her hometown, later she includes the violence which does not negatively affect her art but rather with the energetic rhythm of the choraic eruptions, her art gains a new perspective that subverts not only the patriarchal logic of a woman's being an artist, but also the traditional understanding of aestheticism.

4.3. "She Realized That Silence Has a Sound": Trauma and Working Through

The patriarchal system leaves Elinor all alone with the trauma. She moves away to London to focus on her study, yet the trauma haunts back. Although Toby moves on easily, it is Elinor, the victim of the abuse, who goes through Kübler-Rossian stages of grief. Even though she avoids seeing Toby for a while, Elinor looks after him when he becomes ill. A distance grows between them, but Elinor begins to identify herself with Toby after some time. When she decides to paint his portrait after his death, she notices that she cannot remember how he looks like. Art functions therapeutic to work through, yet she can only feel more

relieved after she has found out how he died. This section, therefore, analyses Elinor's trauma, stages of grief and working through.

Because of the traumatic events in the hometown, Elinor is motivated to move away. The reason behind it is to generate an "internal locus of control" (Herman 58) because she lost it under the patriarchal domination of her family and with the additional contribution of the oppressive spaces. However, as illustrated in the definition of Cathy Caruth, trauma is "an overwhelming experience of sudden or catastrophic events" (*Unclaimed* 11) which does not easily enable the victim to get the control back. On the other side of the coin, she is alone in the experience of working through this overwhelming experience. Diana Russell formulates the term "secret trauma" which refers to the fact that "most victims suffer this often-devastating experience in silence. Some keep the secret all of their lives" (16). Therefore, incest as a secret trauma is an experience of exclusion. Elinor also suffers in silence and seeks for solutions to overcome all alone. However, trauma is also not a matter of simply forgetting as it haunts back, Elinor cannot compensate it by moving to London, which is portrayed in the first night she arrives. She feels vulnerable like "an animal leaving a trail of blood behind in the snow. Even with the door locked, the gas ring lit, and the kettle boiling, she didn't feel safe" (23). Therefore, her motivation to gain an internal control fails because she is overwhelmed by the experience of trauma. This dreary turmoil has substantial effects on the physical and psychological well-being because "the notion of the bodily ego seems to lie precisely upon the frontier between the mental and the physical" (Brown 117). As stated by Freud in his description, melancholia is more about the absorption of ego due to a loss which drains the individual both internally and externally: "profoundly painful dejection, cessation

of interest in the outside world, loss of capacity to love, inhibition of all activity and a lowering of the self-regarding feelings” (“Mourning and Melancholia” 244). The most remarkable psychological effect on Elinor is her withdrawal from outside world. She grieves for the bereavement her trauma provokes. She isolates herself at home and she does not even visit her friends in London as she did in the past. It is physically surfaced firstly when she sits down at the drawing table to brush her hair but ends up with cutting it with scissors (23). She becomes pale, wary and nervous in time. When Paul pays a visit, he notices the shadows under her eyes (109) and sharpness of her bones (119). Her only worldly interest becomes painting: “Painting, she said, till her head spun, and obviously neglecting herself: she was stick thin. The house, too, seemed bereft. He’d glimpsed dust sheets shrouding the furniture in some of the downstairs rooms. She was not so much living here as camping out” (102). The unspeakable and the secret trauma leaves her paralyzed in the interest of the external, yet she devotes herself to the representation of the inner through the images in her paintings. The grief holding “secret, unnameable, and unspeakable” turns into “psychic silence that did not repress the wound” (Kristeva, *Black Sun* 87). Elinor is also aware that her slender body is alien to her as “the face in the mirror stared back at her with no sign of recognition” (23). Although Paul thinks that she grieves for the loss of her brother, Elinor goes through these changes after she is traumatized. Freud in *The Ego and The Id* (1923) states that “it is not merely a surface entity, but is itself the projection of a surface” and “it may thus be regarded as a mental projection of the surface of the body, besides, representing the superficies of the mental apparatus” (20). Due to the trauma, outside becomes meaningless for Elinor as the trauma-related melancholia makes a “black hole” in her life in Kristeva’s words (87). Although her initial ego functions as a receiver of sensations and also as a

projector of the received material, the latter one absorbed in the hole of the loss numbs her. As for the physiological terms, Herman suggests that “Traumatic events produce profound and lasting changes in the physiological arousal, emotion, cognition, and memory” (34). The second chapter called “1917” covers a major part of the novel, yet the traumatic event dates back to 1912. The five-year of latency period shows that her trauma still affects Elinor’s memory because it remains the same in the middle of her life. It is not a matter of forgetting although Toby simply offers that “We [they]’ve got to get back to the way things were” (33). Trauma functions as a revenant because of the fact that there is no such thing as forgetting and returning to the normal. As also argued by Cathy Caruth, “The traumatized, we might say, carry an impossible history within them, or they become themselves the symptom of a history that they cannot entirely possess” (“Introduction” 5). Elinor is also left with a troubled history which is not something that “could be talked about, or explained, or analysed, or in any other way resolved” (67). Therefore, the traumatic past becomes a non-linear, disrupted, and non-referential narrative in the historical memory of the victim.

The archon as the ruler of memory does not allow Elinor to push the trauma into the background. It is Toby’s first visit in London that fuels the operation of Kübler-Rossian stages of grief, which shows the fact that trauma is a deferred experience which is beyond the comprehension until the victim faces a trigger. As an incest survivor, she is unable to integrate the trauma into her consciousness, which is also depicted when the parcel containing Toby’s clothes is delivered up to the family after his death. Elinor says that the parcel “remained in her mind, but separated from her waking consciousness, like a nightmare whose every detail is forgotten, through the fear survives, poisoning the day” (91).

Although on the surface she seems to forget the catastrophe, she represses it to limit the pain. Kristeva describes a person going through melancholia as follows: “I live a living death, my flesh is wounded, bleeding, cadaverized, my rhythm slowed down or interrupted, time has been erased or bloated, absorbed into sorrow...” (*Black Sun* 4). Elinor’s vitalizing choraic rhythm slows down; she seems lifeless and wounded; she cannot even know how long she isolated herself and last but not least, she integrates the pain so as to dissociate herself from the moment of the trauma. This process shows that the whole experience of the sexual attack leads her to undergo secondary dissociation. Van der Kolk et al. define the term as follows: “Once an individual is in a traumatic (dissociated) state of mind, further disintegration of elements of the personal experience can occur. A “dissociation between observing ego and experiencing ego” (qtd. in Fromm) has often been described in traumatized individuals, such as incest survivors, traffic accident victims, and combat soldiers” (307). Secondary dissociation makes the victim fall out of touch with the trauma-related feelings as a coping strategy, which leads the victim to observe herself externally through dreams or flashbacks. To remove the trauma, Elinor also daydreams about the times when they were still brother and sister (43). Although she represses the pain, the grief remains on the surface as it can be clearly seen in her melancholic state of mind. To quote from Freud in this respect, “'Forgetting' becomes still further restricted when we assess at their true value the screen memories which are so generally present.” (“Remembering” 149). When she encounters the true value of the trauma with the agency of the delivered parcel, it shows the fact that Elinor’s traumatic memories wait only for a moment of trigger to rise to the surface.

The traumatic recollection brings the bereavement to the fore by showing that the wounded ego absorbs itself in the grief. In this context, Elinor's grief follows a stage-by-stage response. The five stages (denial, anger, bargaining, depression, acceptance) are framework that "helps us frame and identify what we may be feeling" and as a result of the whole process "comes the knowledge of grief's terrain, making us better equipped to cope with life and loss" (*On Grief* 7). In the first stage called denial, "we respond at first by being paralyzed with shock or blanketed with numbness" (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 8). This stage unconsciously helps to deal with the wound and to survive the loss no matter how the world, now, seems meaningless. As a coping mechanism, the sufferer tries to find ways to get through which "allows the patient to collect himself, and with time, mobilize other, less radical defences" (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 52). Elinor creates a fantasy world in her recollections to deny the present predicament. She daydreams about the past days when Toby and she get on well with each other. In one daydream, they walk through the home from the nearby pond after a long time of playing and even their aunt admires their bond when she sees them (44). Elinor's happy recollections are a way to negotiate with the archon to efface the trauma. However, her thoughts are immediately turns to Toby whenever she slips into daydreaming, which shows that she is preoccupied with the assaulter in her mind because she denies what has happened between them. The past functions as a revenant because she searches for the time when the things have gone wrong. On the other hand, by doing this, she rationalizes the attack to give herself a moment of denial. After the incident, Elinor thinks that "as for her reaction: shock, fear, and something else, something she hadn't got a name for" (12). While it was something she cannot even find the correct naming for, she is later inclined to find an explanation:

There was another possible explanation: that Toby had been conducting a rather nasty, schoolboy experiment to find out what it was like to be close, in that way, with a girl. But then, why did he need to do that? She knew perfectly well that young man has access to sexual experiences that girls like her knew nothing about. So why would he need to experiment on her? (12).

Although she knows that the attack is not something she can rationalize through explanations, in her psyche she denies the abuse as a temporary defence. She comforts herself through memories and explanations in order not to face the torment. Denial is the first step that activates the other stages of grief. Regardless of how she cannot believe that this has happened between them and cannot process it in her mind, the stage of denial helps her to manage her feelings until anger, the following phase, occupies.

Anger as the next stage does not have “logical or valid” roots (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 11) because it hits after one realizes the loss. This phase comes with the question “Why me?” (*On Death* 63). The sufferer thinks about the event as it is not supposed to happen, which complicates the emotional management. The feelings of “sadness, panic, hurt and loneliness” accompany anger (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 12). Anger can be projected to anybody because “you may be angry at this unexpected, undeserved and unwanted situation in which you find yourself” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 12). Even if anger seems everlasting at that time, it is a stage of progress in the healing. In the novel, Elinor’s anger firstly comes out after they return home from the woods and her mother gives an ear to Toby instead of her. She is angry because Toby’s explanation that she got sunstroke emphasizes her weakness, not his. In the second instance of anger, Toby visits his sister only to say that they should return to their normal relationship, which is a strategy to normalize the abuse. Elinor’s anger

is depicted after he leaves as follows: “With his departure, her anger returned. All that stuff about bringing his anatomy textbooks... He’d come to say one word, no, not even that, the stupid, amputated stump of a word: *sis*. That was his pledge that what had happened between them would never happen again, that it would, in time, be forgotten” (34). In the first instance, Elinor is still under the shock of the kissing incidence and her shock immediately turns into anger after she comes across with her mother’s usual temperament to favour Toby. Even before she realizes the harassment, she goes through the prevailing patriarchal oppression which moves her to tears. In the second instance of anger, it happens after the sexual abuse. She flees from home to London, yet Toby visits her to say “*sis*” and they should forget what happened. His trivializing attitude makes Elinor angry because he gave her a memory of trauma, but he normalizes the attack and easily moves on. Elinor’s initial denial is, therefore, soon replaced by anger. Although it hurts Elinor, it is a necessary step in the path to heal, which helps her to follow the next stage of bargaining.

Bargaining, the third step, is “an attempt to postpone and it has to include a prize offered for good behaviour” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 95). After Elinor realizes that neither denial nor anger helps with the traumatic bereavement she goes through, she bargains the pain. Although this phase is a religious negotiation that “God has decided to take us from this earth and he did not respond to my angry pleas, he may be more favourable if I ask nicely” (Kübler-Ross, *On Death* 93), the reason behind such a religious agreement is to postpone grief and pain. Elinor does not have such a contract with God, but she postpones it through focusing on her studies. The artistic concentration “give(s) our psyche the time it may need to adjust” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 19). She, in a way, represses the wound which is yet to surface in the next stage. Elinor, in the

bargaining period, takes more courses to improve her talent. However, she either daydreams about the past memories, or she makes up happy memories to postpone her grief. Even in the dissection class she daydreams while she seems to examine a cadaver. In fact, she goes through her own psychological autopsy in her mind. She also socializes more. She makes friends with Kit, Paul and Caroline and spends most of her time with her friends to prevent being occupied with Toby in her mind. She also keeps a diary and on 3 August 1917 she writes that she has met with some members of the Bloomsbury Group¹⁴. Even at that night she goes off into a daydream. She sees two children, one is confident and even arrogant, and the other is vulnerable, who represent Toby and her. No matter how she tries to distract herself from sinking into the trauma, the archontic power either reminds her memories or gives her retrospective daydreams. Therefore, her attempt to postpone the pain partially fails her, which functions as preparatory factor for the next stage.

The fourth stage of grief is depression which comes out after Elinor feels that the past three phases did not heal her. Elinor reaches this stage after five years of latency. Because it is one of the most compelling stages of all, the changes are more remarkable in the inner feelings of the victim. Elinor's depression is not a mental one but is the result of surfacing of the repressed feelings of the loss, which shows that the wound has not healed yet. Because it comes out sooner or later, Kübler-Ross and Kessler state that "Allow the sadness and emptiness to cleanse you and help you explore your loss in its entirety. When you allow yourself to experience depression, it will leave as soon as it has served its purpose

¹⁴ The Bloomsbury Group is a set containing notable writers, philosophers, painters, and intellectuals of the first half of twentieth century which consists of members such as Virginia Woolf, John Maynard Keynes, E. M. Forster, and Lytton Strachey. The group was famous for the support they gave to young artists.

in your loss” (*On Grief* 22). Instead of repressing the pain more, they suggest allowing depression to do its duty as it gives its place to acceptance afterwards. Depression is an essential stage, but it does not mean that it is an easy one. After periods of postponement, the pain surrenders the sufferer in such a way that Elinor’s melancholic state is the marker of depression’s manifested face. As stated above in a Freudian context, depression of a lost object is a matter of ego. Elinor’s depression shatters her integrity to an extent where the former and the latter position of the ego show a radical change. Although Elinor was the one who socialized with her friends and the intellectuals in the Bloomsbury Group, now she isolates herself in the house where becomes a shrine of the loss. The trauma encircles tightly when her perception of reality changes with the parcel including Toby’s clothes. She feels so anxious that she thinks the smell of the clothes gets stronger from time to time. Klein et al state that “Under the pressure of intense anxiety, the lack of cohesion in the ego would appear to result in a ‘falling to pieces’ of the ego” (33). The cohesion in her psyche is fragmented which drags her thoughts into the trauma again. Although she firstly places the parcel in the attic, she thinks the smell gets stronger and she should put them where they belong in his room. Because she works on the portraits so hard and neglects herself, she cannot be sure if she imagines the smell getting fainter or stronger. In this regard, Kristeva argues that “if loss, bereavement, and absence trigger the work of the imagination and nourish it permanently as much as they threaten it and spoil it, it is also noteworthy that the work of art as fetish emerges when the activating sorrow has been repudiated” (*Black Sun* 9). Elinor distracts her trauma to come out until the parcel reminds her that Toby is dead. Until that time, she fetishistically draws a vague silhouette of a soldier representing Toby. Although she remembered his face clearly before, the parcel splits her ego in a striking way

that she realizes she cannot remember him. The change is due to the confrontation with the trauma once more in an unexpected way. She becomes preoccupied with Toby in her head again. The narrator describes that “A morning came when she hardly managed to work at all. Toby’s features eluded her; his face seemed to be sliding in and out of focus. She took a short break and tried again, but it was no use. Tiredness; she’d been working too hard. This time she gave herself several days off, only to find out, when she returned to the studio, that she couldn’t paint at all” (94). Although her artistic fetish functions as another postponement mechanism, the parcel changes the psychic dynamics, activating the subdued trauma. On the surface, from her friends’ lenses, she is a solitary woman who obsessively draws her brother. However, on a psychological examination, it is visible that she submits to melancholy and depression.

After the void feelings come the last stage of grief, acceptance which does not mean that the victim accepts the pain and recovers simply. For example, after Elinor hears the news of Toby’s death, “her first reaction to the news had been a blaze of euphoria” (89), yet the euphoria cannot simply heal her wound to move on. Acceptance is a compelling stage because it requires “remembering, recollecting and reorganizing” (Kübler-Ross and Kessler, *On Grief* 25). Although Elinor tries hard to forget the trauma in the first three stages, now she is exposed to it more than ever. This trait is what makes acceptance a coercive stage. Elinor realizes that she does not remember his face, but she needs to remember as Toby wrote in his letter: “I know you’ll take care of Mother as best you can. Father’ll be all right, I think—he’s got his work. And Rachel’s got Tim and the boys. I don’t know what to say to you. Remember” (96). Toby implies that every member of the family will be fine in some way or other, but Elinor can only feel better if

she remembers. Elinor's memory cannot be fully recovered. Nevertheless, remembering enables a psychoanalytic catharsis by bringing the repressed into the focus of conscious in order to overcome resistances (Freud, "Remembering" 149). This process is the most essential stage of working through trauma because it purifies through abreaction. While remembering and reorganizing the memories, it brings the sufferer closer to the loss, which enables to establish a new relationship. Elinor also makes a new connection with Toby in this stage by realizing how much they resemble to each other. She remembers that Andrew, one of Toby's friends, thought they are twins and said that "I didn't think boy-girl twins could be identical" (58). Paul also realizes the resemblance when he sees the unfinished portray of Toby: "The resemblance to Elinor—she and Toby hadn't been so alike in life, surely they hadn't?" (126-127). Already identifies herself with the dead papyrus twin, Elinor becomes obsessed with this idea cannibalistically in a metaphorical sense. As she cannot deal with the loss, she creates a cannibalistic imagination of ingestion. Kristeva states that

Melancholy cannibalism [...] accounts for the passion for holding within the mouth (but vagina and anus also lend themselves to this control) the intolerable other that I crave to destroy so as to better possess it alive. Better fragmented, torn, cut up, swallowed, digested...than lost. The melancholy cannibalistic imagination is a repudiation of a loss' reality and of death as well. It manifests the anguish of losing the other through the survival of self, surely a deserted self but not separated from what still and ever nourishes it and becomes transformed into the self—which also resuscitates—through a devouring (*Black Sun* 12).

As she thinks that Toby devoured the space of the papyrus twin and as she associates herself with that twin, the wound in her psyche refuses tolerance to Toby's leaving no room for her living. Because she cannot overcome the incest on her own, she imagines other possibilities to ease her mind. In her diary she

writes: "I'm aware something happening in me that I can't explain. It's almost as if I'm turning into Toby. It's not just me thinking it either, other people have commented. As if you cope with the loss by ingesting the dead person... God, what a morbid thought. And it's left me feeling rather doubtful about those paintings, the ones I did immediately after he died" (237). She metaphorically ingests Toby to repudiate the loss he caused. As her rhythms of chora lower at the time of the abuse, she reclaims the strength by devouring his presence through resembling his to her even in the portraits. Because Toby's portray evokes her face more than his, she feels doubtful about them. Therefore, she uses artistic abreaction to manifest the trauma. The other important progress in the acceptance stage happens when she finds out how he died. Although he was believed to have died in the trench, she finds out that he committed suicide after he was caught having sexual intercourse with a stable boy. This is when she realizes the duplicated image in the portray: "Perhaps without realizing she's slipped into self-portray, producing, in the end, a composite figure, the joint person she and Toby had become" (298). This conjunction dissolves after they sell the house. Before leaving "she'd take just the one photograph of Toby, she decides; the one where his face seemed to be disappearing into a white light" (298). Now that his face disappears, it leaves more room to Elinor's presence. However, the final scene of acceptance only occurs when she repeats the trauma to find out that he is dead. In this regard, Freud states that "we may say that the patient does not *remember* anything of what he has forgotten and repressed, but *acts* it out. He reproduces it not as a memory but as an action; he *repeats* it, without, of course, knowing that he is repeating it" ("Remembering" 150). Repeating purifies the sufferer from the emotional burden and by doing so, the victim steps into recovery. Elinor revisits Toby's room and sleeps in his bed. In her dream, she sees Toby calling her name:

“Oh you are back” she said. His arms held her; his head bent down to kiss her. She touched his warm skin, she flowed towards him, but then a shadow fell. She thought or said “We can’t do this, you’re dead”. Instantly, the warmth and light began to fade. In a second, he’s gone” (300-301). Without realizing truly, she repeats the incest in her dream but at the same time realizes that he is dead. Knowing that he can no longer harm in any way, Elinor grasps his non-presence for the first time after his death. Freud states that “The greater the resistance, the more extensively will acting out (repetition) replace remembering. For the ideal remembering what has been forgotten which occurs in hypnosis corresponds to a state in which resistance has been put completely on one side” (“Remembering” 151). Elinor puts the site of resistance on one side in her dream and acts out the repressed. Therefore, remembering gives its place to repetition which abreacts the source of the repressed. In this regard, the abreaction brings a moment of epiphany which sorts out all the stages of grief. Elinor leaves his room for the last time by also leaving him behind. Even though trauma is not a simple experience to leave everything behind, Elinor at least finds the strength to step into a new page in her life.

To conclude, Elinor is subjected to the oppressive power of her family which originates in the Symbolic adoption of the patriarchal matrix. The emotional abuse is dealt with her semiotic dependence. Since the family as the smallest institutional unit that sets the codes for how to be a “proper” woman, the extension of this idea goes further in the public space with the statements of his peers and professors about norms a woman should submit. Elinor disturbs these norms and functions as an abject body until the time when Toby rapes her. The sexual abuse leads to the trauma and Elinor fluctuates between the borders of “clean” and

“unclean”. Almost feeling dehumanized, she escapes to London for her studies, yet the oppressive spaces in her hometown such as the home, den, mill and Toby’s room, haunts her mind. The viciousness of the private and public spaces leads to her psychological confinement and Elinor loses her strength to fight against the Symbolic. She can only regain her choraic resilience after her family members leave home. Elinor deals with the archontic power through artistic purification. Nevertheless, she can step into recovery after she undergoes the five stages of grief. Assuming herself in the territory of the “other”, Elinor denies the trauma, gets angry with her body and Toby, and postpones the confrontation with the loss. When she goes through the stage of depression and acceptance at home, where now functions curatively, Elinor feels relieved after she finds out how he died and after she repeats the trauma unconsciously. Recognizing her body with the vicious codes of oppression both in the private and public, Elinor’s body is stuck in the entrapping matrix until she subverts it by producing her own time and imaginary space in Kristeva’s words.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has analysed the traumatized bodies in the selected works in relation to the notion of space. Although different philosophical insights are applied to the main texts, the linking views connect each analysis to one another. For this reason, a path is followed in each chapter firstly focusing on the body politics, secondly on the notion of space and thirdly on the operation of trauma and working through. Because the chapters seem to follow separate methodologies, the conclusion chapter will synthesize all the sections within the given objectives of the thesis.

The first sections of each chapter focus on the practices of the body. In *Room* (2010), a Foucauldian understanding of docile body is followed. In *There but for the* (2011), Deleuzian and Guattarian concept of schizo body is examined. In *Toby's Room* (2012), Kristevan and Lacanian perspectives are applied in the analysis of abject body politics. The different theoretical viewpoints gather around the function that each framework discloses the reasons of their trauma which paves the way to examine the traumatized bodies more. In the first novel, Ma and Jack become docile bodies on which Old Nick inflicts his own dark desires. He performs various Foucauldian disciplinary techniques to achieve this. The first is to confine a young girl in a well-secured room for years. The captivity trauma is produced through deprivation. He initially deprives her of being in the public which is followed by the deprivation of food, hygiene, medication, heating and electricity. The assaulter does not name himself as a criminal yet a protector from the threats of outside. These coercive tactics surely causes psychological trauma but also causes somatic symptoms such as continuous headache, toothache and insomnia. Even though she undergoes a period of trauma in the middle of her life, she

protects her son through the techniques of doublethink and storytelling. The resilience comes in the form of the production of a fantasy world, yet it does not protect Jack from the confusion between the real and unreal. Jack bases his perception of reality on his limited experience of living in the room. Therefore, the docile bodies are emerged through the practice of disciplinary power and Foucauldian method uncovers the reasons behind the trauma. In the second selected novel, Deleuzian and Guattarian philosophy deciphers the stressor which triggers Miles' isolation. Although the capitalist practices produce docile bodies, the schizophrenic step of Miles breaks the chains of machinery. The hosts and the regular guests spend time at a planned dinner party with the people different from their background who are marginalized through their gender, race and occupation. They intentionally utter pejorative words. Although on the surface they seem generous and hospitable, in the deeper analysis they are the capitalist machines taking over the legacy of their ancestors by adapting the known spots to today's world. Gen uses their home and the menu she served for communicating with the guests. The artificiality of the bourgeoisie, therefore, becomes a stressor for Miles which reminds him of his own loss. He overcomes this through producing his own line of flight by becoming an active schizo body in contrary to the rest of the docile bodies who submit themselves to their abusive comments. Being an active body to interrupt their flux, Miles disconnects with the community and confronts with his loss. The capitalist machine uses transhistoricity, but Miles breaks the familiar codes of them. Therefore, Deleuzian and Guattarian concept of schizo body stands against Foucauldian docile body. Although in the previous novel, the captivity is a reason for the trauma, Miles produces his own captivity to resist. Ma's captivity does not offer the chance to break the boundaries of docility, but in the second novel, Miles' captivity is a step to subvert it. The

structures coding the bodies are not easy to break yet Miles partly succeeds it. Therefore, Ma's limited resources is the obstacle to produce a flight line, which makes her a complete docile body. Miles is the only one who reverse the docility. As for Elinor in the third novel, she fluctuates between docility and subversion. As both being victims of sexual abuse, Ma and Elinor represent how female subjectivity is subordinated under male dominancy. In the third novel, Lacanian Symbolic order and the notion of abject present reasons behind her trauma. Unlike Ma who is held captive in a restricted space, Elinor has the chance to dwell on choraic flight through her talent of painting. She is a victim of domestic abuse starting firstly with the emotional abuse such as the oppressive remarks of her family who adopt the Name-of-the-Father. As Lacan advocates that "unconsciousness is structured like a language", he means that the Symbolic order in the infancy builds patriarchal structures to be adopted culturally. Because the matrix weaves networks of units connected to each other, her family's adoption of patriarchy can also be seen in her social circle in London. Her family, professors and male peers, therefore, set forth the systematicity of oppression. Although Elinor resists against the emotional abuse, she cannot deal with the sexual violence. Her brother Toby rapes her, but she cannot share the secret trauma with anyone. Although she was firstly Kristevan abject who disturbs the dominant order, she later becomes Lacanian abject who views her body as filthy and repulsive. Therefore, fluctuating between the borders of clean and unclean, Elinor is neither deprived like Ma, nor strong like Miles to turn the docility upside down at a stroke. The domestic violence leads her to lose the integrity of identity and she views her abject body like a moth and a dough. Dehumanizing herself due to the trauma, she loses the semiotic sense and yields to the Symbolic. Therefore, the theoretical framework is functional to bring the reasons of her trauma to the

surface. Even though different paths of methodological perspectives are applied to each text, they show that the codes attributed to a body cannot be easily erased. Therefore, the docile body of Ma, the schizo body of Miles and the abject body of Elinor gather around the term of stigma. Hence, the different philosophical approaches portray that a body in a vicious circle represents the socially ascribed codes, which not only presents a body as a sociological being, but also represents it as desperate in the hands of larger dominant mechanism that constitutes the institutional structures.

The second sections of the chapters have examined the spatial politics employed in the novels. In the first novel, the spatial features of the room and the dialectics of inside and outside are focused on. Ma explores the features of the room as she attempts to escape. Each failure proves that the features make it impossible to escape. In this regard, Old Nick builds a Foucauldian heterotopia, a localizable counter-site, where becomes a stringent measure for Ma because she knows how it feels to be in the public space. Contrarily, Jack does not have any clue about the life outside as he was born in the room. He develops his sense of reality based on his experiences in the room, yet the restricted space does not offer different experiences to widen his cognition. Because their status is reduced to the objects in the room, Jack cannot have a sense of autonomy. Therefore, the vicious codes of the room change their bodily understanding. For this reason, the stigma gathers the room and their bodies on the same ground. It also creates a huge gap in the experience of the antinomy of inside and outside. Although outside means freedom for Ma, it becomes traumatizing for Jack to adapt to all the new manners of society. Going through physically and psychologically orientation, learning becomes a painful activity for Jack who begins to develop a sense of

nostalgia for the room where they were detached from all the rules of society. To cope with this shocking experience, he keeps Rug from the room in their new apartment where Jack and Ma now have separate rooms. Because he identifies their mother-son attachment with the closeness brought by the limited space, Jack yearns for the feeling of security he had in the room. Holding different perspectives, therefore, Ma and Jack's stances attribute the pharmakon status to the room, which prevents them from starting a new life. Due to the psycho-spatial tactics, the room stigmatizes their bodies which becomes a matter of trauma to be solved in order to have a new life. Therefore, the corporeal and spatial codes transform into each other in such a complex way that they come to represent one another. Besides, the viciousness of the body politics analysed in the first sections of each chapter is extended to the space politics, which therefore makes space a factor to be examined in the path to trauma. In the second novel, firstly the importance of the city Greenwich has been dwelt on because it is the location connecting the east to the west which also connects the people who barely know each other. The spatial features of the home are given in detail by the hosts who are the capitalist machines producing their own territorialities. Always boasting about her financial privilege, Gen talks about the value of the furniture and decorations at the home. Although the room is mentioned as spare room at the beginning, later with Miles's occupation the valuable belongings there become an issue. Having such a spare space at home not only shows the affordability but also shows the mediums of the capitalist machine employs in the private. Therefore, it opens the private to the public. Unlike the sharp dichotomy of the private and public in the previous novel, the antinomy has an intertwined relationship in the second work. The capitalist territorialities are shattered with Miles' blockage of the capitalist veins through deterritorialization. He leaves the familiar stations in order to reach the

concept of body without organs which is a space where lacks all the conceptual boundaries of society. Miles reaches the concept, but it produces a mass attributing different meanings to his isolation and benefitting financially from his displacement. The presence of a crowd outside surprises him, but the fact behind the organization of this group of people is because they feel so disenfranchised that they choose Miles as their leader. Therefore, being a disenfranchised body now through his isolation in a room, this code is also inserted into the space which merges his body and the room together. Because deterritorialization is also a psychic journey for Miles, it brings forward the pharmakon ambivalence holding two contradictory views. The capitalist terrain poisons Miles, yet the room functions as a tool triggering working through. In this sense, reterritorialization also means leaving the trauma behind for a new start. Therefore, the spatial politics emphasize the vicious capitalist circles entrapping an individual and causing the psychological confinement triggering the past traumas. In this regard, again in this novel the spatial politics are depicted to be interrelated with his trauma. In the third novel, the spatial politics have firstly tackled from the contrast of the private and public. Elinor's family is a strict one adopting the patriarchal values. When she goes back to London, she encounters the similar oppressive remarks said by her professors and peers. Therefore, the internalization of patriarchy in the private extends to the public, which proves that the oppression of women is political and systematic. Apart from this, the physical spaces are factors accelerating the trauma. As the spaces change, they get narrower to represent Elinor's psychological confinement. First, they visit the den which is a symbol for dark desires and second, they go to the old mill where Toby kisses Elinor. The assault worsens when Elinor thirdly goes into Toby's room to take revenge. However, Toby rapes her sister which becomes a catastrophe in the middle of her life. Elinor seeks solace in London,

but due to the outbreak of the war, she returns home where again she is under the patriarchal restrictions of her family. Only after the death news of Toby, do they leave the house. Elinor, sinking into melancholia, isolates herself from the world outside and turns the house into a studio where she can reconnect the semiotic through art. The house once functioning as poisonous becomes curative and thereby gaining the pharmakon status. Painting becomes a choraic flight which represses the traumatic memories. When the *chora* is taken as a space where feminine productivity is emerged, therefore the house now becomes a *chora* to enable her artistic productivity. The initial spatial politics that poison the spaces are attributed to her body, which transforms the spaces and her body into one. The spatial understanding also fashions her artistic perspective in the representation of space. She aims to draw the landscapes in her hometown, yet they become not celebrations of the sublime but convey the unsettling atmosphere of the period. Therefore, her depressive state of mind arising from the trauma is projected onto the canvas. As she notices that she cannot avoid the war any longer, she becomes a war artist. This also paves the way for the confrontation with the rape trauma she has repressed for a long time. Therefore, the spatial politics employed in every work present that space can also be a research topic in relation to trauma because they are not neutral areas yet coded zones. Because the initial stigmatized codes attributed to their bodies are relatable to the codes of the spaces, therefore the corporeal and spatial attributions can be said to represent each other.

The third sections of the chapters have analysed their trauma and working through in Kübler-Rossian manner. All characters face a trigger before sinking into melancholia. In the first novel, there are two factors: the media stalking Ma and Jack everywhere and the interview accusing the mother of ignoring her child. In

the second novel, Jennifer's upcoming anniversary is the most significant factor. In the third novel, after the delivery of the parcel, Elinor attempts to paint Toby's portrait but she cannot remember his face. All triggers remind the characters of the loss absorbed in the ego. Ma does not have a long period of latency because she confronts the traumatic bereavement immediately after her freedom. Miles has thirty years of latency and Elinor has five years. This temporal delay, either short or long, shows that the trauma affects their memory and relatedly their narrative history. In this regard, the triggers are linked with the archon unearthing the repressed material. Therefore, it is a state which accelerates Kübler-Rossian stages of grief. The first stage is denial in which one cannot fully figure out what has happened to them. It functions to limit the pain. In the first novel, Ma and Jack build a fantasy world where they use doublethink and storytelling as a defence mechanism. Miles denies the death of Jennifer and denies being a part of a capitalist group whose artificiality reminds him of the artificiality he has to go through in his life. Elinor denies the catastrophic events with the attempt to rationalize the attacks. The second stage of grief is anger in which one projects their anger irrationally. Ma projects her anger onto Jack because she cannot do it onto the captor. Miles skips the stage, but Jennifer's family is angry with God because he took Jennifer at such a young age. Elinor is angry with her family's indifference to her and also, she is angry with Toby who left her with too much pain to strive against. The third stage is bargaining which functions as a postponement mechanism. Ma and Jack bargain with God making pleas to be saved. They also treat nicer to the attacker to prevent his acts of violence. Miles postpones his annual visit twice because seeing May reminds him of Jennifer's death. Elinor postpones the confrontation by focusing on her art and by socializing more. In the fourth stage, the characters yield to depression. They go through

Freudian melancholic state in which the sufferers withdraw themselves from the world outside, reproach themselves and lose interest in many things. As a result, the loss absorbs the ego. The depression leaves Ma to stay in bed all the day which finally leads her attempt to kill herself. Miles's depression stage goes parallel with imitating Jennifer's non-presence. While he cycles the rowing machine, he thinks about conjunction of their souls. Elinor's depression stage also causes her isolation at home neglecting herself. Her mind is so preoccupied with the moment of incest that she cannot even remember Toby's face. The role of archontic power is undeniable in this stage because it brings back the traumatic memories. In the final stage, the characters accept the loss and exercises Freudian working through. Ma and Jack revisit the room and act out the old days of intimacy. Miles writes a short story about himself, and this artistic abreaction enables him to leave the room. Elinor repeats the trauma unconsciously in her dream which purifies her from what has happened in the past. Trauma is an experience which leaves the sufferer stuck at the moment of trauma. Therefore, it is not something to be easily recovered. Although in the novels the characters are not portrayed fully recovered, they regain the strength to step towards a new life.

The works are scrutinized in terms of their representations of space and traumatized body. The first novel is examined in a Foucauldian manner concerning his philosophical insights on the body and space. The second novel follows Deleuzian and Guattarian concepts on the body and space in the analysis of the text. The third novel analyses the issues of the body and space through Kristevan philosophy. Employing different methods, the dissertation has tackled the concepts of docile body, schizo body and abject body with their relation to spaces, which are followed by the analysis of trauma. Therefore, the eclectic method adopted in

this dissertation contributes to the discussion of body, space and trauma studies from different perspectives by also establishing a critical dialogue among three contemporary works. Besides, Derridean archive and pharmakon, Freudian melancholia and working through, and Kübler-Rossian stages of grief have paved the way to connect each chapter to one another. The first sections of each chapter have focused on body politics, respectively the docile body, schizo body and abject body. All of them show that it is almost impossible to get out of the stigmas attributed to the bodies. The second sections about space politics bring the bodies and spaces together in a firm way that they come to represent one another due to the codes attributed to the neutral zones through the bodies. Since all the works depict the representation of trauma and also the inevitability of escaping from social attributions, the dissertation, in its last sections, presents the strength of institutional power that leaves the individual paralyzed. Ma, Jack, Miles and Elinor are representatives who portray that trauma is an arduous journey. All three novels are also centred around the notion that the reader is offered a way out at the end. No matter how bleak the atmosphere of the novels, the works offer the reader hope of coping with trauma.

WORKS CITED

- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. Print.
- Arnheim, Rudolf. "Artistic Symbols: Freudian and Otherwise." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 12, no. 1, (1953): 93–97. JSTOR. Web. 23.03.2022.
- Aristotle. *De Anima*. Trans. Mark Shifmann. Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2011. Print.
- Augustine. *The Confessions of Saint Augustine*. Ed. Philip M. Parker. San Diego: Icon Classics, 2005. Print.
- Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994. Print.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helen Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984. Print.
- Balaev, Michelle. "Trauma Studies". *A Companion to Literary Theory*. Ed. David H. Richter. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2018. 360-371. Print.
- Barker, Pat. *Toby's Room*. New York: Anchor Books, 2012. Print.
- Bartky, Sandra L. *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.
- Bernstein, Basil. *Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language, Vol I*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Bijelic, Tatjana. "Mother-Child Bonding and Spatial Androgyny in the Film Adaptation of Emma Donoghue's *Room*". *Istraživanja*, No. 12 (2017): 115-129. Web. 17.02.2021.

- “Body.” *Merriam Webster Online*. Merriam Webster, n.d. Web. 02.04.2020.
<<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/body>>.
- Boon, Suzette., et al. *Coping with Trauma-Related Dissociation: Skills Training for Patients and Therapists*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2011. Print.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of the Taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1984. Print.
- Bourke, Joanna. “The Pity of War”. *The Lancet*, vol. 381, no. 9868, (2013): 716. Web. 01.04.2022.
- Breuer, Josef and Sigmund Freud. *Studies on Hysteria*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: Basic Books, 1895. Print.
- Briganti, Chiara and Kathy Mezei. *The Domestic Space Reader*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012. Print.
- Brown, Laura S. “Not Outside the Range: One Feminist Perspective of Psychic Trauma”. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Ed. Cathy Caruth. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1995. Print.
- Caruth, Cathy. “Introduction”. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. Print.
- , *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996. Print.
- Castaneda, Carlos. *Tales of Power*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974. Print.
- Chambers, Deborah. *Cultural Ideas of Home: The Social Dynamics of Domestic Space*. New York: Routledge, 2020. Print.
- Davies, Ben. “The Complexities and Dwelling in Ali Smith’s *There but for the*”. *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, Vol. 58 No:5 (2017), pp. 509-520. Web. 23.08.2021.

- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. New York: Penguin Books, 1977. Print.
- *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. London: University of Minnesota Press, 2020. Print.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Desert Island and Other Texts 1953-1974*. Ed. David Lapoujade. Trans. Michael Taormina. New York: Semiotext(e), 2004. Print.
- "Schizophrenia and Society." *Two Regimes of Madness*. Ed. David Lapoujade. Trans. Ames Hodges and Michael Taormina. New York: Semiotext(e), 2007. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998. Print.
- *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981. Print.
- Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: Dsm-5*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association, 2013. Print.
- Donoghue, Emma. *Room*. London: Picador, 2010. Print.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge, 1969. Print.
- "Deciphering a Meal". *Daedalus 101*, No. 1 (1975) :61–81. Web. 19.07.2021.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Why Marx was Right*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2011. Print.
- Ege Uygur, Ufuk. *Batı Kültüründeki Felsefi Ruh, Zihin ve Bilinç Kuramları*. Ankara: Ufuk UP, 2005. Print.
- Erikson, T. Kai. *A New Species of Trouble: The Human Experience of Modern Disasters*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994. Print.

----- "Notes on Trauma and Community". *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Ed. Cathy Caruth. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1995. Print.

Ford, Julian D. and Christine A. Courtois. "Defining and Understanding Complex Trauma and Complex Traumatic Stress Disorders". *Treating Complex Traumatic Disorders*. Ed. Christine a. Courtois and Julian D. Ford. New York: Guilford Press, 2009. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. "Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through". *The Standard Edition of The Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. James Strachey. Vol.XII. London: The Hogart Press, 1958. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Ego and The Id*. Trans. Joan Riviere. Ed. James Strachey. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1960. Print.

----- *Beyond The Pleasure Principle*. Trans. James Strachey. London: W. W. Norton, 1961. Print.

----- "Mourning and Melancholia". *The Standard Edition of The Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. James Strachey. Vol.XIV. London: The Hogart Press, 1962. Print.

"Fritzl case". BBC News. Web. 04.01.2021.
<<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7371959.stm>>.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Penguin Random House, 1995. Print.

----- *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage Books Edition, 1970. Print.

----- *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Penguin Random House, 1995. Print.

- “Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias”. *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. Ed. Neil Leach. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005. Web. 08.12.2020.
- “The Subject and Power”. *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (Summer, 1982): 777-795. Taylor and Francis. Web. 02.03.2021.
- Földvary, Kinga. “In Search of a Lost Future: The Posthuman Child”. *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (2014): 207-226. Taylor and Francis. Web. 17.02.2021.
- Gaines, Elliot. *Media Literacy and Semiotics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. Print.
- Gildersleeve, Jessica. “Remembering the First World War after 9/11: Pat Barker’s *Life Class* and *Toby’s Room*”. *Memory and the Wars on Terror: Australian and British Perspectives*. Houndmills: Palgrave, 2017. 111-123. Print.
- Girard, Rene. *Violence and The Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1979. Print.
- Goffman, Erving. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- . *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh SSRC, 1956. Print.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Jacques Lacan: A Feminist Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.
- . *Space, Time and Perversion*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Guzel Kosker, Nisa Harika. "Sahnedeki Yitim: Vahsi Batı." *Ankara niversitesi Dil ve Tarih- Coğrafya Fakltesi Dergisi*, 52.2 (2012): 1-27. Web. 11.06. 2021.

- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of The Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Trans. Thomas Burger. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1989. Print.
- Herman, Judith L. *Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Domestic Violence- From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror*. New York: Basic Books, 2015. Print.
- Holland, Eugene W. "Desire". *Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts*. Ed. Charles J. Stivale. New York: Routledge, 2014. Print.
- Irigaray, Luce. *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*. Trans. Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill. New York: Cornell UP, 1993. Print.
- Jameson, Fredric. "The Postmodern and Consumer Society". *The Cultural Turn: Selected Writings on the Postmodern 1983-1998*. New York: Verso, 1998. Print.
- , *The Political Unconscious*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind. "Writing the Body: Toward an Understanding of 'L'Ecriture Feminine.'" *Feminist Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, (1981): 247–63. JSTOR. Web. 31.03.2022.
- Jordanova, Ludmilla. *Sexual Visions: Images of Gender in Science and Medicine Between the Eighteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989. Print.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Universal Natural History and The Theory of Heavens*. Trans. Ian Johnston. Virginia: Richer Resources Publication, 2008. Print.
- Kearney, Richard. *Strangers, Gods and Monsters: Interpreting Otherness*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Kellner, Douglas. *Media Culture: Cultural studies, Identity and Politics Between the Modern and the Postmodern*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.

- Klein, Melanie., et al. *Developments in Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Joan Riviere. London: Karnac Books. 2002. Print.
- Kornhauser, William. *The Politics of Mass Society*. Illinois: Free Press, 1959. Print.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. Trs. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980. Print.
- , "Women's Time". Trans. Alice Jardine and Harry Blake. *Signs*, vol. 7, no. 1 (Autumn, 1981), 13-35. JSTOR. Web. 29.03.2022.
- , *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1982. Print.
- , "The Semiotic Chora Ordering the Drives" in *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia UP, 1984. Print.
- , *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1989. Print.
- , *Strangers to Ourselves*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1991. Print.
- Kübler-Ross, Elisabeth. *On Death and Dying: What the Dying Have to Teach Doctors, Nurses, Clergy and Their Own Family*. New York: Scribner, 1969. Print.
- Kübler-Ross, Elisabeth and David Kessler. *On Grief and Grieving: Finding the Meaning of Grief Through the Five Stages of Loss*. New York: Scribner, 2005. Print.
- Lacan, Jacques. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. Ed. Jacques Alain Miller. Tr. Alan Sheridan. London: Penguin Books, 1977. Print.

- . *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book I, Freud's Papers on Technique 1953-1954*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. John Forrester. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1988. Print.
- . *Ecrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Routledge, 2001. Print.
- Ladron, Marisol Morales. "Psychological Resilience in Emma Donoghue's Room". *National Identities and Imperfections in Contemporary Irish Literature: Unbecoming Irishness*. Ed. Luz Mar Gonzalez-Arias. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017. Print.
- Leydesdorff, Selma., et al. "Introduction: Trauma and Life Stories". *Trauma and Life Stories: International Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Lister, Eric D. "Forced Silence: A Neglected Dimension of Trauma". *American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol.139, No.7 (July 1982): 872-876. Psychiatryonline. Web. 12.04.2021.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. New York: J. Harper, 1824. Print.
- "Mansplain." *Merriam Webster Online*. Merriam Webster, n.d. Web. 15.03.2022.
< <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mansplain> >.
- Macionis, John J. *Society: The Basics*. Hoboken, NJ : Pearson Education, 2016. Print.
- Marx, Karl and Engels Frederick. *The Communist Manifesto*. Trans. Samuel Moore and Frederick Engels. London: Pluto Press, 2008. Print.
- McAfee, Noella. *Julia Kristeva*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- McFarlane, Alexander C. and Rachel Yehuda. "Resilience, Vulnerability and the Course of Posttraumatic Reactions". *Traumatic Stress: The Effects of Overwhelming Experience on Mind, Body and Society*. Ed. Bessel A.

- van der Kolk, Alexander McFarlane, Lars Weisaeth. New York: Guilford Press, 2007. Print.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *The Structure of Behaviour*. Trans. Alden Fisher. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1983. Print.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. London: Virago Press, 1969. Print.
- Moi, Toril. *Sexual/Textual Politics*. New York: Methuen, 1985. Print.
- Muller, John P. and William J. Richardson. *Lacan and Language: A Reader's Guide to Ecrits*. New York: International Universities Press, 1985. Print.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Melodrama Inside and Outside the Home". *Visual and Other Pleasures*. New York: Palgrave, 1989. Print.
- ."Pandora: Topographies of the Mask and Curiosity". *Space and Sexuality*. Ed. Beatriz Colomina. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Ecce Homo*. Portland: Smith & Sale, 1911. Print.
- Ogden, Pat., et al. *Trauma and The Body: A Sensorimotor Approach to Psychotherapy*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2006. Print.
- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Penguin Books, 2000. Print.
- ."Politics and the English Language". *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 5th Edition, Vol 2. Ed. M. A. Abrams. New York. W. W. Norton & Company, 1986. Print.
- Pekşen, Seda. "The Absent Presence of the Middle Class in Ali Smith's *There But For The*". *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 18 No. 2 (2019): 674-684. Web. 20.07.2021.
- Philips, Deborah and Alan Tomlinson. "Homeward Bound: Leisure, Popular Culture and Consumer Capitalism". *Come on Down? Popular Media Culture in*

- Post- War Britain*. Ed. Dominic Strinati and Stephen Wagg. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Plato. *Phaedo*. Trans. David Gallop. New York: Oxford UP, 1975. Print.
- Rabinow, Paul. *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin, 1984. Print.
- Rainwater, Lee. "Fear and the House-as-Haven in the Lower Class". *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, vol. 32, no. 1, (1966): 23-31. Web. 25.03.2022.
- Richardson, Niall and Adam Locks. *Body Studies: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2014. Print.
- Roudiez, Leon S. "Introduction". *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, Leon S. Roudiez. Ed. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1980. Print.
- Russell, Diana. *Secret Trauma: Incest in the Lives of Girls and Women*. New York: Basic Books, 1987. Print.
- Sandler, Joseph J., et al. "An Approach to Conceptual Research in Psychoanalysis Illustrated by A Consideration of Psychic Trauma". *International Review of Psychoanalysis*, vol. 18 (1991): 113–41. APA PsycInfo. Web. 24 July 2020.
- Sharma, Khem Raj. "Narratological Complexities in Emma Donoghue's *Room*". *Labyrinth*, Vol. 4, No.3 (July, 2013): 144-150. Web. 24.03.2021.
- Shilling, Chris. *The Body and Social Theory*. London: Sage, 2003. Print.
- Sibley, David. *Geographies of Exclusion*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Silverman, Kaja. *The Subject of Semiotics*. London: Oxford UP, 1983. Print.
- Smith, Ali. *There but for the*. London: Penguin Books, 2011. Print.

- Speckhard Anne., et al. "Stockholm Effects and Psychological Responses to Captivity in Hostages Held by Suicide Terrorists". *Traumatology*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (June, 2005): 121-140. Researchgate. Web. 08.02.2021.
- Spinoza, Baruch. *Ethics*. Trans. A. Boyle. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1910. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri. "An Interview with Gayatri Spivak". *Blast unLTD*: Summer 1989, p.12.
- Stewart, Susan. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993. Print.
- Strinati, Dominic. *An Introduction to Theories of Popular Culture*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Sullivan-Costello, Kathleen. *Trauma and Recovery in the Twenty-First Century Irish Novel*. New York: Syracuse UP, 2018. Print.
- Turner, Bryan S. "The Turn of The Body." *Routledge Handbook of Body Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2012. 1-21. Print.
- Ue, Tom. "An Extraordinary Act of Motherhood: A Conversation with Emma Donoghue". *Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol.21, No.1 (March 2012): 101-106. Taylor and Francis. Web. 06.01.2021.
- Van der Kolk, Bessel A. and Onno Van der Hart. "The Intrusive Past: The Flexibility of Memory and The Engraving of Trauma". *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Ed. Cathy Caruth. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1995. Print.
- Van der Kolk, Bessel., et al. "Dissociation and Information Processing in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder". *Traumatic Stress: The Effects of Overwhelming Experience on Mind, Body and Society*. Ed. Bessel A. van der Kolk, Alexander McFarlane, Lars Weisaeth. New York: Guilford Press, 2007. Print.

Van der Kolk, B.A. "The Compulsion to Repeat the Trauma". *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, Vol 12, Number 2, June 1989, pp 389-411. Print.

-----, *The Body Keeps The Score: Brain, Mind and Body in The Healing of Trauma*. New York: Viking Press, 2014. Print.

Vernon, Aisha. "A Dividing Society?". *Controversial Issues in a Disabling Society*. Ed. John Swain, Sally French, Colin Cameron. Berkshire: Open UP, 2003. Print.

Weisman, Leslie Kanes. "Women's Environmental Rights: A Manifesto". *Gender Space Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*. Ed. Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner and Iain Borden. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

West-Pavlov, Russel. *Space in Theory: Kristeva, Foucault, Deleuze*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009. Print.

Whitehead, Anne. *Trauma Fiction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2004. Print.

ÖZET

Bu tez, üç çağdaş yapıt olan Emma Donoghue'nün *Room* (2010), Ali Smith'in *There but for the* (2011) ve Pat Barker'ın *Toby's Room* (2012) eserlerinde mekân ve travmatize bedenlerin temsillerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Travma, akademik çalışmalarda popüler bir konudur, ancak travmanın beden ve mekân arasındaki ilişkisi bakımından çok sık çalışılan bir konu değildir. Bu nedenle, bu tez travmatize bedenler ve mekânlar arasındaki ilişkiyi üç farklı teorik çerçeve ışığında incelemektedir. Metodolojik olarak, ilk roman analizinde Foucault'nun kavramlarını takip edilir. İkinci roman Deleuze ve Guattari'nin bakış açısıyla, üçüncü roman ise Kristeva'nın felsefesi ışığında incelenmiştir. Uysal beden, şizo beden ve iğrenç beden kavramları ana metinlerde sırasıyla işlenmektedir ve farklı türde kavramların birleştiği ortak payda ise bedenlere atfedilen kodların bireyi içinden çıkması neredeyse imkânsız olan kaçınılmaz bir damgalama bölgesine itmesidir. Bu açıdan damganın oluşumunda mekânlar önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Tüm karakterler belirli odalarda travmatize olduğundan, bedensel ve uzamsal politikaların analizinin beden ve mekânları bir bütün haline getirdiği savunulur. Bu nedenle, aynı damga etrafında birleşen beden ve mekânların birbirini temsil eder hâle geldiği ortaya konulur. Travmaya yol açan toplumsal baskı içeren kodları, Freud ve Kübler-Ross'un kavramlarıyla incelenir. Dolayısıyla bu tez, eserlerde toplumsal kodların kaçınılmazlığını, bunların nasıl travmaya yol açtığını ve nasıl aşılabileceğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışmanın ilk bölümünde beden kavramı, bedenin mekânlarla ilişkisi ve travma konuları tarihsel, teorik ve kavramsal bir çerçevede ele alınmaktadır. İkinci bölüm, ilk olarak Old Nick'in uysal beden sistemindeki baskı stratejilerini inceleyerek *Room* (2010) adlı eserdeki beden, mekân ve travma konularını ele alır. Analiz, odayı heterotopik bir uzam olarak ele alan mekânsal analizle devam etmektedir. Mekânsal analiz ayrıca, gerçeklik duygusunu etkilediği için içeri ve dışarının

çatışmasını da dikkate alır. Son olarak, karakterlerin travması ve iyileşme süreçleri yasin beş aşaması bakımından ele alınmaktadır. Üçüncü bölüm öncelikle kapitalist makinenin stratejilerini ve Miles'ı nasıl şizo bir beden olmaya itildiğini incelemektedir. Analiz, Miles'ın bedeninin nasıl haklarından mahrum bırakılmış bir yüzeye dönüştüğünü göstererek, yersizyurtsuzlaştırma ve yeniden yerliyurtlulaşma kavramlarının ele alınmasıyla devam etmektedir. Bu nedenle, kamusal ve özel alan ikiliği de incelenir. Daha sonra, Freud ve Kübler-Ross'un görüşleri uygulanarak, travma ve iyileşme süreci analizi yapılmaktadır. Dördüncü bölüm, ataerkilliğin baskıcı stratejilerine ve bunların nasıl iğrenç bedene yol açtığına odaklanmaktadır. Analiz, kamusal ve özel alandaki baskıcı mekânları inceleyerek bunların Elinor'un psikolojik hapsolmasına nasıl sebep olduğunu göz önünde sermektedir. Ardından, Elinor'un travmasının analizi yapılmıştır. Sonuç bölümü ise, kavramsal ve teorik çerçevede ışığında tüm bölümlerin bir sentezini sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: beden, mekân, travma, *Room, There but for the, Toby's Room*

ABSTRACT

This dissertation aims to examine the representations of space and traumatized bodies in three contemporary novels, Emma Donoghue's *Room* (2010), Ali Smith's *There but for the* (2011) and Pat Barker's *Toby's Room* (2012). Trauma is a popular topic in academic studies, yet it is not frequently studied in terms of trauma's link with the body and space. Therefore, this thesis explores the relationship between traumatized bodies and spaces within three different theoretical frameworks. Methodologically, Foucault's concepts are followed in the analysis of the first novel. The second novel is examined from the point of view of Deleuze and Guattari, and the third novel is analysed in light of Kristeva's philosophy. The concepts of docile body, schizo body and abject body are respectively studied in the main texts, and the common denominator they are united around is that the codes attributed to the bodies push the individual into an inevitable stigma zone from which it is almost impossible to get out. In this respect, spaces play a significant role in the formation of the stigma. Because all the characters are traumatized in certain rooms, it is argued that the corporeal and spatial politics bring the bodies and spaces into a whole. Therefore, it is revealed that the bodies and spaces that are gathered around the same stigma become representative of each other. The codes of social oppression that cause the trauma are examined with the concepts of Freud and Kübler-Ross. Therefore, this dissertation reveals the inevitability of social codes, how they lead to trauma and how to work through it. In this regard, the first chapter of this study tackles the term body, its relations to spaces, and also the concept of trauma within a historical, theoretical and conceptual framework. The second chapter offers the analyses of docile body, space and trauma in the work *Room* (2010) by firstly examining Old

Nick's strategies of oppression. The analysis continues with a spatial one considering the room as a heterotopic space. The spatial analysis also tackles the antinomy of inside and outside as it affects the sense of reality. Finally, the trauma and working through processes of the characters are discussed in terms of the five stages of grief. The third chapter first examines the strategies of the capitalist machine and how they propelled Miles to become a schizo body. The analysis continues with regard to the spatial concepts of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, showing how Miles' body becomes a disenfranchised surface. Therefore, the dichotomy of the public and private is also examined. Subsequently, an analysis of the trauma and working through is offered by applying Freudian and Kübler-Rossian insights. The fourth chapter focuses on the oppressive strategies of patriarchy and how they lead to an abject body. The analysis examines the oppressive spaces in the public and private, revealing how they cause Elinor's psychological confinement. Then comes the analysis of Elinor's trauma and working through. The conclusion section presents a synthesis of all the chapters in light of the conceptual and theoretical framework.

Keywords: body, space, trauma, *Room*, *There but for the, Toby's Room*