ECO-BAKHTINIAN EXPLORATIONS IN ANGLO-NATIVE SELECTED NOVELS

Pamukkale University
The Institute of Social Sciences
Doctoral Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature
PhD Programme

Ayşe ŞENSOY

Supervisor
Doç. Dr. Meryem AYAN

December 2019
DENİZLİ

DOKTORA TEZİ ONAY FORMU

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı doktora programı öğrencisi Ayşe ŞENSOY tarafından Doç. Dr. Meryem AYAN yönetiminde hazırlanan **"Eco-Bakhtinian Explorations in Anglo-Native Selected Novels"** başlıklı tez aşağıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından 26/12/2019 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavında başarılı bulunmuş ve Doktora Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Başkanı
Prof. Dr. F. Feryal ÇUBUKÇU

Jüri-Danışman
Doç. Dr. Meryem AYAN

Jüri
Doç. Dr. Atalay GÜNDÜZ

Jüri
Doç. Dr. Şeyda SİVRİOĞLU

Jüri
Doç. Dr. Cumhur Yılmaz MADRAN

Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulunun 28/01/2020 tarih ve 04/07 sayılı kararıyla onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Ahmet BARDAKCI
Enstitü Müdürü

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Signature: Ay Şensoy

Name, Last Name: Ayşe ŞENSOY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meryem AYAN for all the help and support she has given me throughout this study. Her feedback, positive attitude, guidance and helpful suggestions have greatly contributed to this doctoral thesis. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. F. Feryal ÇUBUKÇU, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Atalay GÜNDÜZ, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şeyda SİVRİOĞLU, and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cumhur Yılmaz MADRAN for their valuable constructive criticism and supportive recommendations. I am also indebted to my dear friends Dr. Özlem AKYOL, Dr. Oğuzhan KALKAN, Tolga AKYOL and Res. Assist. Gülden MÜLAYİM for their help and moral support throughout this journey.

My special thanks go to my beloved husband Beycan ŞENSOY for his endless sacrifices, help, motivation and patience throughout this demanding process. And my final thanks go to my parents for their support.

ABSTRACT

ECO-BAKHTINIAN EXPLORATIONS IN ANGLO-NATIVE SELECTED NOVELS

Şensoy, Ayşe
Doctoral Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature
The Doctoral Programme in English Language and Literature
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meryem AYAN

December 2019, VI+183 Pages

This thesis intends to study the novels *Solar Storms* (1997) and *Power* (1998) by Linda Hogan, a Native American female writer and *Sexing the Cherry* (1989) and *The Stone Gods* (2007) by Jeanette Winterson, a British female writer. The main argument of this thesis is to present that Bakhtinian critical theory could be employed together with ecocritical theory in Anglo-Native selected novels to reveal 'Eco-Bakhtinian space'. It also attempts to find out how these female writers represent nature in contemporary Western and Native American cultures. This thesis seeks to reveal how the natural environment functions over the course of the selected novels and how nonhuman beings influence human beings. This study also aims to investigate how and why perception of nature differs in cultural and personal aspects, and how the concept of nature has changed over time because of political, social, economic, scientific and technological developments. To achieve this aim, Arne Naess's deep ecological analysis will be applied to the selected novels through a comparative approach, which will be based on Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of the carnivalesque, dialogism, grotesque, polyphony and chronotope. In doing so, this thesis aims to propose new ways of seeing for further Bakhtinian and ecocritical studies.

Keywords: Linda Hogan, Jeanette Winterson, Mikhail Bakhtin, Arne Naess, Eco-Bakhtinian space.

ÖZET

SEÇİLMİŞ İNGİLİZ-YERLİ AMERİKAN ROMANLARIN EKO-BAKHTİNCİ İNCELEMELERİ

Şensoy, Ayşe
Doktora Tezi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Doktora Programı
Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Meryem AYAN

Aralık 2019, VI+183 Sayfa

Bu tez çalışması, Yerli Amerikan kadın yazar Linda Hogan'ın *Güneş Fırtınaları* (1997) ve *Güç* (1998) romanları ile İngiliz kadın yazar Jeanette Winterson'ın *Vişnenin Cinsiyeti* (1989) ve *Taş Tanrılar* (2007) romanlarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu doktora tezinin asıl amacı, bir 'Eko-Bakhtinci uzam' oluşturmak üzere Bakhtinci eleştirel kuramın ekoeleştiri ile birlikte adı geçen seçilmiş Anglo-Yerli Amerikan romanlarda uygulanabilirliğini göstermektir. Bu çalışma, adı geçen kadın yazarların eserlerinde günümüz Batı ve Yerli Amerikan kültürlerinde doğayı nasıl betimlediklerini ortaya çıkarmaya çalışmaktadır. Bu tez, adı geçen romanlarda doğal çevrenin nasıl işlediğini ve insan olmayan varlıkların insanları nasıl etkilediğini açıklamaya çalışmaktadır. Bu çalışma, doğa algısının kültürel ve bireysel açıdan nasıl ve niçin farklılık gösterdiğini, ve doğa kavramının siyasi, toplumsal, ekonomik, bilimsel ve teknolojik gelişmeler neticesinde zaman içinde nasıl değiştiğini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, adı geçen romanlarda Mikhail Bakhtin'in karnaval kuramı, diyalojizm, grotesk, çokseslilik ve kronotop kavramları çerçevesinde karşılaştırmalı bir yaklaşımla derin ekolojik çözümlemeler yapılacaktır. Bu sebeple, bu tez çalışması gelecek Bakhtinci ve ekoeleştirel çalışmalar için yeni yaklaşımlar önermeyi hedeflemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Linda Hogan, Jeanette Winterson, Mikhail Bakhtin, Arne Naess, Eko-Bakhtinci uzam.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TEZ ONAY SAYFASI i
PLAGIARISM ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZET v
TABLE OF CONTENTS vi
INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE
BAKHTINIAN CRITICAL THEORY IN ECOCRITICISM

1.1. An Overview of Ecocriticism 13
1.2. Entanglement of Ecocriticism and Bakhtinian Concepts 16
1.2.1. Ecocriticism and the Carnivalesque 18
1.2.2. Ecocriticism and the Grotesque 21
1.2.3. Ecocriticism and Dialogism 28
1.2.4. Ecocriticism and Polyphony 34
1.2.5. Ecocriticism and Chronotope 38

CHAPTER TWO
TRACES OF BAKHTINIAN CONCEPTS IN DEEP ECOLOGY

2.1. Bakhtin and His Deep Ecological World 43
2.1.1. Deep Ecology versus Feminist Ecology 55

CHAPTER THREE
ECO-BAKHTINIAN ANALYSES OF LINDA HOGAN'S SELECTED NATIVE AMERICAN NOVELS

3.1. Ecology of Polyphonic Voices in *Solar Storms* 62
3.2. Dialogue between the Human and Nonhuman in *Power* 82

CHAPTER FOUR
ECO-BAKHTINIAN ANALYSES OF JEANETTE WINTERSON'S SELECTED ENGLISH NOVELS

4.1. Grotesque Responses to Eco-Crises in *Sexing the Cherry* 104
4.2. The Carnival of Survival in *The Stone Gods* 126

CONCLUSION 161
REFERENCES 169
CURRICULUM VITAE 183

INTRODUCTION

This thesis intends to study the novels *Solar Storms* (1997) and *Power* (1998) by Linda Hogan, a Native American female writer, and *Sexing the Cherry* (1989) and *The Stone Gods* (2007) by Jeanette Winterson, a British female writer. The core of this doctoral thesis is to show the viability of Bakhtinian critical theory with ecological concerns in Anglo-Native selected novels to reveal 'Eco-Bakhtinian space', which is a term coined by the advisor of the thesis, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meryem AYAN, and applied throughout this thesis. It attempts to find out how these female writers represent nature in contemporary British and Native American contexts by going back and forth in time and how the physical setting functions, and seeks to investigate how the relationship between human and nonhuman worlds is depicted in these selected novels, how and why perception of nature differs in cultural aspects, and how the concept of nature has changed over time. This thesis sets out with the purpose to explore the interaction between culture/nature, human/nonhuman, earth/body, body/mind, traditional/modern, fact/fiction, story/history, individual/society, self/other, text/reader and gender roles and identities. To achieve this aim, ecocritical theory, particularly Arne Naess's deep ecology movement, will be applied to the selected novels through a comparative lens, which will be based on Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of the carnivalesque and on his concepts of dialogism, grotesque, polyphony, heteroglossia and chronotope.

These novels have been selected on the grounds that they are engaged in extensive representation of landscape and of anthropogenic destruction of nature as well as its effects on human mind and body and on nonhuman communities. Although these selected novels have been examined through different theories of literary criticism such as postmodernism, feminism, Marxism, psychoanalysis, narratology, and even ecocriticism lately, they have not yet been analysed in Bakhtinian terms with ecological concerns. Just like biodiversity in ecosystems, this thesis aims for diversity in the selection of novels with a sense of comparative cultural context. The novels under discussion reflect the turns in ecocritical understanding from 'ecology with nature' to 'ecology without nature', which is an environmental concept proposed by Timothy Morton in his book *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics* (2007). However, it should be noted that these novels are certainly not the representatives of the entire contemporary British and Native American fiction but

another literary road taken to compare the selected Anglo-Native novels, which leads to such a new discussion as Eco-Bakhtinian criticism.

Issues of environment and nature are as old as the human history and culture. It is clearly seen in everyday life that the gap between human and nonhuman beings has widened over the course of centuries, and will continue to open up unless anthropocentric, authoritarian and hierarchical tendencies are effaced. In other words, the disruption and manipulation of the natural world is not a recent event because environmental destruction has existed since the history of human beings. Besides, the concept of nature is among the oldest themes in literature, ranging from the Classics to the Romantics, and from American transcendentalism to the twentieth-century science fiction. Therefore, this thesis aims to emphasise the interconnectedness between humankind and nature in ontological terms, suggesting that humankind should develop ecological consciousness in the world of socio-economic and techno-scientific changes.

Providing the inspiration for this thesis, the article entitled "The Bakhtinian Road to Ecological Insight" (1996) by Michael J. McDowell, which is concerned with American literature for the greatest part, is the most comprehensive article on Bakhtinian and ecocriticism on the grounds that it covers all main Bakhtinian concepts including dialogism, polyphony, chronotope, heteroglossia and carnivalesque. According to McDowell, humankind in the twentieth century began to recognise that an entity is created and shaped through its interaction with other entities and objects. Thus, McDowell put forth that Bakhtin's ideas become available for an ecological analysis of nature and landscape writing. He stated that "Bakhtin's theories might be seen as the literary equivalent of ecology, the science of relationships" (372). Ecocriticism is an interdisciplinary theory of literary criticism that is concerned with both textual and cultural practices in terms of ecological and environmental themes, including the present ideologies, systems and power structures in a given socio-cultural and historical network. Ecocriticism regards literary works as actions which spring from a developed and refined ecological conscience and consciousness. Ecocriticism also searches for a way to save literature from absolute theoretical restrictions and hierarchical understanding led by structuralism (Buell, 2005: 6). It is at this point that ecocriticism and Bakhtin converge in literary texts, which leads to the removal of the boundaries and hierarchies of all kinds. Just as all the characters in novels have voice in Bakhtinian sense, "all entities in the great web of nature deserve recognition and a voice" in ecocritical sense (McDowell, 1996: 372). At the intersection of these two theories, this

thesis attempts to explore how Linda Hogan and Jeanette Winterson have represented the interaction of both human and nonhuman voices in more-than-human environment. Application of Bakhtinian concepts to ecocritical studies allows the reader and literary critics "to enter the private worlds of different entities" in nature (372). Bakhtinian concepts also support one of the characteristics of ecocriticism that nature be united and in harmony with human existence, not necessarily be in isolation from human conduct. Wherever there is a human voice, there is evidence of nonhuman voices as well because everything is an effect of (an)others' causes.

McDowell's another point is that although language is a social construct and thus is anthropocentric, it can still be analysed to interpret writers' perceptions of the nonhuman world and of the relationship between human and nonhuman beings. Once nonhuman beings and elements are incorporated into the literary text, then they each have their own voice and point of view. At this point in his exposition, dialogical analyses of literary texts enable the reader to hear characters and elements of nature that have remained unheard, or that have been muted by authoritative monologic forces, which reveal how human and nonhuman environments affect each other. That is to say, "every creature defines itself and in a real sense becomes a 'self' mentally, spiritually, and physically by its interaction with other beings and things" (375). For Bakhtin, the best way to represent reality is 'dialogism', in which multiple voices and various points of view act on each other. Dialogism basically refers to a sort of dialogue among various voices, including animals, plants, rocks, seas and oceans, earth and air which all bear their own intrinsic values in ecocritical sense. Just as human beings exist through dialogue in their social world, merging with other humans' voices, they also exist through the same dialogue with all organic and inorganic beings in the world of nature for survival. Application of dialogical theory to the selected novels allows for the interplay of different voices and languages in the understanding of the relationship between nature and humankind, and in the recognition of how human characters and elements in nature affect each other.

McDowell continued his argument that interactions between the human and the nonhuman lead to "a polyphony of interacting voices within any given text" (375). Bakhtin's concept of 'polyphony' reveals the interaction of distinct perspectives or ideologues transmitted by different characters in a text, which corresponds to a kind of dissolution of anthropocentrism for the perception and recognition of the world of nature in ecocritical sense. In this way, a dialogical interaction develops between the

human and nonhuman characters in a literary text, and between the reader and literary text. Both Bakhtin's concepts of dialogism and polyphony and ecocriticism meet in literary texts in the way that they illuminate "a plurality of consciousness with equal rights and each with its own world" (Bakhtin, 1984b: 6). Hence, Bakhtin's concept of polyphony allows for a non-anthropocentric vision of the language of nature. As suggested above, language is acknowledged to be a social construct by most of the linguists and structuralists. However, Bakhtin regarded language as a continuous and 'unfinalisable' chain of meaning which is constantly renewed and reproduced through each link in the chain. That is why each voice, each point of view, each meaning is connected to one another in that chain. In this sense, Bakhtin's unfinalisability corresponds to the American biologist and eco-socialist Barry Commoner's first Law of Ecology that states "everything is connected to everything else" (qtd. in Rueckert, 1996: 112), which, by the same token, refers to unfinalised nature and nature's cyclical feature.

The concepts of time and space are also included in this chain. Bakhtin's concept of 'chronotope' suggests a kind of exploration of how landscape and geography are linked to narrative in literature. He defines chronotope as "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature" (Bakhtin, 1981: 84). Chronotope, ecocritically, allows for an understanding of the relationship of the human to the nonhuman in the physical environment. It helps the reader to realise how nature has been perceived historically, how the natural environment is affected by human activities in spatio-temporal process, and how human characters are affected by the changes in nature. McDowell argued that narrative, space and self are intrinsically bound together, which reminds the reader of "the local, vernacular, folk elements of literature" rooted deeply in space (1996: 378). Chronotope in ecocriticism is significant for McDowell in the sense that it helps the reader to understand how human beings "have viewed the relationship of humans and nature" over the course of history (378). Chronotope also exposes the historical change of human perception about nature – from nature as "a living participant in the events of life" to a mere object serving for human pleasure, from idyllic chronotope to bourgeois one (Bakhtin, 1981: 217-234). Chronotope, therefore, manifests that the natural environment has a role as significant as the roles of the narrator and character in a novel.

McDowell also discussed Bakhtin's concept of the 'carnivalesque' in that it provides "a pluralistic, diverse and hence potentially more accurate representation of a natural landscape" owing to the carnivalistic tendency of "an interplay or collision of voices from differing socio-linguistic points of view" (1996: 380). Carnivalesque becomes "non-intellectual, bodily way of knowing the world" without any sort of hierarchies (381). Carnivalesque, which is also known as 'folk-humour', is related to human bodies and their interactions with other bodies. It allows for a space in which various voices are heard and interact. Carnivalesque produces an alternative space marked by equality, freedom and diversity. Carnival is a moment when everything but violence is allowed, which is characterised by some actions of excess and exhibition of grotesqueness. Bakhtin employed the carnival of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, in which rank and hierarchies were abolished and everyone was equal, so as "to challenge the established order with its official, approved forms" (380). In ecocritical sense, it removes the barriers between the human/nonhuman and culture/nature. It proposes an ecological life lived as festive without resorting to violence and exploitation. Carnivalesque tendency does not simply aim to deconstruct the dominant culture or ideology, but provides an alternative way of living. It intends to deconstruct borders and hierarchies so as to reconstruct interconnectedness, equality, boundlessness and complexity in ecological terms. Thus, the theory of carnivalesque enables dialogue among diverse bodies and voices. It allows for human beings to imagine the perceptions of nonhuman beings. Bakhtin's cosmic yet diverse view of the carnival of the Middle Ages corresponds to the tenable human integration into the nonhuman world as in the old days before modernisation.

To sum up McDowell's arguments, he defined his intertextual study as "a Bakhtinian practical ecocriticism", which came out by Joseph Meeker's suggestion that "[l]iterary form must be reconciled if possible with the forms and structures of nature as they are defined by ecological scientists, for both are related to human perceptions of beauty and balance" (1974: 9). Accordingly, Bakhtinian practical ecocriticism, in McDowell's words, dwells on the blend of genres and of literary and natural forms in a harmonious yet diverse manner. Carnivalesque, in particular, permits to achieve an integral relationship between any human value system and nature, and that value depends on the roles the writer, narrator, point-of-view and characters play in the nonhuman world. These subjective values reflect humans' bodily interactions with the nonhuman, providing a closer understanding of the elements of nature. McDowell

claimed that absorbing contradictory elements, or creating grotesque images, leads human beings to better recognise the cosmic, or universal, insights into the nonhuman world that has been ignored in modern Western tradition, which can be interpreted for this thesis that Linda Hogan's treatment of indigenous myths and traditions and her in-betweenness of two different cultures – native and Western – in the selected novels underlie much of her critique of Native American relationships to nature and landscape while Jeanette Winterson's treatment of myths and her time and space travels in the selected novels underlie much of her critique of Western relationships to nature.

In addition to McDowell's inspiring article, there are also some other articles on Bakhtinian concepts and ecological literary criticism, which could be considered as guiding or suggestive texts, such as "Ecology and Carnival: Traces of a 'Green' Social Theory in the Writings of M. M. Bakhtin" (1993) by Michael Gardiner, "Deep Fecology: Mikhail Bakhtin and the Call of Nature" (1994) by Michael Mayerfeld Bell, "Animal Carnivals: A Bakhtinian Reading of C. S. Lewis's *The Magician's Nephew* and P. L. Travers's *Mary Poppins*" (2001) by Catherine L. Elick, "Dialogue with Place: Toward an Ecological Body" (2002) by Deborah Bird Rose, "Reconceptualizing Dialogue in Environmental Public Participation" (2006) by Jennifer Duffield Hamilton and Caitlin Wills-Toker, "Notes toward an Ecological Conception of Bakhtin's 'Chronotope'" (2010) by Timo Müller, and "Facets of EnvironMentality" (2013) by Roman Bartosch. However, all these articles, including McDowell's, are more concerned with theoretical bases than critical or analytical examination of literary texts. Although these articles provide a rich tapestry of ideas and arguments about the integration of Bakhtinian concepts into ecocriticism, they remain too theoretical for the greatest part. None offers an analytical discussion of literary texts from an environmental perspective. Unlike these above-mentioned references, this thesis seeks to cover the shortage of application of these two theories to literary texts. This thesis intends to be a contribution to the branch of ecocritical studies that looks beyond the so-called normative literary narratives about nature in order to scrutinise such transformative literary texts and reflect on their ecological value.

Furthermore, Patrick D. Murphy is actually the one who establishes a systematic theoretical connection between Bakhtin and ecocriticism in literary studies. In his book *Transversal Ecocritical Praxis: Theoretical Arguments, Literary Analysis, and Cultural Critique* (2013), he expressed that Bakhtinian theories provide valuable new ways of ecocritical analyses and new methods of studying literary works and their interrelation

with the material world. In transversal ecocritical praxis, which Murphy called, both human and nonhuman bodies occupy simultaneous yet distinct space engaging in a dialogue in the physical environment to create holistic and ecological meanings. It is this transversal ecocritical practice that shapes the theoretical framework of this thesis.

Ecocriticism is an interdisciplinary theory of literary criticism which is nourished by feminism, Marxism, psychoanalysis, postmodernism, gothic genre, socialism, science, cartography and the like, which have all been and will be applied to literary texts in literary studies. However, it is seen that the transversal studies of ecocriticism and Bakhtinian concepts have not been undertaken in sufficient quantities though Bakhtin's theories can be appropriated to literary texts in ecological terms. With this aim uppermost in mind, this thesis intends to propose new perspectives for further ecocritical and Bakhtinian studies. As for the potentiality of the connection of Bakhtinian concepts to ecocriticism, it is deduced from Bakhtin's words that his ideas and themes can be recognised as powerful constructs for understanding literary texts written with ecological consciousness though his theories are considered to contain human-centred elements and he himself perhaps did not deliberately write about ecology. In *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981), Bakhtin propounded his reasons for environmental crises by pointing out that nature has lost its intrinsic value and agency when humankind gave up embracing it as a subject but began to treat it as an enemy to fight against and an object to serve them for their pleasure. In his work, he implicitly repeated holistic view of human beings with nonhuman beings, culture with nature, and language with nature by emphasizing "the conjoining of human life with the life of nature, the unity of their rhythm, the common language used to describe phenomena of nature and the events of human life" (226). He embodied the continuity of the time concept and the notions of birth, death, rebirth, growth and renewal, which are his basic themes throughout the work, with agrarian images and with reference to ecological cycle so as to indicate that the phenomena of nature and the events of human life are inherently interconnected. Bakhtin's concept of dialogism appears germane to ecocriticism in the sense that human beings stop being the only speaking subject with ecological dialogism. Natural elements also become speaking subjects bringing with them their own voice, discourse and language.

In *Rabelais and His World* (1984a), Bakhtin dealt with the sources and characteristics of the carnival tradition and folk-festivity. Linking festivity to cosmos and historic developments to natural cycle, he stated that feasts are greatly influential

for the carnival spirit because "it transgresses all limited objectives. Neither can it be separated from bodily life, from the earth, nature, and the cosmos. The sun shines in the festive sky, and there is such a thing as 'feast-day' weather" (276). Establishing his theory of the carnivalesque on the themes of the revival and renewal of the world, of freedom, equality and abundance, of suspension of hierarchical ranks, of becoming, growth and incompletedness, of parodies and travesties, of comic crownings and uncrownings, of the marketplace speech, and of festive laughter, Bakhtin provided one of the most significant aspect of the carnivalesque, which is 'grotesque realism', or 'material bodily principle'. For him, "[t]he essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (19). The earth and body are organically interconnected in grotesque realism, which debunks anthropocentrism and, thus, allows for transition from human corporeality to transcorporeal existence through the combination with animals, plants, natural elements and other nonhuman entities in nature. The grotesque body is open to the outside world through open mouth, genital organs, breasts, phallus, potbelly and nose. That the grotesque body transgresses its boundaries through copulation, pregnancy, childbirth, death, eating, drinking, and defecation suggests a kind of circular and reciprocal relationship between the human and nonhuman worlds in ecocritical sense. Bakhtin claimed that "[t]his carnival spirit offers the chance to have a new outlook on the world, to realize the relative nature of all that exists, and to enter a completely new order of things" (34). In this sense, it is quite possible to express that theory of the carnivalesque raises ecological consciousness and seeks to restore the relationship of human beings to the natural world.

Bakhtin's emphasis on the achievement of "a view of the world superior to all other views" and of objectivity distinct from many Western ideologies in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984b) can be considered to offer liberated perspectives of organic and inorganic beings in nature when he proposed "the essential, irreducible multi-centeredness, or 'polyphony,' of human life" which is interrelated to the phenomena of nature (xx). Throughout this work, Bakhtin argued that "*the thinking human consciousness and the dialogic sphere in which this consciousness exists*, in all its depth and specificity, cannot be reached through a monologic artistic approach" (emphasis in original, 271), which is an argument that denies subjective ideologies, monologism and anthropocentrism while inviting humankind to restore harmony with

the nonhuman world so as to achieve full consciousness in Bakhtinian sense and Self-realisation in ecocritical sense through dialogic interaction.

Linda Hogan and Jeanette Winterson in their novels go beyond the objective presentation of the history of nature and the autobiographical pattern of nature writing because "narratives of retreat into unspoiled nature [...] are [...] grounded in a mechanistic view in which nature is seen as separate from human culture and as an object to be contemplated or saved by a controlling, dominated subject" (Dobrin and Weisser, 2001: xvi). These authors rather depict the interrelation of the human culture to nature and the other way round to support life and survival of all species in the world. These authors' ecological convictions share ethics of ecocriticism since the world is regarded in ecocritical theory as "an intrinsically dynamic, interconnected web of relations" with "no absolute dividing lines between the living and the nonliving, the animate and the inanimate" (Buell, 2005: 137). Human and nonhuman environments and beings in these selected novels reveal the ontological and phenomenological interconnections by effacing the boundaries where culture ends and nature begins. This thesis presents nature as a particular agent that intervenes in the human community, in the process of human development and in the course of the human history.

Hogan and Winterson are bound by several interconnections in this study. Both writers share an ecological consciousness that is obvious in their themes, in their unusual characters including activist native women, shapeshifting native women, Dog-Woman and cyborg, and in their belief in reformative value of capability of literature to revive human minds to respect and protect all entities in the natural environment. Both authors question human abuses of nonhuman livings and endeavour to invite human beings to be in solidarity with nonhuman species across cultural values. They both emphasise in their works in-depth interspecies and intra-species connections, which ecocritically provides deep ecological examinations of their narrative practice and their understanding of the nonhuman. In doing so, these writers deny the rational hegemonic narrative and patriarchal domination, and instead employ pluralistic, non-authoritarian and unofficial forms that are in accordance with Bakhtin's concepts of the carnival, dialogism and polyphony and with Naess's deep ecology. Their fictions have world-changing capacity in that the novels under investigation offer heterarchical models that disregard rationalistic and dualistic thinking and decrown traditional binaries. Having ecological significance in terms of respect for all entities in the nonhuman environment, such Bakhtinian tendency in these novels sets the stage for ecological consciousness,

wisdom and imagination. Both authors promote ecological values in their texts by questioning gender issues and existing circumstances in natural and built environments, and by suggesting new ways of perceptions about the relations between human and nonhuman beings.

In this sense, Bakhtinian ecocritical praxis is consistent with the selected novels by Hogan and Winterson on the grounds that they both attempt to decentralise monological voice and singular point of view to achieve symbiosis and deep ecological diversity. On closer examination, deep ecological reflections constantly reappear in the authors' texts. Their novels can be considered to have Bakhtinian elements owing to their tendency for multiple points of view and plural voices, subject/object and gender reconstructions, gender-neutrality, pursuit of nonlinear chronology, characterisation, cross-genre, metafictionality and poetic language. Their writing styles represent the carnival experience and dialogic interaction that looks for "a dynamic expression" of "ever changing, playful, undefined forms" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 10). All these subvertive features have deep ecological reverberations that are not explicitly stated in the texts, but they gain ecological dimension when the oppressions of officialdom, monologic voice, singular perspective and patriarchal culture are considered.

Although these two authors may not be the first and only to use transformative narrative strategies, their persistent tendencies in writing that way give rise to eco-ethical significance. An eco-ethical interpretation of the selected novels within Bakhtinian framework can be justified by the harmonious blend of the authors' tendencies in which nature is always present. In other words, these two authors "reweave new stories that acknowledge and value the biological and cultural diversity that sustains life" (Gaard and Murphy, 1998: 2). The novels to be explored represent such a reweaving of stories which maintain ecocritical principles of diversity and symbiosis. To put it in different words, these novels incorporate Bakhtinian ecocritical praxis in two ways: first, in the narrative employment of ecocritical principles within Bakhtin's concepts; and second, in their influence on raising readers' ecological awareness.

This thesis consists of four main chapters. Chapter 1 provides the first part of the theoretical background covering an overview of ecocriticism and Bakhtinian critical theory, revealing entanglements between the two theories. Chapter 2 deals with the second part of the theoretical background covering an overview of Naess's deep ecology movement, which is the philosophical background of ecocriticism, and

Bakhtin's theories of the carnivalesque, grotesque, dialogism, polyphony and chronotope, showing the dialogic connections between these two theories. This chapter also discusses some arguments about the relationship between deep ecology and feminist ecology, as both writers are women and their main characters are mostly female, to show that feminism or feminist ecology is not taken into consideration in this thesis since it brings about another border and hierarchy. Chapter 3 presents Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of *Solar Storms* (1997) and *Power* (1998) by Linda Hogan. This chapter provides ecological wisdom and environmental discourse of Linda Hogan, revealing her native traditions about native landscapes, animals and plants in polyphonic and dialogic atmosphere. Chapter 4 offers Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of *Sexing the Cherry* (1989) and *The Stone Gods* (2007) by Jeanette Winterson. This chapter offers ecological imagination and environmental discourse of Jeanette Winterson, revealing her post/apocalyptic tendency towards nonhuman environment and beings in grotesque and carnivalesque atmosphere.

These novels are organised in chronological order so as to trace the changing perspectives of the waves in ecocriticism, its transformation from the traditional to the modern, from tree-hugging to quasi-apocalyptic and post/apocalyptic tendencies, from ecology with nature to ecology without nature, from the longing for the past to the hope for better future lost in darkness, and from the green to the grey. These transformations all reflect a kind of carnivalesque, dialogic and polyphonic space for the interactive narration and ecological interaction. Each of the analytic chapters gives a brief introduction to the writer and the novel under investigation. Excerpts from various parts of the novels are selected as references for Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of the novels. These excerpts can function as representatives of the attitudes of Western and Native American worlds towards nature and as indications of how positions on and perceptions of nature differ in white and native societies. Finally, this thesis ends with a concluding chapter which revisits the ideas of each chapter about Bakhtinian reflections in ecocritical analyses by comparing and contrasting the environmental positions taken in these four novels under investigation, and which also includes some ideas for future studies on Eco-Bakhtinian practice. The analyses show that Hogan and Winterson share a tendency to warn people about environmental destruction and to raise ecological awareness in their societies. The authors also put that the positions of their characters and the communities in the nonhuman world in their selected novels are intimately related to the authoritative ideologies and existing power structures in a given socio-

cultural context, which they both seek to transform through their writings for a better and gre(y)ener future, or for the hope of turning back to greenness rather than living in a greyish space.

CHAPTER ONE
BAKHTINIAN CRITICAL THEORY IN ECOCRITICISM

This chapter constitutes the first phase of the theoretical part of the thesis, on which Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of the novels *Solar Storms* (1997) and *Power* (1998) by Linda Hogan, and *Sexing the Cherry* (1989) and *The Stone Gods* (2007) by Jeanette Winterson depend. This chapter begins with a brief overview of ecocriticism, and proceeds to Bakhtin's critical theory. Over the course of the chapter, entanglements between ecocriticism and Bakhtinian critical theory are explained in detail.

1.1. An Overview of Ecocriticism

Ecocriticism is a field of literary criticism that discusses the science of ecology and environmental issues in literary texts. The term 'ecocriticism' is considered to have been coined by William Rueckert in 1978 (Westling, 2006: 26). He defined it as "the application of ecology and ecological concepts to the study of literature" (Rueckert, 1996: 107). In *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, Glotfelty described ecocriticism as "the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment", attempting to take "an earth-centred approach to literary studies" (1996: xviii). To make it clearer, ecocriticism deals with the interconnections between culture and nature, the human and nonhuman, literature and ecology (xix). Barry defined ecocriticism as "a project that turn[s] away from the 'social constructivism' and 'linguistic determinism' of dominant literary theories" (2002: 169).

Buell divided ecocriticism into two waves. He suggested that first-wave ecocriticism attaches more importance to the word 'environment' for 'natural environment'. First-wave ecocritics prefer to call the new literary criticism as 'environmental criticism' rather than 'ecocriticism' (Buell, 2005: 17). The first-wave ecocriticism mostly suggests earthcare, which is the struggle to conserve the biotic realm (Coupe, 2000: 4). It later adopts the 'philosophy of organism', removing hierarchical divisions between the human and nonhuman in the environment (Elder, 1985: 172). It requires more scientific literacy in order that humans can praise the ability of science to discover and describe natural laws, helping them understand the environment and correct their misconceptions about nature (Buell, 2005. 18). Hence, it harmoniously connects science, culture and nature, all of which must need, respect and appreciate each other not to cause disorder, war and chaos both in human and

nonhuman worlds. In this way, human beings get away from their anthropocentric view; science becomes objectified as a discipline away from the direction of culture; and nature becomes freer from the dominations of culture.

Second-wave ecocriticism expands its boundaries to the built environment. It is absorbed both in the natural and the built environments, regarding them as interrelated. Michael Bennett put forth the idea that environmental literary studies must also develop 'social ecocriticism', which also draws attention to irregular urbanisation and worsening landscapes in the natural environment (2001: 32). The most serious development of the second-wave ecocriticism is the adoption of environmental ethics, aesthetics and politics, which gains ecocriticism a philosophical aspect (Buell, 2005: 22). The second-wave ecocriticism deals with "environmentally oriented developments in philosophy and political theory" (Garrard, 2004: 3). Moreover, it is now claimed that ecocriticism is experiencing its third-wave in the twenty-first century with its focus on the metaphysical sciences and multidisciplinary studies (Oppermann, 2003: 17). Although Buell suggested several waves of ecocriticism, it is quite difficult to tell them apart as all these waves are fluently followed by one another. Generally speaking, Linda Hogan's selected novels *Solar Storms* and *Power* could be considered in between the first and second waves of ecocriticism while Jeanette Winterson's selected novels *Sexing the Cherry* and *The Stone Gods* could be considered in between the second and third waves of ecocriticism in aspects of the authors' writing styles and themes of the novels.

Patrick D. Murphy in his dialogical book *Transversal Ecocritical Praxis* (2013) proposed that ecocritical theory needs to be developed by an interdisciplinary cooperation of multiple literary theories and applied criticism rather than a pure ecological literary criticism and a single genre. Combining ecocriticism and ecofeminism with Bakhtinian theories at few points so as to explore the ecological aspects of literature and culture and to manifest the human responsibility for the more-than-human, Murphy called his dialogical ecological foundation as "transversal ecocritical praxis" (2013: 1). Murphy's concept of transversal practice rejects "unitary, monological decrees and absolute dictates" in literary criticism because a single literary theory is not enough to examine a literary text in a comprehensive manner (2). Transversality, in this sense, suggests "convergence without coincidence, conjuncture without concordance […] within the context of differences", as the philosopher Calvin Schrag wrote (1997: 148), which thus encourages orientation towards "global

heterogeneous and heterarchical ecocriticism" (Murphy, 2013: 2). In Schrag's view, the concept of the universal is replaced by that of the transversal, which is a constant dynamic course of unification through correlation. That is, transversality, as dialogical process, becomes "an achievement or communication as it visits a multiplicity of viewpoints, perspectives, belief systems, and regions of concern" (Schrag, 1997: 133). The transversal 'praxis' for Murphy corresponds to a dialogical interaction "between the abstract and the concrete, the theory and the practice, the concept and the application" (2013: 4). The transversal praxis as dialogical engagement is not finished as in Bakhtin's focus on unfinalisability and always embraces revision and correction of terms and methods. In doing so, transversal praxis fuses the text, theory, criticism, human society and nonhuman community together in dynamic and multifarious dimensions. Therefore, transversal ecocritical praxis provides an *ethical* practice for ecological literary studies to achieve its complete academic development (Murphy, 2013: 6; emphasis in original).

Murphy put forth that Bakhtin's critical theory allows for useful ways for ecocritical examination of literary texts since Bakhtinian concepts include linguistic, historical, social and environmental contexts of literary works in themselves instead of mere aesthetic, rhetorical and structuralist concerns. In accordance with Bakhtin, Lawrence Buell also argued that genres and texts can be considered as ecosystems for being discursive environments in narrow sense and for creating sociohistorical environments in broader sense. Buell wrote that "an individual text must be thought of as environmentally embedded at every stage from its germination to its reception" (2005: 44). In this sense, the text not only "represents the world" but also "positions [humankind] in relation to the rest of the world" (Brown & Herndl, 1996: 215). Besides, languages, which construct texts, depend on a sort of ecological support for their survival because they are the instruments by means of which human beings gain knowledge about the environment and adopt, maintain or change their attitudes towards the environment (Harré et al., 1999: 172-173). Before going on further to argue the affinities between Bakhtinian critical and ecocritical theories, it is better to explain Bakhtinian terms which provide transversality for ecocriticism.

1.2. Entanglement of Ecocriticism and Bakhtinian Concepts

Bakhtin has sometimes been studied as a philosopher, as an ethical and a religious thinker, and as a forerunner of social activism, as a linguist and as a cultural and literary critic at other times. As also expressed by Michael Gardiner and Michael Mayerfeld Bell in their introduction to their book *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words* (1998), "[t]he sheer breath, complexity, and conceptual richness of Bakhtin's intellectual legacy has much to offer to a panoply of academic disciplines […] his project was an inclusive and open-ended one, with broad relevance for all the human sciences" (2). Bakhtin is studied internationally in fields of literature and the humanities today. Basing his theory on the principle of communication, Bakhtin made current in mainstream literary and cultural studies with the terms 'carnivalesque', 'grotesque', 'dialogism', 'heteroglossia', 'polyphony' and 'chronotope'. There can be no doubt that Bakhtin's ideas have been among the most productive critical themes in cultural and literary theories in recent years, with a great number of books, articles and dissertations providing far-reaching and practical insights into the humanities.

Bakhtin's concepts of the carnivalesque, grotesque, dialogism, polyphony, heteroglossia and chronotope all handle similar problems in different aspects. That is why it is not possible to examine any one of them separately without making reference to the others. This thesis aims to expand the concepts of the carnivalesque and grotesque from festivity of folk culture and from the principles of material bodily lower stratum; the concepts of dialogism, polyphony and heteroglossia from simple linguistic communication between the self and the other, and the individual and society; and the concept of the chronotope from the mere relationship between time and space in narrow senses to a multitude of varying social, cultural, gender and ecological themes. Bakhtin's concepts can be appropriated to ecocritical theory to make more powerful analyses of novelistic texts since both Bakhtinian and ecocritical theories highlight diversity and heterogeneity. In his essay entitled "Toward a Methodology for the Human Sciences", Bakhtin distinguished exact sciences from the human sciences on the grounds that the exact sciences are monologic for their concern with the object of knowledge whereas the human sciences are dialogic for their concern with other subjects (1986: 159-72). In this sense, the science of ecology belongs to the categories of both the exact science and the human sciences in aspects of both a source of knowledge and the relation of human beings to the nonhuman. Therefore, Bakhtinian-inspired ecocritical theory suggests a new definition of the human subject in its relation

to the external and nonhuman environment. Michael Holquist wrote in his introduction to Bakhtin's *Art and Answerability* book that "Bakhtin honors *both* things and the relations between them – one cannot be understood without the other. The resulting simultaneity is not a private *either/or*, but an inclusive *also/and*" (1990: xxiii; emphasis in original). In this sense, the entanglement of Bakhtinian critical theory and ecocriticism manifests that "every human being occupies such a determinate place in existence: we are all unique, but we are never alone" (xxvi). As Buell also explained, "ecocentric thinking is more like a scattergram than a united front. All its strains define human identity not as free-standing but in terms of its relationship with the physical environment and/or nonhuman life forms" (2005: 101).

Bakhtin sought to "interpret the world for his society" in his works, though "not limited […] in a particular time and place" with his theoretical suggestions (Holquist, 1984: xiv). He was deeply interested in the Renaissance "because he saw in it an age similar to his own in its revolutionary consequences and its acute sense of one world's death and another world's being born" (xv). The age of Renaissance is an era of great transformations, during which verbal and ideological authoritarianism of the Middle Ages was destructed; mathematical, astronomical and geographical discoveries of great significance were made; the finiteness and restricted quality of the old universe was destroyed (Bakhtin, 1981: 415). In *Rabelais and His World*,[1] Bakhtin, having been inspired by Rabelais in his attempt to annihilate the immobility of ideological hierarchy through the parody of the novel *Gargantua and Pantagruel* (1532-1564), examines the connection between a counterpoise enforced from above and an inclination for transformation from below, between the official and the unofficial, between the old and the new (Holquist, 1984: xvi). It has been argued that Bakhtin preferred Rabelais for his book because Rabelais manifested "for the last time the possibility of expressing in literature the popular, chthonian impulse to carnival" and showed that "the conflict of

[1] *Rabelais and His World* politically discusses the Soviet intellectuality in the 1930s in that all authors, despite their philosophy or style, were urged to take part in the Union of Writers in 1932, an institutional unity having compelled the authors to write only Socialist Realist novels in 1934 (Holquist, 1984: xvii). For Bakhtin, however, the novel genre celebrates the linguistic and stylistic variety instead of the strict authoritative prescriptions established by the Soviet regime. For this reason, Bakhtin formed 'grotesque realism' so as to criticise the literary style of the Soviet government (xvii). According to Michael Holquist, Bakhtin's Rabelais book strives to reveal how the Russian revolution had lost contact with its origin in the people and how the folk laughter could be brought back into life. In this sense, Bakhtin's work carnivalizes the existing Soviet regime in order for a hope for a non-Soviet future (xxii). In a similar vein, ecological literary theory reveals how and why human beings have also lost touch with their roots in nature in the Anthropocene.

official versus unofficial forces is fought out not merely at the level of symbols" (Holquist, 1984: xxi). Bakhtin expressed that Rabelais is the greatest creator in European literature although he "is the least popular, the least understood and appreciated" writer in world literature, and thus he, shaping the fate of the world literature, comes after Shakespeare or even next to him as some Western literary critics and writers have asserted (Bakhtin, 1984a: 1). Likewise, of all theories of literary criticism, ecocriticism is the least understood and appreciated one, yet the most holistic theory of literary criticism although it is considered enigmatic just as Bakhtin's theory is regarded so in the field of letters.

1.2.1. Ecocriticism and the Carnivalesque

Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalesque is greatly influential during all the history of literature either directly or indirectly, reflecting changes in human consciousness in philosophical, artistic, social and historic aspects. Bakhtin defined the carnivalesque as the celebration of "liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order", which "marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions" (1984a: 10). Holquist argued that Bakhtin's theory of the carnival springs from the conflict for power struggle between the medieval church/state and the carnival itself (1984a: xxi). As Bakhtin provided, the carnival and unofficial feasts of the medieval times are free "from all religious and ecclesiastic dogmatism, from all mysticism and piety", and are "deprived of the character of magic and prayer", neither commanding nor asking for anything while some parodying the Church's rituals (1984a: 7). Carnival festivities and comic spectacles based on laughter pervaded all over medieval Europe, having been different from "the serious official, ecclesiastical, feudal, and political cult forms and ceremonials" (5). For Bakhtin, Rabelais is the one who elaborated the medieval laughter thoroughly (97). The festive laughter is for all the people, though ambiguous because it both suggests gay and triumphant relativity and ridicules, both affirms and denies, both veils and unveils. Festive laughter is different from pure satire since satire is a "private reaction" that negates the "wholeness of the world's comic aspect" (12). The festive laughter, instead, focuses on the wholeness of the world. As Bakhtin pointed out, "[a]ll the acts of the drama of world history were performed before a chorus of the laughing people. Without hearing this chorus we cannot understand the drama as a whole" (474).

In *Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin explained that Rabelaisian images reject dogmatism, authoritarianism, intolerance and hostility since Rabelais supported open-endedness while opposing finalisability, arrogance and prosaicness in life (1984a: 3). Rabelais's world is alive with vast humorous forms and signs that debunk the official and grave atmosphere of medieval religious and feudal system. Those humorous forms and indications, which involve "the comic rites and cults, the clowns and fools, giants, dwarfs, and jugglers, the vast and manifold literature of parody", characterize the folk carnival humour (4). Bakhtin proposed that there are three forms of folk humour, including "*[r]itual spectacles*: carnival pageants, comic shows of the marketplace, *[c]omic verbal compositions*: parodies both oral and written, in Latin and in the vernacular, and *[v]arious genres of billingsgate*: curses, oaths, popular blazons", all of which are interrelated (5; emphasis in original).

Those forms of folk humour provided "nonofficial, extraecclesiastical and extrapolitical aspect of the world, of man, and of human relations", which consequently created "a second world and a second life outside officialdom" based on laughter and governed by "a special type of relationship, a free, familiar, marketplace relationship" (1984a: 6, 154). Whereas "the palaces, churches, institutions, and private homes were [officially] dominated by hierarchy and etiquette", the marketplace had its own unofficial territory (154). This second world parodies "the extracarnival life" by turning it "inside out" on the grounds that the carnival demands "a continual shifting from top to bottom, from front to rear, numerous parodies and travesties, humiliations, profanations, comic crownings and uncrownings" (11). That is why the carnival marketplace merges different genres and forms within the unofficial spirit. In the same vein as mentioned above, the medieval carnivalistic parody is different from the serious parody of modern times that exhibits uncooperative aspect and rejects regeneration. This "two-world condition" (6) also offers a "utopian realm of community, freedom, equality, and abundance" (9). This utopian realm is an escape from the official feasts of medieval times because the official feasts imposed the existing ideological worldview and reinforced the unalterable hierarchy, providing no second world. The official feast, "whether ecclesiastic, feudal, or sponsored by the state", is concerned with the past to order the present indisputably whereas the nonofficial feast looks to the future for liberation, equality, abundance, tolerance and change (9). The carnival feast, according to Bakhtin, "is a primary, indestructible ingredient of human civilization; it may become sterile and even degenerate, but it cannot vanish" (276).

Carnivalisation provides “a special type of communication impossible in everyday life”, which allows for sincere and autonomous speech between the speaking agents (Bakhtin, 1984a: 10). That is why the carnival spirit “offers the chance to have a new outlook on the world, to realize the relative nature of all that exists, and to enter a completely new order of things” (34). From this vantage point, the carnival is basically in between life and art, becoming life itself in reality and art shaped in playful patterns. Welcoming all the people of all ranks, ages and spheres, the carnival essentially “has a universal spirit”, and “it is a special condition of the entire world, of the world’s revival and renewal, in which all take part” so as to live in it rather than seeing it as a spectacle (7). That is why the concept of the carnival is neither imagination nor an abstract idea, rather it is experienced. This carnival experience looks for “a dynamic expression” of “ever changing, playful, undefined forms” (10).

Bakhtin explained some elements that make up of the folk festive culture. The concept of the mask is one of the leading elements of the folk culture, which signifies “the joy of change and reincarnation”, “gay relativity”, and “the merry negation of uniformity and similarity” (Bakhtin, 1984a: 39). The mask connotes transformation, effacement of boundaries, and mockery, merging reality with image. Negation is another significant element of the folk culture as it has a concrete character in popular-festive imagery. Negation means “the ‘other side’ of that which is denied” by the officialdom, which rebuilds the image of the object, transfers its place, replaces its order through exaggeration (410). That is, the object that has died or has been destructed still dwells in the world but as transformed in time and space. Travesty is another significant element of the folk culture which suggests renewal of clothes and transformation of the social image. Madness is another element of the folk culture in that “it is a ‘festive’ madness” that parodies “official reason” and “the narrow seriousness of official ‘truth’” in gay atmosphere (39). Then comes the reversal of the hierarchical ranks, which is another element of the folk culture exemplified by Bakhtin with a jester who is proclaimed king and with authorities of the Church chosen at the festivals (81). Clowns and fools are the representatives of the folk culture, representing the threshold of life and art (8). By means of clowns and fools, the carnival unveils the simple truth beneath the surface of false consciousness and arbitrary orders, reinscribing social laws by suggesting freer and more equal alternatives within them. At this point, the concept of the folly is another element of the folk culture, which is also ambiguous in that it suggests both negative and positive commentaries. Bakhtin defined folly as “the

opposite of wisdom-inverted wisdom, inverted truth" and as "a form of gay festive wisdom, free from all laws and restrictions, as well as from preoccupations and seriousness" (260).

Folk culture brings humankind closer to the world and "establishe[s] a link through the body and bodily life, in contrast to the abstract and spiritual mastery sought by Romanticism", a link which provides affinity with ecocritical practice (39). To give a simple example, just as the king becomes the clown during the carnival, humankind may also become the clown during the ecological carnival chosen and mocked by the nonhuman entities regarded as 'gay monsters'. All these alterations are correlated with the change of social order and historic time unlike the stability and immobility of the medieval hierarchical levels. As Hwa Yol Jung also pointed out in his article "Bakhtin's Dialogical Body Politics", the carnival refers to "a *non-violent technique of social transformation* by the maximal display of the body" and added that "it is festive politics that is a communal celebration of festive bodies whose space is filled always with the extravagant display of colourful vestemes and lavish gustemes" (1998: 104; emphasis in original).

Carnivalisation, however, does not prompt nihilistic delusion or anarchy despite its liberating, degrading and debunking characteristics because the carnival spirit encourages continuous becoming, development and renewal. It rather resolves the pessimistic perception of existentialism through the festive and gay atmosphere. The carnival environment provides "a *new mode of interrelationship between individuals*, counterposed to the all-powerful socio-hierarchical relationships of noncarnival life" (Bakhtin, 1984b: 123; emphasis in original). All social classes, ages and all kinds of living species and inorganic beings are equal during the carnival. The carnival spirit denies any kind of conclusion because all conclusions give birth to new beginnings repeatedly.

1.2.2. Ecocriticism and the Grotesque

Grotesque realism, another Bakhtinian term related to the theory of the carnival, is a genre that combines realism with folk culture and exhibits some carnival features. Bakhtin wrote that "images of the human body with its food, drink, defecation, and sexual life", which are described as the 'material bodily principle', play a significant role in Rabelais's work (Bakhtin, 1984a: 18). Characterised by exaggeration and hyperbolism of the negative and improper through festive laughter, these images are

represented in extreme forms reflecting carnivalesque and utopian characteristics. For instance, defecation connotes generating power and prolificacy as excrement is conceived as gay matter in the festivity owing to its function as an intermediary between the body and the earth as well as between the living body and dead substance which is turned into earth again in the form of dung and fertilizer. That is, "the living body returns to the earth its excrement, which fertilizes the earth as does the body of the dead" (1984a: 175). These images of grotesque realism concentrate on the "gay and gracious" wholeness of the "cosmic, social, and bodily elements" (19). Like the carnivalesque, the material bodily principle is also universal embracing all the living beings. Basically ridiculing anything that should not happen or exist, grotesque realism stands up to the separation from the materiality and corporeal roots of the world. In grotesque realism, "the body and bodily life have here a cosmic and at the same time an all-people's character" because the material bodily principle does not represent the biological individuality, or the bourgeois ego, but the people as a whole who are constantly developing and renewed (19). Bakhtin emphasized that bodies do not exist only for themselves but are part of a material corporeal whole.[2]

The exaggerated images of the human body have positive significance as they suggest fertility, growth and abundance in the form of a "banquet for all the world" (19). Grotesque realism, through exaggeration, degrades "all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract; it is a transfer [of every high ceremonial gesture or ritual] to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (19). Degradation here has a topographical significance in the way that 'downward' relates to earth while 'upward' to heaven. While the upper part corresponds to the face or the head, the lower part refers to the genital organs, the belly and the buttocks (21). Bakhtin explained that degradation indicates "coming down to earth, the contact with earth as an element that swallows up and gives birth at the same time" (21). In this sense, to degrade, which stands for interest in "the lower stratum of the body, the life of the belly and the reproductive organs" that are represented by the "acts of defecation and copulation, conception,

[2] Bakhtin was always preoccupied with the body of the subject and with the subject of the individual's connection to the world, a world which is real and tangible in philosophical and aesthetic aspects. On constructing his theory, it is believed that Bakhtin was strongly influenced by Bergson's concept of the body in the latter's work *Matter and Memory* (1896) in terms of Bakhtin's differentiation between the 'inner' and 'outer' body. Bergson's effort to consider the materiality of the human corporeality as a philosophical problem inspired Bakhtin in his endeavour to deal with Cartesian dualism through dialogism. Moreover, Bergson's recognition that the body is simply an object among numerous objects refers to Bakhtin's concept of the body as a growing or degrading object in relation to other surrounding objects (Holquist, 1990: xxxiii).

pregnancy, and birth", means "to bury, to sow, and to kill simultaneously, in order to bring forth something more and better" (21). Grotesque realism celebrates the fertility of the earth and the womb. Therefore, grotesque images suggest "biocosmic circle of cyclic changes, the phases of nature's and man's reproductive life" as well as the cycle of "social and historic phenomena" (25).

In contrast to the finished and ready-made images, grotesque images are "ugly, monstrous, hideous", signifying dismemberment, old age, death, birth, growth, pregnancy and copulation (Bakhtin, 1984a: 26). In other words, life in grotesque realism is manifested "in its twofold contradictory process" in which the boundaries separating the body from the external world are not defined clearly (26). That is why the grotesque body is integrated into the rest of the world with its incomplete, outgrowing and transgressive characteristic. To put it in different words, the grotesque body is part of life on the whole. The parts of the grotesque body, is "open to the outside world" so that "the world enters the body or emerges from it" on the one hand, and "the body itself goes out to meet the world" on the other hand (26).[3] Bakhtin listed these parts as the open mouth, nose, breasts, potbelly, anus, genital organs and the phallus. It is clearly seen that all these bodily organs are either convexities or orifices which serve as bridges between the human body and the nonhuman world. Here is a more vivid extract about Bakhtin's ideas on the connection of the body to the external world:

> the grotesque body is cosmic and universal. It stresses elements common to the entire cosmos: earth, water, fire, air; it is directly related to the sun, to the stars. It contains the signs of the zodiac. It reflects the cosmic hierarchy. This body can merge with various natural phenomena, with mountains, rivers, seas, islands, and continents. It can fill the entire universe. (1984a: 318)

[3] It is a clearly known fact that he suffered from osteomyelitis, an inflammatory disease of bones which reduces blood supply to the bone, during his adult life (*Collins Dictionary*, 2014: n.p.). Due to his worsening health condition, his leg had to be amputated in 1938, the year around which Bakhtin began to study Rabelais (Dentith, 1995: 5). Suggesting a concrete connection between Bakhtin's health and his theory, Peter Hitchcock in his article "The Grotesque of the Body Electric" (1998) pointed out that Bakhtin's disease had a crucial role in his theorisation of the concept of the grotesque and his writing on the culture of body with the chronic and excessive pain he suffered and the manifest absence of his leg transforming his own body into a carnivalised and grotesque body (78). That is why Bakhtin's theory of the grotesque body reflects the image of what was amputated from his own body, which, in a way, manifests a desire for the complete body that is not and will not be achieved. As Hitchcock wrote, "[w]hen Bakhtin writes of the grotesque open character of the body he is not just reading a wild sixteenth-century narrative: he is articulating the coordinates of his own experience of the liminality of flesh" (1998: 88).

Denying the impervious sphere that blocks and isolates the body as a distinct and finished occurrence, the grotesque imagery displays two bodies in one in the way that one body gives birth and dies while the other is conceived and born, which means one body generates another body. As Bakhtin wrote,

> the unfinished and open body (dying, bringing forth and being born) is not separated from the world by clearly defined boundaries; it is blended with the world, with animals, with objects. It is cosmic, it represents the entire material bodily world in all its elements. It is an incarnation of this world at the absolute lower stratum, as the swallowing up and generating principle, as the bodily grave and bosom, as a field which has been sown and in which new shoots are preparing to sprout. (1984a: 27)

To make it clear, Bakhtin gave the example of the death of one-cell organisms: "when the single cell divides into two other organisms, it dies in a sense but also reproduces; there is no departure from life into death" (52). This double-faced becoming, that is, the clash between life and death in an isolated body becomes the grotesque body "in the act of becoming. It is never finished, never completed; it is continually built, created, and builds and creates another body" (317).

Bakhtin pointed out that the grotesque is related to "the aesthetics of the monstrous" (1984a: 43). In other words, all that is terrifying in ordinary life becomes pleasing and ridiculous monstrosities in festivity. The grotesque, parenthetically, denotes "the positive hyperbolism of the material bodily principle" in Bakhtinian terms (45). For this reason, the grotesque releases the world from all that is dark and fearsome, removing all horrors and presenting joy and light with "a festival of spring, of sunrise, of morning" because a true freedom is maintained in an utter fearless environment (41). Laughter overcomes the fear of the godly and human power, of authoritarian orders, of earthly prohibitions and restrictions, and of death. Laughter emerged as a reaction to the feudal and theocratic order of the medieval times, which is thus acknowledged as "the second nature of man" (75).[4] By means of the carnival spirit and the regenerating feature of laughter, the grotesque emancipates human beings, their consciousness, worldview and imagination from inhuman demands that predominantly govern the world in order for unlimited and gay potentialities. Festive laughter is associated with "the change of seasons", "the phases of the sun and moon", "the death and renewal of vegetation", and "the succession of agricultural seasons" (81), all of

[4] Secularisation and dissolution of feudalism in the Middle Ages effaced the borderlines between the official and nonofficial.

which, grasping a broader and deeper meaning, stand for hope of a better and happier future, of a fairer social, economic and political order, of a more ecological life, as exemplified by Bakhtin with the grotesque and two-edged image of the womb that has both regenerative and intimidating connotations:

> All unearthly objects were transformed into earth, the mother which swallows up in order to give birth to something larger that has been improved. There can be nothing terrifying on earth, just as there can be nothing frightening in a mother's body, with the nipples that are made to suckle, with the genital organ and the warm blood. The earthly element of terror is the womb, the bodily grave, but it flowers with delight and a new life. (1984a: 91-92)

It is pertinent at this point to utter that laughter and the grotesque are interconnected in that grotesque imagery defies all that is glorified and finished as laughter destroys the completedness.

The material bodily principles manifest human beings' awareness of their materiality and their bodily nature, which are all about the life of the earth, the awareness which is achieved during the carnival. That is why all the people in the feast are protagonists of the carnival, who are "the absolutely merry hosts of the earth flooded with light, because they know that death is pregnant with new life, because they are familiar with the gay image of becoming and of time" (250). This carnivalesque awareness demands, instead of subjective consciousness, collective consciousness of earthly and historic eternity and of constant revival and growth as in the cycle in the natural world. Therefore, the carnival "transgresses all limited objectives. Neither can it be separated from bodily life, from the earth, nature, and the cosmos. The sun shines in the festive sky, and there is such a thing as 'feast-day' weather" (276).[5]

---

[5] Bakhtin was influenced from Goethe's view of nature, an eco-conscious view that renders humankind an integral part of nature which is achieved by carnivalesque elements. In Goethe's poem in prose, which is entitled "Nature" (1782), it is seen that the world of nature has a profound carnival spirit. Here is some excerpt from the poem:

> Nature […] Surrounded and embraced by it, we cannot emerge from it, nor penetrate deeper into it. Unwanted, unexpected, it draws us into the whirlwind of its dance and flies on with us, until we drop wearily out of its hands.
> It has no speech, no language, but it creates thousands of languages and hearts, through which it speaks and feels […]
> It is all. It rewards and punishes, gladdens and torments. It is stern and gentle, loves and terrifies, is impotent and all-powerful.
> All men are in it, and it is in all men. It conducts a friendly game with all, and the more they win in it, the more it rejoices. With many, it plays so secretly, that the game ends unwittingly for them.

Humankind's intrinsic integration into nature that constitutes wholeness manifests Bakhtin's view of the incompletedness. This carnival atmosphere helps human beings recognize that they are inseparable part of the world of nature from which everything on earth emerges and that they are also a member of all existing entities. In such atmosphere, human beings transgress their bodily boundaries going beyond their skins towards other bodies so as to revive and develop, which enable human beings to become conscious of the earth and of the sky. As Bakhtin himself wrote, "[n]ow this many-headed, many-minded, fickle, blundering monster suddenly sees itself united as one noble assembly, welded into one mass, a single body animated by a single spirit" (1984a: 255). The human body in the carnival environment enters the constant flow within time, a kind of historic endlessness. It is grasped by the continuous process of becoming and growth and by the constant transformation of death and rebirth.

Bodily elements of the lower stratum such as dung, urine and fart help human beings overcome their fear of the world of nature since they provide links between the earth, sea and sky, by means of which cosmic terror is turned into a gay carnival amusement. It, thus, implies that fear cannot exist without joy and vice versa since fear and joy have some intrinsic relation to each other. Cosmic terror here refers to "the fear of the immeasurable, the infinitely powerful" as well as "the starry sky, the gigantic material masses of the mountains, the sea, the cosmic upheavals, elemental catastrophes" (335). This cosmic terror hidden in the ancestral human body implies that human beings cannot deal with the forces of the vast nature through their limited scientific, technological, mystical and cultural forces, which actually reveals humankind's impotence before nature since the very ancient times. Nevertheless, to Bakhtin, this cosmic terror, which actually emerges when an integral part is removed from the whole, is overcome "through laughter, through lending a bodily substance to nature and the cosmos" in folk culture (336). The grotesque imagery, thanks to the material bodily principle, encourages human beings to absorb the cosmic elements – water, earth, fire and air – within themselves. This renewed body becomes "the cosmos' own flesh and blood, possessing the same elemental force but better organized" than before (341).[6] Therefore, natural forces and death are not feared any longer. The world

---

> Its spectacle is always new, for it creates continually new spectators. Life […] is its best invention; death means greater life to it […] It is whole and eternally unfinished. As it creates, so can one create eternally. (qtd. in Bakhtin, 1984a: 254).

[6] The medieval universe was ordained according to Aristotelian principle of the four elements, including earth, water, fire and air, each of which was ranked in the cosmos vertically. The rank of each element

of nature also gains bodily characteristics during this transference reciprocally just as humankind is revived by cosmic elements. Furthermore, there is a kind of material similarity of humankind to the natural landscape in that "[e]ach geographical part of the earth and each land corresponds to a definite part of the body" (357). Therefore, the idea of the human body as microcosm of the world and that of the earth as a giant human body expose the affinity between the topography of the earth and the anatomy of the body. Parenthetically, all images of the material bodily lower stratum "throw down, debase, swallow, condemn, deny (topographically), kill, bury, send down to the underworld, abuse, curse; and at the same time they all conceive anew, fertilize, sow, rejuvenate, regenerate, praise, and glorify" (435).

Bakhtin also expounded that the grotesque language points to the world and to all universal phenomena in that "the passing from night to morning, from winter to spring, from the old to the new, from death to birth" all reflect incomplete transformations (1984a: 165). These incomplete transformations and the grotesque elements of travesty, degradation and materialisation all make the world a more carnivalesque space, which render those inhabiting in it freer, franker, gayer and less fearful. Grotesque images in the carnivalesque atmosphere also reflect changes in history, society and time and suggest that all established norms and authorities are relative and alterable. In this sense, natural catastrophes, ecocritically, lead to a kind of belated human awareness as well, and, thus, to the questioning of the pre-established

---

was established by its station in connection with the centre of the universe, which was the earth. The nearer the element to the centre, the purer and more complete was this element's quality. The principle was based on the fact that all cosmological events of earthly things, creative or destructive, are constituted by the transformation of one element into the element closest to it, which thus means that "fire is transformed into air, air into water, water into earth" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 363). However, this medieval hierarchical cosmos was destructed during the Renaissance for a horizontal order because vertical hierarchical cosmos prevented human beings from the process of becoming (363). In this relative cosmos, the centre of which is the material bodily principle and earth, humankind grows and regenerates in itself, becoming animal, plant, rock and the other way round as expressed by Pico della Mirandola. Although Pico's ideas conflict with ecological consciousness to some extent, it still encourages free will of human beings for what they want to be and how to be. Other views that opposed Aristotelian medieval cosmos during the Renaissance were proposed by Ficino on the one hand, who asserted that the universe "is not an aggregate of elements but an animate being in which each part is an organ of the whole", and were proffered by Patrizzi on the other hand, who argued that all things in the cosmos from the stars over the sky to the most basic thing or element underground are animate, and were also maintained by Cardano, who stated that all natural phenomena are analogous to organic matter to some extent in that he described metals as "buried plants" growing underground (363-365). All these Renaissance ideas, including those of Pomponazzi, Giambattista Porta, Giordano Bruno, Campanella, and others, correspond to the animatisation of the universe with every organic and inorganic entity in it through the emphasis on the concept of microcosm. That is why the vertical line of the cosmos is an anthropocentric order while the horizontal line is an ecocentric order. All these ideas suggest that the world is humankind's home and, thus, there is no reason for human beings to fear nature, and that the entire universe with all its elements and forces penetrates in the human body with its higher and lower strata.

social, cultural, political and religious norms. Human beings are already immortal in the carnival thanks to the material bodily lower stratum, which is why there is no need for destructive attitudes for the sake of growth and of a more comfortable future as the material bodily principle provides a gay future. As Bakhtin clearly indicated, the true grotesque depends on the "notion of time, of change and crisis, that is, of all that happens to the sun, to the earth, to man, to human society" (48).

1.2.3. Ecocriticism and Dialogism

Another revolutionary concept of Bakhtin is dialogism, which was introduced into the realm of literature in 1929 with his first masterwork *Problems of Dostoevsky's Art* (Holquist, 1981: xxiv). Holquist asserted in his book *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World* (2002) that all of Bakhtin's writings are spirited with the principle of dialogue (14). Holquist also provided that dialogue, for Bakhtin, is real and the ultimate truth while monologue is an illusion as it is not questioned and is accepted without any criticism (2002: 57). Dialogue establishes a correlation between the centripetal and centrifugal forces. In a similar vein, meaning is achieved through dialogic communication. Dialogue is so significant for Bakhtin that everything ends if dialogue ends (1981: 252). He fiercely justified dialogic interaction in these words: "*[T]he thinking human consciousness and the dialogic sphere in which this consciousness exists*, in all its depth and specificity, cannot be reached through a monologic artistic approach" (1984b: 271; emphasis in original). Such dialogic interaction can be expanded to include the entire universe and its elements because dialogue "is present in exchanges at all levels – between words in language, people in society, organisms in ecosystems, and even between processes in the natural world" (Holquist, 2002: 40). To provide much deeper understanding in literary terms, a word within a language engages in a dialogue within itself, entering an internal dialogic interaction with its connotations (Bakhtin, 1981: 279). Besides, every utterance inevitably requires a response because "[t]he word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer-word" which "provokes an answer, anticipates it and structures itself in the answer's direction" (280).

Literature exposes interactions between society and individuals in dialogical aspects in the way that dialogues between characters expose worldviews and passions of the characters in the novel. At this point, human characters become dialogic agents that make choices and judgements about value in the material world within temporal and

spatial framework (Holquist, 2002: 158). Here the dialogic agent as subject recognizes that other entities also have access to a language that lies beyond her/his control (Jefferson, 1989: 163). Beatrix Busse also explicated that "dialogue is interaction and therefore inherently ecological" because "the subject-object relation is re-defined" through dialogues "as constantly changing and not dualistic" (2006: 132-133). From here follows the fact that humanity lives only in dialogic interaction with the nonhuman world just as "language lives only in the dialogic interaction of those who make use of it" (Bakhtin, 1981: 183). Therefore, the dialogized body populates itself in the world with other bodies and other things, existing as one of the active subjects and one of the event-making agents among others.

Patrick D. Murphy (2013) expressed that Bakhtinian theories provide valuable new ways of ecocritical analyses and new methods of studying literary works and their interrelation with the material world. In transversal ecocritical practice both human and nonhuman bodies occupy simultaneous yet distinct space engaging in a dialogue in the physical environment to create holistic and ecological meanings. Furthermore, nature also becomes the observer, the centripetal force, which witnesses the motions of human bodies in relative interaction. Just as the Bakhtinian observer is an active participant in the relation of concurrence, nature is also an active agent in that simultaneity since it both affects and is affected by the motions of the human bodies. Ecologically conscious novels achieve such transversal quality through the portrayal of freed perspectives of organic/ inorganic beings and animate/inanimate bodies in nature. Although the concept of intersubjectivity is of great significance in the formation of the subject, it needs to be expanded beyond the human towards the more-than-human. Intersubjectivity promotes ecocentric and biocentric perspectives and encourages human beings to shape their identity with respect to the eyes of another. Therefore, the perception of the nonhuman world changes from "*being subjected to*" towards "*being the subject of*" (Murphy, 2013: 42; emphasis in original). In this sense, the subject becomes "more than human" and the human becomes "more than the subject of his or her own narrative" (43).

The individual identity is here transformed into "*co-dentity*" which consists of "the material world in which all of the social formations operate with, through, and on a person" and which covers "the category of the body, both the immediate, personal one, and the environmental one" (46; emphasis in original). Furthermore, the concept of the 'co-dentity' can be expanded to the concept of the "*eco-dentity*" to include all the entities and elements in the ecosphere and biosphere and all of their interactive

operations (46; emphasis in original). For this reason, these concepts of co-dentity and eco-dentity remind the reader of Butler's statements in her book *Undoing Gender* (2004), in which she wrote that the human bodies for which human beings strive for rights are not only their own bodies but also bodies of anothers engaging in a material dialogue interactively responsive to internal and external stimulations, namely, those of natural and cultural at the same time (21). Tzvetan Todorov also shared the idea of anotherness in terms of building of the self dialogically by stating that the self "is the result of our perceptions: that of ourselves, of our body, and of our actions, but especially the perception we have of the image others have of us" (Murphy, 2013: 51, 124).

According to Holquist's statements, Bakhtin regarded the world as activity because existence is an event for him, which thus means that the nonhuman world is also a being and an existence in itself (2002: 23). Therefore, the existence of the nonhuman world also indicates its capability of utterance, which hence signifies that nature as well has a word to say in its conversation with humankind. In this way, the first and foremost phenomenological prerequisite for dialogic interaction, which is to take into consideration the words of others of all kinds, is fulfilled. Human beings are not only in conversation with its own species, but also with cultural and natural elements. In other words, the world speaks to human beings and they remain alive and human as long as they are answerable to the world and they affect the ecology of the world they inhabit – an addressivity which suggests co-existence and co-being in the world. As Holquist expressed in the following words,

> We are responsible in the sense that we are compelled to respond, we cannot choose but give the world an answer. Each one of us occupies a place in existence that is uniquely ours; but far from being a privilege, far from having what Bakhtin calls an alibi in existence, the uniqueness of the place I occupy in existence is, in the deepest sense of the word, an answerability: in that place only am I addressed by the world, since only I am in it. Moreover, we must keep on forming responses as long as we are alive. (2002: 28)

Human beings' responsibility for answerability, addressivity and co-existence in the nonhuman world motivates them to lead a communal living. Dialogical ecocriticism requires the notion of answerability which refers more to human's ethical responsiveness to the nonhuman than the simple action of talking back. As Murphy's words clarify, "answerability imposes obligations on the ecocritic in relation to

environmental issues, representations of ecology, and the quality and functionality of artistic images of nature, environments, ecologies, and human practices" (2011, 156; 2013: 11). According to Murphy, Bakhtin's concept of answerability should be expanded beyond moral considerability for humankind to include all other entities (2006: 419). Transversal ecocriticism helps human beings gain answerability to and responsibility for anthropogenically induced phenomena in the ecosphere and biosphere. Furthermore, Murphy ardently suggested that Bakhtin's theory of the carnivalesque ethically encourages "internally persuasive narrative and rhetorical strategies for representations of environmental philosophies, ecological ontologies, and activist issues" (2013: 22).

This notion of answerability leads to another concept of significance in Bakhtinian and ecocritical studies, which is transgredience. The term transgredience refers to outsideness in that the author to depict life and the critic to assess those depictions "must take up a position outside himself, must experience himself on a plane that is different from the one on which we actually experience our own life […] He must become another in relation to himself" (Bakhtin, 1990: 15). The world is perceived through tempo-spatial position of the self and through that of the other, and the difference between them becomes the relativity, that is, the varying references of the outsideness. What the self and other see differ from one another in the way that the other cannot see what the self sees and vice versa.

Transgredience allows for a person, an entity, an object or an event to be perceived as a whole from the position of outsideness. The concept of transgredience, which can also be associated with mutuality of differences, can be related to ecocritical studies in the way that it exposes the question of humans speaking for nature or nature speaking to humankind. Transgredience, which implies to be seen through the eyes of an outside another, is achieved "when the whole existence of others is seen from outside: not only their own knowledge that they are being perceived by somebody else, but from beyond their awareness that such an other even exists" (Holquist, 2002: 31). In this sense, the perception of the outside another existence reveals the rest of the entities in the natural world in general terms and ecosystems, natural courses, animals, plants or inorganic elements in particular terms. Therefore, the practice of transgredience allows for the effacement of anthropocentric boundaries towards more biocentric or ecocentric environments. It is a turn from "I-for-myself", or even "I-for-humanity" to "I-for-the-other" (Bakhtin, 1993: 54). The natural environment has a distinct set of characteristics

that are independent of how an individual human being perceives them at any moment. These determined characteristics give different feelings and impressions to different human individuals, which thus makes deep differences in humankind's attitudes towards nature. In other words, the objective thing produces subjective perceptions, which reflects Bakhtinian ideas of outsideness on Naess's concept of the intrinsic value. In this sense, this Bakhtinian interpretation of the outsideness sets nature free from fixity, solidity and dependence on humankind because everything, including perceptions and meanings, flows in nature. It signifies that nature is a living entity, having soul, freedom, feelings and its own language. Therefore, deep ecology movement – which will be explored in the next chapter – makes the ecosystem concept more visible and its problems more tangible, showing the correlations between human and nonhuman entities in the greatest whole.

Adoption of an extrinsic orientation and raising consciousness towards the natural world can be considered as an act of growth and becoming of a character as a changed subject in Bakhtinian sense and as an achievement of the 'wider Self' or 'Self-realisation' in deep ecological sense. Just as Bakhtinian terms are based on a kind of ethical inclination for the cultural practice of lingual communication that foregrounds the responsibility of the author or speaker for what they state and the influences of those statements on other people, transversal ecocritical theory is also founded on an ethical orientation for the cultural practice of the ecocentric communication that stresses the responsibility of the human actants for what they say and their influences on nonhuman 'anothers' and, thus, on the involvement of the nonhuman voices in environmental writing both in literal and figurative aspects. Murphy defined the concept of 'anotherness' as "not the Alien and not the Stranger, but the brother, the cousin, the sister, and not just the human ones, but all the creatures with whom we share the planet" (2006: 419). As Murphy elaborated, adoption of an ecocentric attitude "as a subjective orientation to both the internal and external worlds of the human body" is of significance since it "provides means by which to utilize transgredience in the service of nature appreciation and ecocritical comprehension because it enables self-objectification as part of another-subjectification" (2013: 13). So ecocritical theory provides the reader that it is impossible to keep devotion to anthropocentric thinking, to make no move for healing in the face of anthropogenic disasters and to have no reason for believing that somebody other than herself/himself might take care of the crises since environmental

writings, both fiction and nonfiction, inform the reader about environmental crises, disasters and ecological realities vividly.

To equate nature with otherness deprives the ecocritical endeavour of any further commentary on nature/culture relations. What is mastered and exploited is not otherness, but a culturally – both patriarchally and antropogenically – constructed agent. Nature under capitalism and anthropogenity is oppressed because nature is regarded as an object and substance to serve for human beings. The promotion and valorisation of otherness will not liberate the natural world. The fact that human beings are inclined to equate this exploited subject with ontological otherness, which is conceived as a threatening, chaotic, brute and alien force, is an ideological and official move made to veil the concrete and real material grounds of domination and exploitation. In this respect, the reason why nature has been otherised and marginalised can be explored by a materialist examination.

Bakhtin's theories of carnivalesque and dialogism have been embraced by few ecocritics for its ability to provide a platform for the voices of marginalised nonhuman beings and elements to be heard among the monologic, authoritative and hegemonic voices of human beings. Speech in Bakhtinian ecocritical studies – whether verbal, written or hidden – is "*in* the world", "*of* the world" as well as "*about* the world" (Gardiner, 2000: 134; emphasis in original). While the author of the monologic novels is interested merely in human beings, the author of the polyphonic novel hears the dialogue of nonhuman beings. Ecologically conscious writers do not create their idea-images out of nothing, they do not make them up, yet they hear and witness them in the reality at hand and in the nonhuman world subject to anthropogenic devastation and climate changes. In an ecologically conscious dialogic novel, the character acquires the ecologic initiative necessary to change her/his nature towards self-realization.[7]

Carnivalisation provides for the maintenance of the dialogue thanks to its hermeneutic and reconstructive power. Dialogism, together with the carnivalesque, allows for the contradictions to come together, absorb each other, know and understand one another. To carnivalise the world means to dialogize it so as to get rid of the "monological 'misrule' of officialdom" (Jung, 1998: 105). That is why the carnival spirit restores the unity of nature and culture, of mind and body and of the self and the other, debunking Cartesian dualism and anthropocentric tendencies through dialogical

[7] Corresponding to the 'self-realised' characters of deep ecological movement, Bakhtin's 'full subjects' also tell their own tales in their own points of view (Booth, 1984: xxiii).

paradigm. It seems that Cartesian dualism found a rather unpredictable 'rebirth' in Bakhtin. As Merleau-Ponty's words clearly express, humankind becomes a cosmic subject "[i]nsofar as mind, body and nature are not separate but overlapping and intertwined" (1962: 441). The relations between the human body and nonhuman entities in the world are vigorous, continuously evolving in vital interdependencies. As Westling wrote, human beings "have no choice to disengage, for [their] very life emerges within the intertwined and cooperating cells and organs of [their] bodies, just as those bodies have always moved in participation with things and forces surrounding them" (2011: 129). Unlike Cartesian dualism or Western understanding, nature is conceived as a dialogical partner in Bakhtinian ecological imagination, which is an intrinsically dialogical relation termed as "corporeal intertwining" by Nick Crossley (1996: 174). In a similar vein, deep ecologists seek to "replace the philosophical foundations of the mechanical model of the world with philosophical foundations of an organic model" (Turner, 1995: 336). In this sense, Bakhtin's theory of the carnival seeks to recover the organic view of Earth as a living organism which has been overthrown with the Scientific and Industrial revolutions describing the natural world as machine with no feelings.

1.2.4. Ecocriticism and Polyphony

All linguistic, social and ecological dialogic relations mentioned above can boldly be represented in the novel genre since it has the manipulative power to impose patterns and manners on the perception of the world and offer humankind different versions of reality through its numerous uses of language. Bakhtin preferred the genre of the novel while constructing his theory because the novel, for Bakhtin, is the only genre that is growing and unfinished. As he wrote, "[s]tudying other genres is analogous to studying dead languages; studying the novel, on the other hand, is like studying languages that are not only alive, but still young" (1981: 3). The novel is also significant for Bakhtin as the genre hosts a great "variety of discourses, knowledge of which other genres seek to suppress" (Holquist, 2002: 70). The emergence of the novel genre displays the transition from "a socially isolated and culturally deaf semipatriarchal society" to "international and interlingual contacts and relationships" (Bakhtin, 1981: 11). Such interactions create polyglot environment, ending closed and finished existences. In such a polyglot environment, new relationships are built between language and the object it describes. The novel genre was formed at a time when the

epic genre began to fail the needs of the contemporary people, "when the object of artistic representation was being degraded to the level of a contemporary reality that was inconclusive and fluid" (39). According to Bakhtin, the genre of novel is the most appropriate literary form for polyphony as it provides more potentialities of different and multiple voices and languages other than the authorial voice (Booth, 1984: xxiii).

In polyphonic novels, all characters – whether protagonists, antagonists or secondary ones – have respectable roles as 'full subjects', as having their own consciousnesses not defined by the author but controlled by themselves: "[Characters] are treated as subjects, ends in themselves, defying any temptation the author may have to fit them into his superior plans" (xxiii). Polyphonic novels manifest "*a plurality of consciousnesses, with equal rights and each with its own world*", which thus renders characters "*not only objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse*" (Bakhtin, 1981: 6-7; emphasis in original). That is why each character perceives the world from her/his point of view within the framework of the author's portrayal. Polyphonic novels encourage the potentialities of concurrent coexistence, interdependence and living in harmonious interaction with other entities. Bakhtin highlighted that "*the polyphonic novel is dialogic through and through*" since it describes all human and nonhuman speech and relationships (40; emphasis in original). However, in monologic novels, characters – human only – are closed and completed, acting and thinking in accordance with what the author defines rather than what they are and they want. Characters do not have their own consciousness but are only part of the author's consciousness. Monologic novels do not involve characters' thoughts or feelings other than the author's. Therefore, the world monologic novels depict is silenced and objectified by the author. The author of a polyphonic novel, on the other hand, expands her/his consciousness so as to reach the consciousnesses of her/his characters. In dialogic novels, thus, characters, whether human or nonhuman, interact with each other in a great number of ways, engaging in conversations and exchanging ideas.

Diverse speech genres of languages are of great significance in the novel as they provide a polyglot world rich with creative and dialogic consciousness. The dialogue of the polyphonic novel fuses the discourses of the binary oppositions, those of the self and other, together. For this reason, the relation between the self and other is acknowledged as dialogic rather than dichotomic (Holquist, 2002: 18). Based on the principle of relativity, dialogism manifests that all meanings in the world are relative on the grounds

that meanings are attributed as a result of the dialogue between two bodies holding concurrent yet different space. Besides the two bodies in interaction with one another, there must also be an observer to grip the essence of the relation when the notion of motion is incorporated (19). In such relativity, the observer, identified as the centripetal figure, maintains the two bodies identified as centrifugal figures. This relativity shows that although the two bodies are engaged in the same event in different spaces that event feels different for both parts because each of the bodies has their own view of the world and distinct standpoints in temporal and spatial frame. Time is of great significance in this relativity theory because time is comprehensible only in the course of action, which reveals changes in the material world. In short, dialogic interaction requires three elements, which are "a center, a not-center, and the relation between them" as Holquist pointed out (2002: 28).

The emergence of the novel genre also promoted the self's uncovering of itself and of the other. In the same way as the carnivalesque, dialogism also serves a discursive means for disclosing the truth. While carnival confronts the official culture which denies other cultural strata, dialogism opposes the authoritarian word which does not admit any speech type or different voice because the novel genre maintains "the eternally living element of unofficial language and unofficial thought (holiday forms, familiar speech, profanation)" (Holquist, 2002: 20). In doing so, the dialogic novel provides for "the parodic self-questioning of the dominant verbal styles and ideologies which pervade modern life" (Sandywell, 1998: 207). According to Bakhtin, novelistic images are inherently dialogic in terms of languages, styles and worldviews of another (Bakhtin, 1981: 46). Though written by the consciousness of a single author, the novel is still a system of languages, styles and consciousnesses that reciprocally and ideologically interact with one another which are substantially interconnected.

The novel is a literary genre that is "multiform in style and variform in speech and voice", consisting of "several heterogeneous stylistic unities, often located on different linguistic levels and subject to different stylistic controls" (Bakhtin, 1981: 261). In other words, the novel genre is comprised of heterogeneity of social speech types and of languages as well as of variety of individual voices that are artistically arranged (263). Bakhtin asserted that "language is heteroglot from top to bottom" on the grounds that "it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all

given a bodily form" (291).[8] All these co-existences of contradictions form languages that intermingle with one another in diverse and hybrid ways. Bakhtin explained the heteroglot sense of the world through the concept of hybridization, which means a fusion of two languages in a single utterance, a meeting on the ground of utterance between two distinct linguistic consciousnesses divided from each other by an era, by social distinction or by some other reasons (358).

Heteroglossia in the novel is recognised by the language characters use. In a dialogic novel, each character has her/his autonomous verbal and semantic speech reflecting their beliefs, ideas and perspectives. In addition, the speech of characters affects the speech of the author, a situation which leads to speech diversity and stratification of languages in a novel (315). Bakhtin defined heteroglossia in the novel as "*another's speech in another's language*, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way" (324; emphasis in original). Heteroglossia allows for "*double-voiced discourse*" in which two speakers disclose two diverse intentions at the same time. The first one is the direct intention of the speaking character while the second one is the deflected intention of the author (324; emphasis in original). Such discourse incorporates two voices, two denotations, two utterances, two perspectives and two languages which are all dialogically related to each other. For Bakhtin, there is no unitary and pure authorial language in a novel because the novelistic genre rejects the authoritarianism of a single language and its ideology.

Heteroglossia in novels is embodied by the individual human figures in Bakhtinian terms with dialogisation of similarities and contradictions. While heteroglossia corresponds to the multitude of socially constructed discourse, dialogism then refers to fusion of these discourses together in speech (Steinby and Klapuri, 2013: xiii). However, heteroglossia also incorporates languages of nonhuman figures in Bakhtinian-inspired ecological literary studies. What Bakhtin described as social heteroglossia becomes ecological heteroglossia in this thesis since the heteroglot characteristics of the nonhuman world and of the human community harmoniously arranging a novelistic theme is the epitome of the theme of humankind speaking to nature and nature speaking to humanity as an agent. Thanks to ecological dialogism, humankind ceases to be the only speaking subject. Entities of all kinds in the nonhuman

[8] Holquist and Clark stressed in their research that Bakhtin grew up in a polyglot environment moving city by city, including Orel, Vilnius and Odessa, and was brought up by a German governess who taught him German language and Classical literature (Dentith, 1995: 4). It can be construed that this polyglot environment in his childhood shaped his philosophy of heterogeneity in his youth.

world also become speaking agents bringing with them their own discourse and language. This doctoral thesis is also heteroglot on the grounds that it mixes Bakhtinian concepts with ecocritical theory. These two theories – one based on the human while the other on the nonhuman – illuminate each other reciprocally in the novels selected for analysis in this thesis. These literary theories are dialogically entailed in one another in the way that they both support each other for a hope of better future in all aspects.

1.2.5. Ecocriticism and Chronotope

Bakhtin's another concept of great significance is the concept of chronotope, literally meaning "time space", which he defined as "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature" (1981: 84). He borrowed this term from mathematics and from Einstein's Theory of Relativity in particular as a metaphor to express "the inseparability of space and time" (84). Time and space are integrated to constitute a concrete whole together in the literary artistic chronotope. Bakhtin argued that chronotope has a generic reference that defines genres and generic characteristics within diverse discourses of the novel. That is, chronotopes describe "possible action spaces for the characters in the world of a novel", which thus determine the subgenre of a novel (Steinby, 2013: 119). As Holquist claimed, the other way round is also possible in that genres establish chronotopes in a novel both for the writers and readers (2002: 142).

Chronotope explores the relation between a literary work's artistic unity and a factual reality. In this sense, every literary image can be considered as a chronotope. "There are different chronotopes for different views of the world and different social situations" such as the chronotope of encounter, the chronotope of the road, the chronotope of threshold, the family-idyllic chronotope and the chronotope of the labour idyll, etc. as Bakhtin listed (Steinby, 2013: 107). Each chronotope can contain several minor chronotopes within it in addition to the fact that any motif can correspond to a distinctive chronotope of its own, and that is why "[c]hronotopes are mutually inclusive, they co-exist, they may be interwoven with, replace or oppose one another, contradict one another or find themselves in ever more complex interrelationships" (Bakhtin, 1981: 252). Chronotopes engage in dialogical relationships with "the world of the author, of the performer, and the world of the listeners and readers" (252). They maintain a ground on which entanglements are resolved and unresolved. It materialises time in space, making it tangible and perceptible. As Bakhtin put it, "the chronotope

makes narrative events concrete, makes them take on flesh, causes blood to flow in their veins" (250). Chronotopes provide a basis for "*representation* out of which narrative events emerge, a series of temporal markers conjoined with spatial features which, together, define specific historical, biographical, and social relations" (Pier, 2005: 64; emphasis added). In other words, chronotopes describe "'reality' within the world of the text, *as conceptualized within that world itself*" (Beaton, 2010: 62; emphasis in original). The author is not completely outside the chronotope of her/his creation. She/He portrays the world either from the point of view of a hero taking part in the represented event, or from a narrator's point of view, or from a fictitious author's perspective, or from his own perspective in direct auctorial discourse (Bakhtin, 1981: 256).

Chronotopes also have axiological aspect, which refers to evaluation of temporal and spatial situations as perceived by the characters and the reader (Holquist, 2002: 152). Liisa Steinby suggested in her article "Bakhtin's Concept of the Chronotope: The Viewpoint of an Acting Subject" that chronotope "provides the right moment of time and place for [certain kinds of] human action" (2013: 116). In other words, time/space frame is axiological since it questions whether a certain time or a certain place is good or bad for subjects. As Bakhtin expressed, "[t]ime itself abuses and praises, beats and decorates, kills and gives birth; this time is simultaneously ironic and gay" (1984a: 435). That is why chronotopes also represent a concrete situation in which some actions are possible while others are restricted in accordance with the depictions of events, themes and ideologies. In this sense, chronotopes with ecological concerns reveal either the healing or destruction of nature in axiological terms because both destruction and healing happen within time. As Holquist put it differently, "time is knowable only in terms of action, that is of changes in the natural world: temporal relations are first constituted by physical relations that obtain not among static things but among *event*" (2002: 159; emphasis in original).

An essential wholeness in ecocritical sense is achieved in time and space only by the intrinsic unity of the human and nonhuman worlds. Bakhtin stressed the importance of the integration of human beings into the natural environment in these words: "As long as the organism lives, it resists a fusion with environment, but if it is torn out of its environment, it dies" (1981: 254). Emphasising the interrelationship between the human and nonhuman worlds in cyclic time, Bakhtin fiercely argued that

> It is necessary to find a new relationship to nature, not to the little nature of one's own corner of the world but to the big nature of the great world, to all the phenomena of the solar system, to the wealth excavated from the earth's core, to a variety of geographical locations and continents. (234)

Chronotope also shows "the image of man" in literary realm, which is thus inherently chronotopic (Bakhtin, 1981: 84). Bakhtin's theories can be considered to play a significant role in reconstructing the human image in the novel in accordance with ecological consciousness. A human being is both a natural and moral being, who is a naturally determined and morally free subject acting autonomously and responsible for her/his doings (Steinby and Klapuri, 2013: xviii). Rather than the concept of the objectified other, Bakhtin preferred the concept of the "co-subject", the "one to whom we listen when he speaks, whom we speak to, whose words we include in our own speech" (xxi). This concept of Bakhtin is based on self-recognition as a human being and recognition of the nonhuman world in her/his thoughts and actions. In this sense, a human hero in a novel is part of both natural and cultural worlds she/he lives in and is also a self-governing subject of moral acts at the same time. She/He makes ethical decisions and frequently meditates on her/his actions and experiences. Besides, humankind's emergence is a historical occurrence which is maintained by the natural world, which showcases that human beings belong with nature in their survival and growth. As Bakhtin exemplified:

> This is an arena of historical events, a firmly delineated boundary of that spatial riverbed along which the current of historical time flows. Historically active man is placed in this living, graphic, visual system of waterways, mountains, valleys, boundaries, and routes. He builds, drains marshes, lays routes across mountains and rivers, develops the minerals, cultivates the irrigated valleys, and so on. One sees the *essential* and *necessary* character of man's historical activity. (1986: 37-38; emphasis in original)

What Bakhtin meant is that humankind's historical activities restructure the nonhuman world as well as human communities. In a similar vein, humans are shaped by their environment in their doings though they do not lose their power of ethical autonomy. Chellis Glendinning claimed that "Western culture is suffering from 'Original Trauma'" that is "caused by the systemic removal of [human] lives from nature, from natural cycles, from the life force itself", which ends up with "the

traumatic loss of a sense of belonging on the Earth" (1995: 37). Loss of humans' relationship to the natural world, either by removing themselves from countries into cities or leading the natural world into destruction, means humans' alienation from the only home they will ever have, that is, from Earth. Murphy defined ecology as "the study of the house, while household places emphasis on the activities and functions rather than the building as an object" (2013: 25). Those activities and functions determine human beings' individual existence in that house which consists of more-than-human elements and the existence of those elements in the human world. As Murphy wrote, human beings always perform their "sense of unique individual existence within a household of the more than human world at the same time" that bodies of human beings are "households for other organisms performing their own identities and transformations" (37-38). 'The house' Murphy mentioned in his argument is the world of nature.

Nature has been objectified since the Scientific Revolution for empirical experiences, and has been regarded as an object to master and possess all its elements. Its intrinsic wholeness has also been ruined in order to create a dichotomy between matter and spirit. As Barry Sandywell put it in his article "Memories of Nature in Bakhtin and Benjamin" (2000), "[t]he ancient participatory cosmos was replaced by a mathematical order of inanimate matter" with the Scientific Revolution and the Enlightenment afterwards (95). In this mathematical order, nature was reduced to an object, rationalised, mechanised and standardized by technical interests. The anxiety about the 'death of God' in the late nineteenth-century ended up with the 'death of nature' in later century (96). The view of the death of nature in modern times can only be removed by the reunification of matter and spirit, which can be achieved by "returning to the concrete realm of material existence, social reality and 'histor(icit)y'" (98). This reunification is realized when nature and labour enter into a dialogical relationship because nature functions as a life-sustaining horizon of the material world of human history through social labour. This reunification, stated differently, is maintained when the history of nature is included in the histor(icit)y of the human race. It should be pointed out here that human beings change their own nature so long as they transform their natural world. The image of a fixed nature or the image of nature as the unalterable conditions of the physical human existence is deconstructed, a deconstruction leading to Bakhtinian understanding that nature is a being-in-itself, an

unfinalisable process and an active agent instead of a possessed object or a substance to exploit.

Nature sustains its voices through dialogic encounters with different human communities and historical cultures, speaking distinctly in various languages and in different chronotopic environments. This is one of the points where Bakhtinian hermeneutics of nature meets transcorporeality of ecocritical theory, covering the stratifications of organic and inorganic life culture. In this respect, Bakhtinian concepts highlight going beyond the borders of the perception of nature drawn by the dominant culture and officialdom. The borderline between culture and nature is dialogised both textually and contextually so as to transform the "asocial image of 'nature'" into an "objectivity to the cultural idea of nature as a symbolic construction" (Sandywell, 2000: 116). In Murphy's words, nature has been marginalised by humankind because it has been regarded as an object or a site for human activities since the Enlightenment instead of "an entity in its own right, a speaking subject, a hero in the Bakhtinian sense, or a locus of sacred power" (1994: 59). To elaborate,

> Nature is man's inorganic body – nature, that is, insofar as it is not itself the human body. Man lives on nature – means that nature is his body, with which he must remain in continuous intercourse if he is not to die. That man's physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature. (Marx, 1988: 76)

In saying so much, this chapter has sought to explain the relation between Bakhtinian critical theory, including Bakhtin's main concepts of the carnivalesque, grotesque, dialogism, polyphony, heteroglossia and chronotope, and ecocritical theory. This chapter has concentrated on the interactive viability of both theories in interdisciplinary literary studies in order to show the reader that human and nonhuman beings are inherently dependent on each other for their well-being and survival. This chapter has also discussed that Bakhtinian critical theory can be employed together with ecocriticism in literary texts to reveal that nonhuman beings have the same subjectivity, voice and agency that human beings have. In the pages that follow in the next chapter, this interaction will be elaborated with a focus on Arne Naess's deep ecology movement.

CHAPTER TWO
TRACES OF BAKHTINIAN CONCEPTS IN DEEP ECOLOGY

This chapter constitutes the second phase of the theoretical part of the thesis, on which Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of the novels *Solar Storms* (1997) and *Power* (1998) by Linda Hogan, and *Sexing the Cherry* (1989) and *The Stone Gods* (2007) by Jeanette Winterson depend. This chapter begins with a brief overview of Arne Naess's deep ecology movement, which is one of the most influential environmental ethics of the ecocritical theory, and proceeds to delineate affinities between deep ecology and Bakhtinian critical theory. Over the course of the chapter, how Bakhtinian critical theory enters a dialogue with deep ecology is explained in detail. This chapter finally discusses the arguments about in which ways deep ecology is similar with and different from feminist ecology through presenting the pros and cons by several deep ecologists and feminist ecologists only to show that feminism or feminist ecology is not the concern of this thesis because it leads to another border, hierarchy and distinction, though the selected novels are by female writers and their novels are rich with female characters.

2.1. Bakhtin and His Deep Ecological World

Ecocriticism can be considered as the recovery of literature from anthropocentric and structuralist tendency and as the rehabilitation of mimesis through the truthful representation of ecological facts. That is, literary mimesis can bring about an ecocentric reorientation of the reader through restoring their respect, love and faith in the natural environment. Therefore, humans' recovery of their relation to nature provides a reformation of the narrative pattern for human beings to establish a meaningful relationship to their social, cultural and natural environments. In this sense, deep ecology movement puts forward an ethical duty on humans to recognize the intrinsic value of nature before and different from human valuing, which is yet argued with the human language. Murphy's transversal ecocritical praxis that provides an ethical practice for ecological literary studies in Bakhtinian aspects is maintained by Arne Naess's deep ecology movement in this thesis. Both Bakhtin's critical theory and Arne Naess's deep ecology movement are considered revolutionary in the humanities owing to their reformative arguments about interrelatedness, dialogism, egalitarianism, heterarchy, non-violence, relational thinking, diversity and plurality. Deep ecology

movement, accompanied by the carnivalesque, grotesque, dialogism, polyphony and chronotope, question the norms and notions on which the old hierarchies, old beliefs, old power relations, old binaries, and old oppositions in natural and built environments are constructed and suggest how ecologic tendency would restructure them all. Both Bakhtinian concepts and deep ecology movement "criticize the traditional sense of a separate, independent, authoritative *center* of value or meaning; both substitute the idea of *networks*" (Campbell, 1996: 131; emphasis in original). Naess's emphasis on "a nonhierarchical ontological ecological egalitarianism" corresponds to Bakhtinian critical theory (Sessions, 1995: 193).

Carnivalisation, to begin with, enables human beings to re-establish connection with the outside world by stimulating their nonhuman senses and freeing their anthropocentric, authoritarian and egoistic selves from their own built natures. In this sense, deep ecology movement "can provide a needful corrective to modern culture's underrepresentation of the degree to which humanness is ecosystemically imbricated" (Buell, 2005: 103). That is why deep ecology renders reinvention of "the human species within the community of life species" in Thomas Berry's words (1988: 21). The carnival spirit, hence, encourages healing the wounds in the natural world with the sense of interconnectedness and recovers what human beings have lost, which are a more upstanding sense of themselves, a sense of connectivity to their deeper selves, to other people, to animals, to vegetation, to the world and to a deeper correspondence among the body, soul and Earth.

Naess came up with his ecophilosophy in order to make a way out of the environmental chaos into ecological revival and egalitarianism. The term 'ecophilosophy' refers to the employment of "basic concepts of the science of ecology – such as complexity, diversity, and symbiosis –" to elucidate where human beings stand "within nature through the process of working out a total view" (Rothenberg, 1989: 3). Ecophilosophy suggests that humans "are creatures of reason, yes, but that is not all [they] are, and if [they] attempt to live [their] lives using only reason or logic as [their] yardsticks for value and significance, [they] miss seeing the reality that [their] lives are implicit in everything around [them] and cannot be extracted from that wholeness" (Payne, 2006: 239). Naess's ecophilosophy is based on an ecological ontology that assumes humankind as inseparable from nature. That is, human beings are inseparably a part of all the things they separate themselves from. What this new ontology posits is that human beings will not any longer harm nature at their disposal as it indicates

hurting an integral part of themselves since nonhuman beings feel the same joy and sorrow as human beings do.

Naess expressed that he established his philosophy on his experiences out in the physical environment since his childhood, especially when he "travell[ed] alone in early June to the highest mountain region of Norway Jotunheimen" at fifteen years old (Naess, 1979: 13).[9] As the years went by, Naess found out the reason why the connection between human and nature is central through his ecological philosophy that enlarges the human self into the vast nature. His experience on high mountains conveys the carnivalesque and dialogic experience of the mountain life during which the boundaries between humanity and mountains are removed while they all stand heterarchically in the world of nature. His experience with mountain life encouraged him to identify his self with mountains and provided him with an ecologic insight that parts of nature are actually parts of humans' self and that humankind cannot exist independent of them.

Ecophilosophy looks into the distinct views of perceiving the world, which enables each individual to develop different ecocentric reasoning that is called 'ecosophy' by Naess. He developed his own ecosophy that constructed the deep ecology platform, which is Ecosophy T.[10] He also stated that it is quite possible to develop many other ecosophies with different letters like Ecosophy A, Ecosophy B, Ecosophy C, each of which represents an individual's own system of ecocentric reasoning because an ecosophy signifies "a personal system, a personal philosophy" (Rothenberg, 1989: 5). Ecosophy thus reveals different perceptions and interpretations that contribute to

---

[9] He was detained by "deep rotten snow" and was not able to find anywhere to sleep. Then he met a very old man by chance with whom he "stayed together for a week in a nearby hut" (13). It was during this experience that Naess was inspired by nature's inherence:

> The effect of this week established my conviction of an inner relation between mountains and mountain people, a certain greatness, cleanness, a concentration upon what is essential, a self-sufficiency; and consequently a disregard of luxury, of complicated means of all kinds. From the outside the mountain way of life would seem Spartan, rough, and rigid, but the playing of the violin and the obvious fondness for all things above the timberline, living or 'dead', certainly witnessed a rich, sensual attachment to life, a deep pleasure in what can be experienced with wide open eyes and mind.
>
> These reflections instilled within me the idea of modesty – modesty in man's relationships with mountains in particular and the natural world in general. As I see it, modesty is of little value if it is not a natural consequence of much deeper feelings, a consequence of a way of understanding ourselves as part of nature in a wide sense of the term. This way is such that the smaller we come to feel ourselves compared to the mountain, the nearer we come to participating in its greatness. I do not know why this is so. (1979: 13-16)

[10] The letter 'T' is claimed to refer to Naess's mountain hut 'Tvergastein', which means "cross the stones" in Norwegian language (Rothenberg, 1989: 4; Langlais, 1995: 196).

dialogical and polyphonic ways of understanding phenomena in nature. According to Rothenberg, Naess's dialogic tendency originated from his work about semantics in the 1950s. In his *Interpretation and Preciseness* (1947), Naess expressed, in Rothenberg's words, that "those who communicate do not do so on the basis of sharing a common language, but by mutually interpreting what the other has said based on prior understanding of what the words and expressions mean" (1989: 5). Naess pointed out that communication in ecological terms does not happen alone, which also renders relational thinking and interactive interpretations, which means that neither human beings, nor nonhuman entities, nor environmental problems are independent of each other. It practically manifests that human beings produce ideas and send them forth to the world but these ideas are realized only when they are recognized by nonhuman entities to cooperate and coexist. That is why ecosophy proposes that a human individual should think not only of humankind but also of nonhuman species and the health of Earth because the planet is more than humankind and more fundamental than human species. Although Naess came up with the idea of ecosophy, he also expressed that he was not much concerned with morals or ethics but rather with how human beings experience the world since philosophy comes after experience, which thus reflects participatory carnivalesque and communicative dialogic tendency.

Signifying a turn from science to wisdom, ecosophy means looking for ecological wisdom in the scientific knowledge of ecology through individual perception of the world and personal code of values which guide one's own choices and decisions about the natural environment and all its residents. Developing ecosophies can be associated with the carnivalesque and chronotopic qualities because an ecosophy refers to a total view with which one feels at home, where one ecophilosophically belongs in ecosphere, and it always transforms along with one's own experiences. Ecosophy is based on experience in the natural environment, which requires acting in it, living in it and meditating instead of only looking at it. Ecosophy, just like the carnival tradition, encourages active ecocentric participation of human beings in natural processes rather than their being spectators at the environmental changes because the world is a carnival space and human beings are participants in it. In constructing his ecosophy, Naess intended to "stress the continued possibility for joy in a world faced by disaster" because a joyful experience is gained through either conscious or unconscious development of a sensitivity to natural qualities (qtd. in Rothenberg, 1989: 2). By the

same token, Bakhtin also emphasized "gay and gracious" wholeness of the "cosmic, social, and bodily elements" (1984a: 19).

Naess believed that "[i]t is the work of the philosopher to go deeply into problems and situations which may at first seem simple or obvious, digging out the roots to reveal structures and connections that will then be as visible as the problem first seemed to be easy" (Rothenberg, 1989: 12). This being the case, he called his philosophical ecology "deep ecology", which is an ecophilosophical term that Naess introduced in 1973. Naess defined the science of ecology as "the interdisciplinary scientific study of the living conditions of organisms in interaction with each other and with the surroundings, organic as well as inorganic" (1989: 36). He, however, underlined that all studies of human beings' relations with all kinds of surroundings do not belong to ecology because it only manifests environmental devastation in numbers, but it alone is not enough to reveal the effects of devastation on diversity and on human and nonhuman entities. The lack of science of ecology in evaluative diagnosis is compensated by deep ecology movement, which focuses on both facts and effects. It is thus ecosophy not ecology that provides principles for motive and action for individual, social and political efforts. For this reason, Naess acutely argued that new types of evaluative communities in which human beings are intrinsically related to nature and harmoniously interact with nonhuman beings in creative aspects should be established.

This idea of Naess raises carnivalesque awareness in the way that it unearths sources of ecospherical egalitarian life which have been desecrated by humans' efforts to conform to the "urbanized, techno-industrial mega-society" (Naess, 1989: 24). It is the folk's responsibility as a whole, neither solely the ecologist's nor the philosopher's, to work for a more eco-conscious lifestyle that is "[s]imple in means, rich in ends", and therefore for a carnivalesque and dialogic recovery of the whole human civilisation (88). A carnivalesque and heterarchical society would be the best for maintaining a certain ecosystem. In such a society embraced by the carnival spirit, human beings experience joy when nonhuman beings, including landscapes, experience joy, and sorrow when the latter experience sorrow. A major irony is also worth to state at this point that environmental crises enable human beings to recognise the value of Earth and all its inhabitants, encouraging them to come up with new models for ecologic progress and efficiency, and help them to recognize that soils, rivers, mountains, micro-organisms and the slightest systems of life should be conserved. This grotesque irony, which could be considered as a kind of renaissance, brings out the regenerative aspect

of the carnival in the way that crises of life conditions on Earth help human beings to establish new social, economic, political and industrial forms for co-existence. That is why deep ecology movement deals with every contemporary personal, philosophical, social, economic and political problem in the face of environmental crises. As one of the basic principles of the organisation called "The Future in Our Hands", founded by Erik Dammann in Norway in 1973, was quoted by Naess:

> […] preservation of the natural and whole biological environment, with humans as an integrated part, is a necessary condition for the development of the life quality of mankind, and its maintenance in the future […] ecological considerations are to be regarded as *preconditions* for life quality, therefore not outside human responsibility […] The life style of the majority should be changed so that the material standard of living in the Western countries becomes *universalisable* within this century. (Naess, 1989: 88-89; emphasis in original)

Naess defined deep ecology as "a movement within environmentalism which is activist, ecocentric rather than anthropocentric, and based on nonviolent philosophical or religious views" (1995: 214).[11] Deep ecology movement has been enhanced since its introduction by growing awareness of the uniqueness of the blue planet. It strongly underlines that Earth is not a disposable thing since there is not any other discovered planet of the same beauty and diversity in the universe. Deep ecologists seek to raise human ecological consciousness that is able to comprehend and admire its interrelations with all other forms of life to the planet altogether. What it means is that each life form, whether organic or inorganic, inherently has the "right to live and blossom" (Naess, 1989: 166), which is a universal right that cannot be determined by the authoritative humankind. Considering the benefits of nonhuman entities gives deep satisfaction to

[11] According to what George Sessions expressed in his work *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century* (1995), deep ecology movement has been inspired by the ecologically conscious religious beliefs and aboriginal lifestyles all over the world, and by the philosophical traditions of Taoism, Saint Francis of Assisi and the Romanticism of the nineteenth century with its origins in Spinoza's ethical positions (ix). Deep ecology movement emerged with the rise of the science of ecology and with ecocentric perspectives mainly suggested by Aldo Leopold, Rachel Carson, Dave Brower and Paul Ehrlich, all of whom emphasised deeper awareness and respect for the ecological integrity of Earth and its entire human and nonhuman species (ix). They all questioned the position and aims of Western society in terms of human's authority to dominate and control Earth, and then they provided philosophical and ethical challenges to the anthropocentrism of Western civilisation. Another long-standing debate around the question of the rise of the environmental crises has been put forth by the historian Lynn White, Jr., in 1966. Focusing on religious orientations and values, White discussed that Christianity had divested nature of its sacred significance, urged its exploitation, and stimulated an anthropocentric worldview that claims the superiority of human beings and their dominion over the rest of nature. As a challenge to Judeo-Christian desacralization of nature, White suggested a return to Saint Francis's view that supports the equality of all creatures (Sessions, 1995: x).

ecocentric human beings. Such deep satisfaction obtained from the understanding of 'live and let live' offers non-hierarchical, egalitarian and pluralistic communities in the ecosphere and ecological justice for all humanity, animals, plants, rivers, landscapes and all the entities. Therefore, this ecosophical attitude underlines that human beings can never use any nonhuman beings on Earth only as a means because Earth does not belong only to humankind but to entire life forms. Moreover, this deep satisfaction also reveals that human beings have limited egos though they are essentially more than their egos within the whole as they have the capacity to take positive and active part in the maintenance and sustenance of the whole, by means of which they share the greatness and beauty of the planet. Thereby all human and nonhuman entities enjoy their greater selves, contribute to each other's wealth and health and rejoice in their carnival and dialogic existences.

Naess put forth the term 'Self-realisation' while constructing his Ecosophy T. The term suggests a sort of perfection to him, "an ultimate goal" never to be achieved exactly because it is a never-ending process (Naess, 1989: 85). It is a transformation from 'ego-realisation' to 'self-realisation', with lower case s, and thence to 'Self-realisation', with capital S. Self-realisation denotes expansion of the limited egos from the human self to embrace all entities in universe. That is why the concept of Self-realisation is also known as the universal Self, the absolute Self, the great(er) Self or the Atman (85). The human identity is shaped by the relationships with nonhuman entities. What Naess suggested with the concept of Self-realisation is that "all life is fundamentally one" with humankind's "individual needs and desires" (Rothenberg, 1989: 9). Therefore, Self-realisation encourages human beings to harmonise their identity with the physical nature as well as with all they live in and live with. The higher Self-realisation is achieved, the deeper the identification with more-than-human beings is realized. In other words, Self-realisation deals with "the question of who [humans] are, can become, and should become in the larger scheme of things" (Fox, 1986: 85). However, the individual self is not dissipated in the greater Self since different individual selves construct the diversity of the larger Self. In a similar way, the individual self is not dissolved in the carnival self because each different individual self contributes to the diversity of carnival bodies. Self-realisation is heightened by an increase in the carnivalesque and dialogic diversity of life forms. As Naess ardently pointed out, "[t]he greater the diversity then, the greater the Self-realization" (Bodian,

1995: 30). Self-realisation is for all entities and species, and, therefore, diversity and complexity of life forms increase potentialities of life and identification.

Self-realisation is a continuous phenomenon as it is never reached due to transforming circumstances both in the physical nature and in the individual self, which can be associated with Bakhtin's focus on becoming and growth of characters, incompletedness and unfinalisability. Self-realisation "is an active process" rather than "a place one can reach. No one ever reaches Self-realisation, for complete Self-realisation would require the realization of all […] It is only a process, a way to live one's life" (Rothenberg, 1989: 9). Human's essential integration into nature that constitutes wholeness manifests Bakhtin's view of the incompletedness. This carnival atmosphere helps human beings recognize that they are inseparable part of the world of nature from which everything on Earth emerges and that they are also a member of all existing entities. As Aldo Leopold expressed, human beings are just "plain members" of the ecological community, adding that they are "only fellow-voyagers with other creatures in the odyssey of evolution", provided with "a sense of kinship with fellow-creatures; a wish to live and let live; a sense of wonder over the magnitude and duration of the biotic enterprise" (1949: 109), which Leopold made reference to Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859). In such atmosphere, human beings transgress their bodily boundaries going beyond their skins towards other bodies so as to revive and develop. Human beings become conscious of the earth and of the sky in this way.

Elaborating Self-realisation, Conrad Bonifazi wrote that "[t]he earth is a psycho-somatic entity. Its psyche, extending from the biosphere, is principally concentrated in human beings" (1978: 232). What Bonifazi meant is that humankind is Earth's consciousness in deep ecological sense. As Bakhtin himself wrote, "[n]ow this many-headed, many-minded, fickle, blundering monster suddenly sees itself united as one noble assembly, welded into one mass, a single body animated by a single spirit" (1984a: 255). While explicating his concept of Self-realisation, Naess constantly emphasized that the 'self' should not be confused with the 'narrow ego' because the self is a developing individuality maturing from ego to social self, from social self to a metaphysical self, and from metaphysical self to an ecological self (Naess, 1995: 226).[12]

[12] Naess pointed out that he was much inspired by Baruch Spinoza's ideas of 'self-preservation' and 'self-perseveration' in *Ethics* (1677) while constructing his ideas of relational thinking, identification, interconnectedness, wholeness and the wider Self (Naess, 1989: 85). Basing his philosophy on metaphysics and pantheistic roots, Spinoza intended to resacralise the world by identifying God with

In a similar vein to Bakhtin's idea of unfinalisability, Naess also believed that deep ecology movement is an unfinished philosophical system that continues to develop as Earth goes on rotating (Naess, 1995: 76). In order to bring together those who identify with deep ecology and those who will work out their own alternative ecosophies, Arne Naess and George Sessions marshaled a platform of deep ecology movement, consisting of eight points (Naess, 1989: 28). According to these eight points,

> (1) The flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth has intrinsic value. The value of non-human life forms is independent of the usefulness these may have for narrow human purposes.
> (2) Richness and diversity of life forms are values in themselves and contribute to the flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth.
> (3) Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.
> (4) Present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.
> (5) The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of nonhuman life requires such a decrease.
> (6) Significant change of life conditions for the better requires change in policies. These affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures.
> (7) The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating *life quality* (dwelling in situations of intrinsic value) rather than adhering to a high standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.
> (8) Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to participate in the attempt to implement the necessary changes. (Naess, 1989: 29)

Nature so that the human and nonhuman exist as one (Sessions, 1995: 162). Naess explained that for Spinoza

> all particular things are expressions of God; through all of them God acts. There is no hierarchy. There is no purpose, no final causes such that one can say that the "lower" exist for the sake of the "higher." There is an ontological democracy or equalitarianism which, incidentally, greatly offended his contemporaries, but of which ecology makes us more tolerant today . . . no great philosopher has so much to offer in the way of clarification and articulation of basic ecological attitudes as Baruch Spinoza. (1975: 118-119)

Spinoza established a non-anthropocentric philosophical system that negates Judeo-Christian, Cartesian and Baconian ideas of dominion over Nature. What Spinoza meant with wholeness is the whole of the body of all life forms and of landscapes, the whole of the conscious mind, the whole of the universe and thus the whole of Nature (Naess, 1995: 253). The British Spinoza scholar Stuart Hampshire also expressed that Spinoza believed that "men can attain happiness and dignity only by identifying themselves, through their knowledge and understanding, with the whole order of nature" (1951: 161). Though not explicitly ecological in contemporary sense, Spinoza's philosophy influenced those who spoke on behalf of nature against the human-centered domination of the world after the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions.

In addition to this platform, deep ecology movement principally favours "*the relational, total-field image*", which sees "organisms as knots in the biospherical net or field of intrinsic relations"; "*biospherical egalitarianism*", which prevents human beings from unnecessary killing, exploitation and suppression (Naess, 1995: 151; emphasis in original); "*principles of diversity and of symbiosis*", which "enhances potentialities of survival, the chances of new modes of life, the richness of forms" and increases "the ability to coexist and cooperate in complex relationships" without killing, exploiting and suppressing (152; emphasis in original). This third principle suggests the idea that "Live and let live" rather than "Either you or me" (152). "*Anti-class posture*" is maintained by all three abovementioned principles, which is extended to any group conflicts such as those of between human and nonhuman, man and woman, body and mind, matter and essence, and between developing and developed countries (152; emphasis in original). The principle of "*fight against pollution and resource depletion*" suggests an ethics of deep responsibility that serves deep ecology movement (153; emphasis in original). The principle of "*complexity, not complication*" refers not to chaos but to consideration of vast systems, favouring "[c]ombinations of industrial and agricultural activity, of intellectual and manual work, of specialized and non-specialized occupations, of urban and non-urban activity, of work in city and recreation in nature with recreation in city and work in nature…" (153; emphasis in original). The principle of "*local autonomy and decentralization*" is concerned with strengthening "local self-government and material and mental self-sufficiency" through "a reduction in the number of links in hierarchical chains of decision", which gives way to decentralisation meaning for the reduction of energy consumption (154; emphasis in original).

Naess believed that deep ecology movement is a new ethic that embraces humans, animals, plants and all life forms, enabling human communities to live in harmonious relationship with the nonhuman world on which they are dependent to survive (Naess, 1995: 66-67). Deep ecologists ardently propose that the question of dominion and exploitation of the planet by individuals and/or establishments needs to be thoroughly revised because Earth does not exist merely to be dominated and exploited by human beings for their endless desires. Earth rather exists for itself and belongs to all the organic and inorganic component members of the human and nonhuman communities. The deep ecological vision appears to find an ideal expression in Bakhtin's theory of the carnival in that the entire Earth is a carnival itself gorgeously celebrating existence in all its boundless forms. Each body of being participates in this

celebration "as the proper fulfillment of its powers of expression" (Berry, 1995: 12). Therefore, the world is not a collection of isolated beings and objects yet rather a network of interrelated, interdependent, dialogic and polyphonic corporealities.

Besides, the carnival spirit is based on the experience of oneness and equality of all life forms in the world and of their recurrent rhythms of birth and death. In this sense, nature, expressed by Naess, is not "something to be dominated or conquered; it is something with which we coexist" (Bodian, 1995: 26). Spinoza's idea that "all things hang together" refers to Naess's deep ecological view of "a nonhierarchical ontological ecological egalitarianism", which is achieved through each individual's Self-realisation (Sessions, 1995: 193). Such Self-realisation enables the self to relate itself to other living beings,[13] ecosystems, ecosphere and to Earth since everything is interrelated. The relational total-field image and the principle of complexity are also manifested in grotesque realism through the recognition of the cycles of life and their interrelation in nature such that body dies, turns to dust, and to vegetation later.

Deep ecology seeks to sustain the diversity of all life forms on the one hand and the cultural diversity of human life on the other hand, which thus offers a more satisfactory way of living and increases vitality and joy for all life forms. The joy human beings experience in nature is intensified through increased Self-realisation which refers to widening and deepening of the self. Such increased Self-realisation requires human beings to see themselves in more-than-human beings. However, lack of Self-realisation and ecological devastation decrease both life quality of all living forms and potentiality of joyful experiences. Joy becomes available to human beings only when they respect and preserve the richness and diversity of life forms and the landscapes of the natural world. And it is in humans' responsibility to protect nature and all its life forms since human beings "are the first kind of living beings" that "have the potentialities of living in community with all other living beings" (Naess, 1995: 239). Such carnivalesque joy encourages an increase in environmental justice, in ecological virtue and wisdom, in freedom and eco-consciousness, in material agency and in humankind's environmental responsibility.

The wider Self enables every living being to be closely connected to each other, leading to identification with all living beings, and, thus, to the practice of non-violence

[13] Naess preferred the term 'living being' to the term 'organism' because the latter refers only to biologic beings while the former includes rivers, landscapes, mountains, forests and all the slightest beings and formations in Earth (Naess, 1995: 224).

in the natural environment. Just like in the carnival, there is no need for moralisation in this practice because living beings do not need any morals to make them breathe. The atmosphere of non-violence is achieved by the belief in the essential oneness of all life forms. All living beings as one are "much greater, deeper, generous and capable of more dignity and joy" than human beings think, which provides non-violent and non-competitive joys for each being as in the carnival (Naess, 1995: 235). Therefore, Naess pointed out that it is more ecologic for human beings to perform beautiful acts rather than moral acts and that it is more significant to focus on humans' inclination instead of their morality.[14] Naess also encouraged Self-realisation in humankind by emphasising that human beings are "very special beings!" both as an individual and as a species, whose capability to acknowledge and identify with life in Earth makes them "conscious joyful appreciator of this planet as an even greater whole of its immense richness" (Naess, 1984: 8).

As human beings survive only within a larger complex of ecosystems, any harm done to other species out in the physical environment, or to other ecosystems, or to Earth itself will affect human beings sooner or later in terms of their physical well-being, body-mind harmony, intellectuality, aesthetic expression, spiritual satisfaction as well as social order. In Paul Shepard's words, "[m]an is in the world and his ecology is the nature of that in-ness" (1995: 131).[15] Ecological destruction happens when the non-vital needs of human beings conflict with the vital needs of nonhuman beings, which is, however, too difficult to draw distinctions between what is vital and non-vital for both sides. The objectives of deep ecology movement do not oppose scientific, industrial and technological improvements but their misuse to injure the health of the planet. What deep ecology seeks, according to Naess, is that it prioritises natural entities and landscapes independent of human needs and then agrees to the use of technological devices centering on the ecosphere, which is an endeavour to be stated in this phrase: "[t]o tread lightly on Earth" (Naess, 1989: 97). What Naess meant with prioritisation is that the vital needs of ecosystems and nonhuman entities are to be acknowledged as human beings' own needs.

---

[14] Naess favoured the Kantian concept of the beautiful act while constructing his ecophilosophy. Kant put that when one performs a beautiful act, like sympathetic benevolence and affection, it is undoubtedly a good action that has moral value in itself. However, the benevolent feeling, here, is natural and positively-inclined, and the beneficent action is not performed in compliance with a universally valid moral principle (Kant, 1964). For this reason, Naess believed that humankind's ecological tendency is not a moral duty but an intrinsic inclination. It shows what an individual wants to do rather than what she or he has to do.

[15] "Man" here refers to all male and female human beings.

2.1.1. Deep Ecology versus Feminist Ecology

There is still another significant aspect of deep ecology movement, which has not been mentioned yet. It has frequently been asked why this doctoral thesis focuses on ecocriticism and deep ecology rather than on ecofeminism and feminist ecology as the selected authors that are examined in the thesis are all female writers and their protagonists are all female as well. Although it is obvious that deep ecology movement is highly practicable in the analyses of the selected novels by Linda Hogan and Jeanette Winterson for Eco-Bakhtinian analyses, deep ecology is still considered as a male-constructed movement by some ecofeminists. Deep ecology movement both shares some similarities with and becomes different from feminist ecology.

Ariel Kay Salleh pointed out in her discussion paper titled "Deeper than Deep Ecology: The Eco-feminist Connection" that both deep ecology and feminism consider change as gradational and added that "the violence of revolution imposed by those who claim 'to know' upon those who 'do not know' is an anathema to both" (1984: 341). However, she criticised deep ecology by offering "a feminist critique of deep ecology" in that she saw deep ecology as "another self-congratulatory reformist move" that reinforces "the suppression of the *feminine*" (344; emphasis in original). However, Michael E. Zimmerman explicated that reformism in deep ecology calls for "radical challenge in humankind's understanding of its place in nature" because androcentric and anthropocentric assumptions blind human beings to the fact that they are not essentially separate from nature, but rather are extentions of it (1987: 36). He responded to Salleh's feminist critique of male-constructed deep ecology that deep ecologists are inclined to write in masculinist ways and they write their experiences of/in nature in a manner distorted by patriarchal consciousness by stating that it is women who augment "an essentialist and/or genetic doctrine of the differences between men and women: the man is thinker, woman is feeler" and the generalisation of patriarchal thought that "women are more attuned to nature than are men" (39-40). Then he remonstrated that "[i]f we humans are essentially or naturally dichotomised by sex-linked traits (reason vs. feeling)" as the tenet of many feminists "then there is no real point in trying to change human cultural practices" (40). He, thus, suggested that deep ecologists and feminist ecologists need to come together in reconstructing the current attitudes of Western civilization towards nature and transform human life to heal the human-nonhuman relationship because both men and women have the capability of being equally attuned to nature (42). To do so, it is of great significance to respect each female

and male human being so as to respect the intrinsic value of every nonhuman being (44). Despite all her harsh critiques on deep ecology, Ariel K. Salleh concluded her discussions related to the deep ecology-ecofeminism debate by expressing that "[w]hat is hopeful for a future symbiosis of deep ecology and ecofeminism is their shared theory of internal relations" (2000: 121).

In his article "Eco-feminism and Deep Ecology", Jim Cheney criticised deep ecologists for their not recognizing "the feminist critique inherent in their emphasis on 'biospherical egalitarianism in principle' with its anti-hierarchical, anti-dominance implications" and for not seeing "the intimate relationship between the domination of women and the domination of nature and the mutually reinforcing nature of the two" (1987: 118). However, Cheney contradicted himself while contemplating 'a feminist deep ecological view' as opposed to 'the male-constructed deep ecology movement' – in his own words. In his article, he referred to the philosopher Claudia Card's summary of the psychologist Carol Gilligan's views in her book *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (1982). Gilligan expressed in her book that women and men have different perceptions of morality. She described the morality of men as "the justice approach" as well as "the rights conception" while that of women as an "ethic of care" as well as "the responsibility conception" (Card, 1985: 1). Card continued that "Gilligan's two 'moralities' differ in their ways of representing moral dilemmas and resolving moral conflicts. Women see conflicts of responsibilities where men see conflicts of rights. Women resolve conflicts by the method of inclusion. Men use the method of fairness, or balancing claims," adding that "[w]omen think contextually. Men think categorically. Men see *aggression* as the source of hurt. Women find it in *failures of response*. Women define the self through relationships of care and responsibility. Men define the self in terms of individual achievement" (1985: 2; emphasis in original). However, Gilligan's views summarised by Card as referred in Cheney's article do not evince deep ecology as having masculinist perspective with patriarchal consciousness, as ecofeminists claim, though the movement was constructed by a male human – Arne Naess. Neither Gilligan nor Card imply that women are closer to nature than men, yet they rather reveal that women are more carnivalistic than men in their social and environmental relations since "[w]omen's images of relationship are web-like" (Card, 1985: 2).

Marti Kheel argued that deep ecologists and ecofeminists, whom Warwick Fox calls 'transpersonal ecologists', hold the same opinion "in their critique of an

environmental ethic that is grounded in abstract principles and universal rules discoverable through reason alone" (1991: 63). That she discussed in her article Carol Gilligan's view that "women speak about moral problems in a 'different voice' from that of men" also provides justification for this doctoral thesis to the extent why deep ecology is supported instead of feminist ecology with so many female protagonists in the selected novels written by female authors. Although women speak differently about environmental problems in ethical terms from that of men, it does not necessarily require a reference to ecofeminism because the focus is not on ethics or morals but on human experience of/in the natural world and female/male human ecological consciousness. This idea is maintained when the statements of Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva is reinterpreted. If "women understand nature better than men", "poor women living in the southern hemisphere", hence, "understand it better than middle class women living in the northern hemisphere", or aboriginal people and people of colour understand nature better than Western white people (Peterson & Peterson, 1996: 131). This difference of perception depends on economic, cultural and political structures and reveals that "all women and all men have a body […] a material base" for reaching more holistic understanding (Mies and Shiva, 1993: 20).

As Marti Kheel offered, both deep ecology and ecofeminism could "be viewed as 'deep' philosophies in the sense that they call for an inward transformation in order to attain an outward change" (1991: 63). Both deep ecologists and many ecofeminists share the belief that spirituality is of great significance for the inward transformation of sensibility in order for human beings to achieve a sense of deep interconnection with all forms of living. Kheel explained that deep ecology and ecofeminism have a lot in common in the sense that they "[b]oth posit a critique of abstract rationality while emphasizing the importance of feeling, experience, consciousness, and spirituality, as well as a holistic awareness of our interconnection with all of life" (64). She then argued that these two ecophilosophies differ from each other in aspect of their understanding of the root of environmental crisis. While deep ecologists claim that it is the anthropocentric worldview that causes environmental crisis, ecofeminists claim that it is the androcentric worldview that leads to environmental destruction. What lies beneath the differences of these two ecophilosophies is the varying understandings of the self they assert. While deep ecologists offer a gender-neutral concept of the self, ecofeminists offer a gender-based concept of the self suggesting that men and women experience the world differently. Kheel, however, argued that it is not only men who

have been alienated from nature but also women. For instance, when a woman buys or wears a fur coat, it means that she "has clearly accepted male standards of beauty and hence the violence toward nature that such fashion entails" (70). Kheel, on the contrary, suggested that women could get rid of male norms of alienation and violence and recover their intrinsic connection to the nonhuman world by "develop[ing] a stronger sense of separate identity while simultaneously recognizing their interconnection with other living beings" (70). Nevertheless, she added that women need not develop their identities through the masculine model of opposition as ecofeminists do to deep ecologists. She pointed out that human's union with the nonhuman should be realised by affectionate attitudes, with a consciousness of love, instead of aggressive drive.

Like Kheel, Warwick Fox (1995) defended his argument on deep ecology as a non-sexist movement by expressing that ecofeminists are to blame for overemphasising the subordination of women and its relation to the subordination of nature. He questioned why ecofeminists do not also argue the subordination of aboriginal people, poor people or people of colour. He inferred that the most important reason for this is the distraction of ecofeminists from their concern with androcentrism. He found ecofeminists guilty of asserting androcentrism as the main problem and of describing men, by nature or in history, as the only ones who have exploited the nonhuman environment or who can resort to the logic of domination. However, even Karen J. Warren, as a prominent ecofeminist, supported Fox when she explained that "matriarchy is not the solution to patriarchy any more than saving nature and letting humans die is the solution to the problem of environmental destruction" (qtd. in Sessions, 1991: 100). It is of great significance to emphasise at this point that it is the patriarchy to blame for, not all men, since male domination, according to historians and anthropologists, "is ubiquitous if not universal" (100). Therefore, Fox suggested that ecofeminists should stop overstressing the domination of women and should give up disregarding the subordination of aboriginal people, poor people, and people of colour. In this sense, Fox did not hesitate to manifest ecofeminists' lack of depth with their feminist critique of deep ecology as they deny the fact that the cause of ecological crises is rooted not in androcentrism but in anthropocentrism. As he wrote in his article, it is quite possible to think of "a society that is nonandrocentric, socioeconomically egalitarian, nonracist, and nonimperialistic with respect to other human societies, but", he continued, "whose members nevertheless remain aggressively anthropocentric in collectively agreeing to exploit their environment for their collective benefit in ways

that nonanthropocentrists would find thoroughly objectionable" (Fox, 1995: 276). In other words, Fox accused ecofeminists of supporting the patriarchal understanding of woman/nature connection by arguing that ecofeminists are worried about ecology since history has connected women to nature. As Lyn M. Stearney (1994) also expressed, this link, however, imperils both women and nature on the grounds that it gives all responsibility for the care of nature onto women and set men free to use it at their pleasure.

Although ecofeminism offers various perspectives in egalitarian concerns, it does no more than redressing human-centered perspectives. Therefore, deep ecologists do not see any essential divergence of opinion between deep ecology and ecofeminism despite the fact that the latter has its own distinguishing theoretical qualities and distinctive focuses due to its different theoretical history (Fox, 1995: 271). Deep ecologists accord with ecofeminists in the fact that men have been far more involved in the history of ecological devastation than women. However, deep ecologists diverge from ecofeminists at the point that "capitalists, whites, and Westerners" have been far more involved in the history of ecological devastation than "pre-capitalist peoples, blacks, and non-Westerners" (Fox, 1995: 275). Moreover, Stacy Alaimo explained that nature is to be redeemed from being an "undomesticated feminist space" in humankind's perspective towards a "nongendered" domain that "emphasize[s] continuity between human and nature while still respecting nature's difference", and that "cannot be encompassed by, controlled by, or even entirely known by human culture" (2000: 171, 183). That is why this doctoral thesis focuses on deep ecology movement rather than ecofeminism to overcome anthropocentrism and patriarchy. What deep ecology focuses on is the identification of all living beings within a cosmological context, so to say, within the context of an ecological awareness that all organic and inorganic entities in the universe, regardless of sex or gender, are part of a whole single developmental process. Therefore, this doctoral thesis explores that men and women are on the same carnival and dialogical level, and they become equal and joyful together in their deep interaction with nonhuman entities intraspeciesly and interspeciesly in transversal ecocritical praxis.

Deep ecology movement has also been criticised by some scholars for not being practical and effective and for being unreal and 'inconsistent rubbish' (Sylvan, 1985). For instance, Lester Milbrath argued that deep ecologists "are immersed in nature emotionally and philosophically" but are "not very involved in politics and political

reform" (1984: 25). Most of them, to him, "live in counter-culture communities that are close to nature and minimally disturb the biosphere as they interact with nature to provide their life needs" (25). Describing them as "both radical and conservative", Milbrath criticised that "[a]lthough society may eventually learn important lessons from the experiences of these people in their new communities, they do not constitute a strong force for near-term social change" (25). In addition, some conservative lobbies also criticise deep ecology movement for "seeking to cultivate a liberal, almost counter-culture view of the world" and for "striving for some vague political goal, designed to come about by stopping energy production […]" (Peckinpaugh, 1982: 3). Nevertheless, Bill Devall and George Sessions took a stand against these criticisms by asserting that "[d]eep ecology is emerging as a way of developing a new balance and harmony between individuals, communities, and all of nature" (1985: 7). As they wrote, deep ecology movement has the potentiality to satisfy human's "deepest yearnings", such as "faith and trust in [humankind's] most basic intuitions" and "courage to take direct action" (7). Providing carnivalesque atmosphere in the physical nature with "joyous confidence to dance with the sensual harmonies discovered through sport, playful intercourse with the rhythms of our own bodies, the rhythms of flowing water, and the overall processes of life on Earth", deep ecology offers a re-examination of how human beings perceive and construct their world (7).

Furthermore, Naess was also criticised for being a misanthropist with his ecophilosophical approach (Bookchin, 1987, 2; Skolimowski, 1987: 31). He responded to this criticism by pointing out that it is humankind that lays a bridge in the relational system without set borderlines in time and space since "[t]he relational system connects humans, as organic systems, with animals, plants, and ecosystems conventionally said to be within or outside the human organism" (Naess, 1989: 79). Celebrating the existence of humankind, Naess rather argued that Homo sapiens, with its intellectual capabilities unique to its species among millions of kinds of other species, has more significant role for the universal care of Earth than other living beings can afford. Naess believed that "humankind is the first species on earth with the intellectual capacity to limit its numbers consciously and live in an enduring, dynamic equilibrium with other forms of life" (1989: 23). So humankind becomes the carnivalesque and dialogic figure in the reconstruction of connection with the nonhuman. What Naess meant is that human beings, both men and women equally, inherently have environmental consciousness to care for the diversity and health of their natural environment and to

interact with nonhuman entities. However, humans' adoption of a global techno-industrial culture has turned them into anthropocentric bodies, which has led them to desecrating nature and losing their positions as the responsible participants in maintaining the diversity within ecosystems.

In conclusion, this chapter has revealed the relation between Bakhtinian critical theory and deep ecology movement in terms of transversal ecocritical praxis. Through Bakhtin's concepts of the carnivalesque, dialogism, polyphony and chronotope, this chapter has revealed the significance of interrelatedness, dialogism, egalitarianism, heterarchy, relational thinking, diversity, plurality and symbiosis in the nonhuman world by repositioning human beings as the responsible participant in Earth. Additionally, this chapter has indicated similarities and differences between deep ecology and feminist ecology, emphasising that deep ecology is more practicable than feminist ecology in overcoming anthropocentrism, patriarchy and hierarchy. The next two chapters, which are analytical chapters of this thesis, will study Eco-Bakhtinian explorations of *Solar Storms* (1997) and *Power* (1998) by Linda Hogan with the focus on her ecological wisdom and environmental discourse, revealing her native traditions about native landscapes, animals and plants in carnivalesque, dialogic and polyphonic atmosphere, and Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of *Sexing the Cherry* (1989) and *The Stone Gods* (2007) by Jeanette Winterson, with the focus on her ecological imagination and environmental discourse, revealing her post/apocalyptic tendency towards nonhuman environment and beings in carnivalesque, grotesque and chronotopic atmosphere.

CHAPTER THREE
ECO-BAKHTINIAN ANALYSES OF LINDA HOGAN'S SELECTED NATIVE AMERICAN NOVELS

This chapter aims to explore how Linda Hogan deconstructs anthropocentric, ethnocentric, patriarchal and hierarchical discourse in her selected novels in order to reconstruct environmental discourse in the face of anthropogenic environmental crises and to reveal Eco-Bakhtinian space. This chapter, through Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of Hogan's selected novels, investigates what positions human and nonhuman beings take in each other's worlds, whether human beings establish dialogues with nonhuman entities, how Bakhtin's concepts of carnivalesque and dialogism are related to Hogan's ecological standpoint, and how polyphonic and heteroglot voices in the selected novels reflect Hogan's deep ecological imagination and her ecology of mind.

Solar Storms (1997) is examined in the first part of this chapter while *Power* (1998) is analysed in the second part to find out polyphonic and heteroglot voices of diverse nonhuman entities within Euro-American human community in carnivalesque and dialogic atmosphere. These novels, which portray the effects of the human on the nonhuman and those of the nonhuman on the human in ecologic sense, are studied with references to Mikhail Bakhtin's concepts of carnivalesque, dialogism, grotesque, polyphony and chronotope, which are re-evaluated in ecocritical theory, and to Arne Naess's ecophilosophy of deep ecology movement.

3.1. Ecology of Polyphonic Voices in *Solar Storms*

Linda Hogan in her Native-American novel offers a vivid description of societal restrictions, Euro-American hegemony and control, and tribal and environmental degradation in multiple contexts, leading the reader into questioning monologic and authoritative discourses of anthropocentrism and ethnocentrism. Questioning the binary constructions of self/other, story/history, human/nonhuman, nature/culture, native/non-native, material/spiritual, mapping/unmapping, matriarchy/patriarchy, dream/reality, peace/violence and gender boundaries, Hogan gives voice to the lost, forgotten, marginalised and the oppressed, including all humans regardless of their gender and all nonhuman entities, so as to decrown authoritarian power relations and societal discrimination and to help one find her/his true self and identity. *Solar Storms* (1997) is

quite viable to examine through Eco-Bakhtinian approach in order to create environmental discourse because the novel can be considered as an attempt to do away with Cartesian dualism and authoritarian power relations of patriarchy, hierarchy and ethnocentrism. This part of the chapter brings *Solar Storms* into new dialogue with Bakhtinian concepts about complex relations and diverse speeches between human/nonhuman and native/non-native bodies, material/spiritual selves, tribal/urban lives, forgetting/remembering and mother/daughter. The novel focuses on conveying environmental messages and recovering environmental justice, with its satiric, dreamy and polyphonic voice as well as carnivalesque and chronotopic tendency, narrating the events during the 1970s and 1990s when political, social and environmental conflicts of the James Bay Project in northwestern Quebec, Canada, are told through the perspectives of Dora-Rouge, Agnes, Bush and Angel.

Solar Storms provides a Bakhtinian reading for the argument of the thesis through its quasi-apocalyptic, ecologically problematic, satiric and polyphonic content, which is framed by an ecocritical treatment of Native American fiction. The novel carnivalises dominative discourses of Euro-American culture, anthropocentrism and ethnocentrism, which all have deep impacts on negative transformation of nature. Linda Hogan provides an ecocentric novel that reveals environmental injustice and ecological problems on local scales and suggests polyphonic solutions. Hogan carnivalises Cartesian dualism and vehemently argues that fixed categories of culture/nature, human/nonhuman, material/spiritual and mind/body are actually unstable and constantly in flux. Her environmental wisdom that removes the barriers between nature/culture, human/nonhuman and material/spiritual contributes to the blend of Bakhtinian critical theory with deep ecology movement. The aim of environmental wisdom here is to bring forth the forgotten, ignored, neglected and muted human and nonhuman entities and expose their presence, subjectivity, voice and agency.

Hogan merges oral tradition with contemporary events in the novel in order to cover the history of five generations of Native American women. Drawing on the real event of the James Bay Project in northwestern Quebec, Canada, which is a dam project constructed by the diversion of neighbouring rivers into the La Grande River, Hogan rewrites native people's history by narrating alternative stories that leap from one reality to another and from one view to another. Focusing on the interconnection between human and nonhuman histories, she degrades highlighted human history, which lacks the "power to deeply affect", in order to "do something stronger than history" that fails

to reach the emotions of readers (Hogan, 1994: 116). The novel consists of one prologue that presents Agnes's storytelling about Bush's feast, and twenty-one chapters that narrate Angel's transformation and Native American people's stories beneath the development of Euro-American dam project. Hogan is against the fixed, stable, finished and the linear while writing. That is why she stated that humans "need new stories, new terms and conditions that are relevant to the love of land" and love of the nonhuman, "a new narrative that would imagine another way to learn the infinite movement and work in this world" (1995: 94). Time flows backwards and forwards through memories and stories of the characters, and a number of genres including history, oral stories, and a few plant drawings intervene in the novel. There are multiple narrators and insert narratives, which forms a kind of chain in the novel. Angel's relatives narrate her origins of the trauma and environmental injustice, which she then passes along to readers. Set in the period between the 1970s and 1990s, though not clearly defined, *Solar Storms* deals with the history of nature and native lands, and nature of native people with a focus on the relation of fact to fiction and vice versa. Although the novel has mostly been studied through ethnic studies and theories of memory, trauma and mere ecocriticism, this part of the chapter explores the novel through deep ecological movement of the ecocritical theory within the framework of Bakhtinian concepts of the carnivalesque, dialogism, polyphony and chronotope.

Solar Storms narrates the story of Angel, a mixed blood Cree-Inuit young girl, who comes back to her tribal home in Adam's Rib in search for her mother and true identity after growing up in a number of foster homes in Oklahoma away from her traditional heritage. She meets her matrilineage – her great-great-grandmother Dora-Rouge, her great-grandmother Agnes, her grandmother Loretta, her step-grandmother Bush and her mother Hannah, and shares their collaborative struggles for social and environmental justice. The novel begins with a remembered feast of mourning, which is titled "Prologue". Agnes tells Angel that Bush holds a feast of mourning, which brings all the members of the tribal community cooperatively together in preparation and participation, and during which mourners share their food with the dead. The novel then continues in chapters with Angel's transformation from Angela Jensen to Angel Wing. Left and scarred on the face by her mother, Angel is depicted as a white-imaged victimised young girl who has a lost soul wandering around the universe. After Angel arrives in her tribal hometown, she embarks on a journey together with Dora-Rouge, Agnes and Bush to their Canadian homeland, father north into the Triage region, so as

to reconnect with their ancestors, the Beautiful People. Upon arriving, they see that their land and native way of life are being threatened by the dam project. They struggle to protect their ancestorial homeland in nonviolent ways like community meetings, blockage of roads against bulldozers, petitions, and legal orders. In this sense, the novel does not only present a young woman's journey to her native land and her healing process but also reveals an indigenous community's struggle for survival and environmental justice. Women bear some carnivalesque characteristics as they use "*non-violent technique of social transformation* by the maximal display of the body" (Jung, 1998: 104; emphasis in original). The writer, therefore, exposes the reader how social and environmental justice has often been ignored in political decisions influencing native lands and people. Journeys in the novel cover Angel's journey to find her true self, her roots and her mother, Dora-Rouge's journey back home, Agnes's journey towards death, and Bush's journey towards environmental justice. These journeys allow for transgression of anthropocentric boundaries between self/other, space/time, matter/spirit, dream/reality, nature/culture, human/nonhuman and man/woman, by enabling women to attain healing and re-immersion in their heritage.

Having a mixed blood heritage – Chickasaw and Anglo, which enables her to write from a "cultural ecotone", Hogan writes at the junction between environmental matters and the historical and continuing treatment of native people in America (Cook, 2003: 1). Her novel, which emphasises the concept of land as body and body as land, is concerned with the "traditional, indigenous perspective of the land and human relationship with the land" (Johnson, 1998: n. p.). In the novel, Hogan reflects "different histories of ways of thinking and being in the world" (Hogan, 1995: 12). She creates a carnivalesque space in which both nature and culture, human and nonhuman, the Native American and Euro-American, the tribal and the modern, the traditional and the contemporary come together to achieve reconciliation and polyphony. Juxtaposing the ecological Native with the anthropocentric and ethnocentric European, Hogan provides a carnivalesque mode of interrelationship between individuals, communities and cultures "counter-posed to the all-powerful socio-hierarchical relationships of noncarnival life" (Bakhtin, 1984b: 123). Like Naess, Hogan also seeks to raise carnivalesque awareness to unearth sources of ecospherical egalitarian life that have been desecrated by Euro-American people's efforts to conform to the "urbanized, techno-industrial mega-society" (Naess, 1989: 24). She handles the political and spiritual consequences of a colonial encounter between the exploiter white Western

culture and the exploited indigenous culture. The ecological Native people consider the land, animals and plants as sacred:

> But the older ones, whose gods still lived on earth, called it the Hungry Mouth of Water, because if water wasn't a spirit, if water wasn't a god that ruled their lives, nothing was. For centuries they had lived by nets and hooks, spears and ropes, by distances and depths. They'd lived on the rocking skin of water and the groaning ice it became. They swallowed it. It swallowed them. (Hogan, 1997: 62)

These indigenous people can be depicted as deep ecologists since they feel deep sympathy with all life forms, lead ecologically-responsible and caring lives, know their interrelation with a life system, or a web of life, in which all elements of the system, including humans and the slightest nonhuman entities, are interwoven in complex relations and are inherently dependent on each other. Native people believe that each life form, whether organic or inorganic, has the "right to live and blossom", which is a universal right that cannot be determined by the authoritative humankind (Naess, 1989: 166). While indigenous people see everything alive, connected and surrounded by love and respect, non-native people believe wilderness is "full of demons", are afraid of "the voices of animals singing at night", and destruct "all that could save them, the plants, the water" (Hogan, 1997: 86). For instance, Euro-American people have poisoned the foxes and wolves "to make more room for the European settlers and the pigs and cattle they'd brought" (24). Some indigenous people have become so hungry that they have eaten "the poisoned carcasses of deer that the settlers left out for the wolves" (38).

The novel begins with a carnivalesque element, Bush's mourning feast, which is ceremonial in that it aims to bring the individual together "with his or her fellows, the community of people with that of the other kingdoms", and the one who participates in ceremony "sheds the isolated, individual personality and is restored to conscious harmony with the universe" (Allen, 1986: 62). So such ceremonies "create and support the sense of community that is the bedrock of tribal life" (63). Bush wants to hold Adam's Rib community together, to recover harmony with the tribal society, and to restore balance between the human and nonhuman. Her feast looks to the future for liberation, equality, abundance, tolerance and change. It creates a carnivalesque world of revival and renewal, which can be associated with Bakhtin's banquet imagery. In Bush's feast, people taste the world just as the earth tastes dead bodies, introduce it into their body and are introduced into the world at the same time, and thus both are united

as an integral whole.[16] In this sense, Bush's feast of mourning intends to reattain social and environmental justice as well as regenerative cycle in the entire ecosystem to celebrate revival and life over extinction and death. That is why a connection is established between eating and speaking, as Bakhtin believed, "between digestion and dialogue" in her feast (Jung, 1998: 104). Language is freed at table talk, and thus the banquet turns into a feast of words, utterances and languages. As Michel Jeanneret represented this connection, "'[i]t is after all the same organ the tongue, which savours words and delights in foods" (1991: 2). Free, sincere, gay, fearless and materialistic relationships are established in Rabelaisian banquet table since the subjects of the table talk are laden with "profound wisdom" that also covers ecological wisdom (Bakhtin, 1984a: 285). This part, however, calls forth more questions than answers, inviting readers to enter a dialogue with the text. The beginning of the novel, thus, carnivalises the traditional novel structure of a straight line of narration by bending the line of narration on itself and by using cyclical time.

Hogan deals with the concepts of time, matter, history and reality in the novel through her interest in Einstein's relativity theory. Hogan's carnivalisation of time and narration refers to her epistemological metaphor of snake, which she uses much in her writing. Such carnivalisation challenges linearity of time and narration as well as hierarchy of entities. As Donelle N. Dreese wrote, "[d]ue to the snake's ability to coil itself in the form of spiralling circles, it echoes the circular life philosophy of continuity, reciprocation, and holistic living (nurturing spiritual, mental, physical, and emotional needs)" instead of "the Western linear construct, which leaves a loose end dangling into oblivion" (1999: 8). To cite another example, when women arrive at the boundary waters, they leave behind Western notion of time: "The time we'd been teasing apart, unravelled. And now it began to unravel us as we entered a kind of timelessness. Wednesday was the last day we called by name, and truly, we no longer needed time. We were lost from it, and lost in this way, I came alive" (Hogan, 1997: 170). Women enter a kind of timelessness which Allen describes ceremonial time in which there is not any separation between human and nonhuman environments (1986: 149-150). Just as

[16] Banquet is a collective feast open to the entire world, including human and nonhuman beings. Rabelais's novel is thoroughly filled with the scenes of eating and drinking. For instance, Rabelais, in his novel *Pantagruel*, tells that the earth absorbed Abel's blood after his murder and became fruitful. Then people who eat boxthorn berries grown on this earth became dimensionally gigantic figures, which is one of the scenes exemplifying the image of the world as open mouth and the theme of swallowing (Bakhtin, 1984a: 279).

Western perceptions of time are gone, the boundaries between self/nature, human/nonhuman and between one another are gone as well.

Ceremonies, or rituals, in the novel are of great significance in that they function both as renewal of one's own health while restoring healthier connections with other human and nonhuman beings at the same time and as involvement of readers into a larger circle. By including readers in the ceremonies, Hogan reminds these participants that all things in the universe are interconnected. The author stated that ceremonies include "not just [human] prayers and stories […] but also the unspoken records of history, the mythic past, and all the other lives connected to [humans' lives], families, nations, and all other creatures" (Hogan, 1995: 37). Rituals are also important for Angel since they "transform someone or something from one condition or state to another" (Allen, 1986: 79). Rituals help Angel to heal and change from "an isolated (diseased) state to one of incorporation (health)" with the unification of "diverse elements into a community, a psychic and spiritual whole" (80). The novel tells Angel's re-initiation into a traditional knowledge of a world where human and nonhuman beings are united in harmonious relations. During her ceremonial passage from a "rootless teenager" to a self-sufficient, strong and eco-conscious young woman who is deeply embedded in her tribal community's struggle for survival, Angel recognises that she must re-establish the interrelatedness between the human and nonhuman so as to revivify the peace and balance within herself, her family, her tribe and within the biosphere (Hogan, 1997: 25). As Shepard Krech III expressed, the native people in nature who recognise "the systemic consequences of [their] actions," feel "deep sympathy with all living forms, and" take "steps to conserve so that earth's harmonies are never imbalanced and resources never in doubt" (1999: 21).

Angel is the most outstanding character of the carnivalesque in the novel, with her transformation from a lost, rootless and troubled teenager into a recovered and conscious young woman. Angel has been left and disfigured partly on the face by her mother Hannah who has suffered trauma. She has been fostered to various families, forgetting her roots away from her native family and culture. During her stay in Adam's Rib and her journey to the Beautiful People, Angel recognises her connection to her forgotten history, to the land destroyed by Euro-American views and actions, and to the "fragments of stories" (Hogan, 1997: 85). She sees that she can achieve wholeness in and with nature by piecing the fragments of her past together as she is part of the process of creation: "Dora-Rouge, I think now, was a root and we were like a tree

family, aspens or birch, connected to one another underground, the older trees feeding the young, sending off shoots, growing. I watched and listened. It was an old world in which I began to bloom. Their stories called me home" (48). Angel learns to see deeper by negating her preconceived notions and predetermined laws of Western ideology. She recognised that she "lived inside water. There was no separation between" her and water because she "knew in a moment what water was. It was what had been snow. It had passed through old forests, now gone. It was the sweetness of milk and corn and it had journeyed through human lives", and "[i]t was blood spilled on the ground. Some of it was the blood of [her] ancestors" (78). When Angel finds her true self, she also finds the self of her tribe because the sense of being in native culture is more tribal than individual. In this tradition, self is "transpersonal" and it "includes a society, a past, and a place. To be separated from that transpersonal time and space is to lose identity" (Bevis, 1993: 19). Thus, Angel restores her connection to Adam's Rib community, getting away from the isolation and loneliness in foster homes for many years. While Angela Jensen, as a scared teenager, hides her scarred face with "a curtain of dark red hair" in the beginning, Angel Wing reveals her face and finds it "beautiful" in the end (Hogan, 1997: 25, 350). Angel comes out of her scarred and traumatised skin and finds out that "something wonderful lives inside" her (351).

Stressing the concept of body as land/land as body, Hogan emphasises the interconnection between human and nonhuman histories throughout the novel:

> I don't know where the beginning was, your story, ours. Maybe it came down in the milk of the mothers. Old Man said it was in the train tracks that went through the land and came out of the iron mines. I've thought of this for years. It might have started when the crying children were taken away from their mothers or when the logging camps started and cities were built from our woods, or when they cut the rest of the trees to raise cattle. (40)

The financially-motivated destruction of the natural environment is not only manifest in/on the land but also in human psyche and on human body. The destruction of the land and rivers is reflected on the bodies of native people. For instance, Hannah has bitten part of Angel's face, which can be considered as a grotesque response to the destruction of the natural world and starvation. Hannah's madness, or trauma, is carnivalesque as it parodies "official reason" and "the narrow seriousness of official truth" in grotesque atmosphere (Bakhtin, 1984a: 39). Besides, Hannah can be

considered as a grotesque being as "she tried to kill [Angel], swallow [her], consume [her] back into her own body" (Hogan, 1997: 251). Just as Hannah bites Angel's face, her inherent part, displaying cannibalistic behaviour, Euro-American colonisers are also described as people eating the natural world that is their intrinsic part, tribes and the future of nonhuman beings. Angel's scarred face represents the indigenous land and people ruined by Euro-American practices. Angel's transformation from Angela Jensen to Angel Wing and from a scarred face to a beautiful and self-confident woman shows the stories of violence committed against her indigenous land and of tribal resistance to that destruction. Angel transforms from a victimised young girl to an eco-conscious traditional native woman who finds her true identity by immersing herself in the ceremonial life of the tribal community. Angel's scarred and incomplete face provides her with grotesque transgressive characteristic and integration into the rest of the world. As Dora-Rouge said, humans "are cocoons who consume [their] own bodies and at death we fly away transformed and beautiful" (89).

Angel learns to be a plant dreamer, which means the one who is responsible for finding healing herbs and plants, which enables her to develop new insights into human and nonhuman relations and to gain ecological understanding of plants and animals. Having a joyful experience of sensitivity to natural qualities, she develops "*eco-dentity*" by integrating her body into plants, herbs, rivers and the land (Murphy, 2013: 46: emphasis in original). She effaces borders between the human and nonhuman worlds, between herself and nature, between herself and her past. She realises that she is an intrinsic part of the same biological, historical and physical laws as other entities in the natural world, that she is an inseparable part of a complex ecosystem, which is a web of life that is in an ever-changing and a cyclical natural process that challenges anthropocentric and hierarchical notions of superiority, mastery and exceptionality: "I had travelled long and hard to be there. I'd searched all my life for this older world that was lost to me, this world only my body remembered. In that moment I understood I was part of the same equation as birds and rain" (Hogan, 1997: 78-79). Angel's body becomes a carnival body when she learns to be a plant dreamer. She develops "gay and gracious" wholeness of the "cosmic, social, and bodily elements" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 19). Her ability of plant dreaming becomes her own ecosophy, which is a carnivalesque tendency that enables her to feel at home. Her body becomes both a source of knowledge and a site for communication with the nonhuman world:

> [T]here was a place inside the human that spoke with land, that entered dreaming […] Field, forest, swamp. I knew how they breathed at night, and that they were linked to us in that breath. It was the oldest bond of survival […] I remembered things I'd forgotten […] the plants and I joined each other. They entangled me in their stems and vines and it was a beautiful entanglement. (Hogan, 1997: 170-171)

Angel achieves integrity by accepting her intrinsic other, an ecocentric intention which suggests essential norms of deep ecology that emphasise symbiosis, biodiversity and egalitarianism in Earth and respect for all organic and inorganic life forms. Her ability of plant dreaming is a carnivalesque and dialogic way out of binaries, which is "a dream not of a common language, but of a powerful infidel heteroglossia" (Haraway, 1991: 181). In this way, Hogan degrades anthropocentric and ethnocentric dualisms of naturalised and stereotyped identities by creating a carnivalesque and polyphonic world that consists of storytelling, history retelling, survival and resistance to get rid of the non-native authority.

Angel's search for her true identity and origin and her deep ecological journey to reach Self-realisation can be associated with Bakhtin's chronotope of "the life course of one seeking true knowledge (1981: 130). During her journey, her life is divided into some phases beginning with anthropocentric ignorance, moving through her sceptical self-criticism towards green experience and ultimately to Self-realisation, which is not completely achieved though as Naess put. For instance, she is brought up with more Western culture away from her native traditions, and feels uncomfortable in Bush's house, in which the vines worm through the windows and grow along the walls while Bush brings animal bones to rebuild them, because of the state of in-betweenness, but then she recognises that she is an inseparable part of the natural world. She recognises who she is, who she "can become and should become in the larger scheme of things" (Fox, 1986: 85). She achieves to uncover her hidden side that has been covered by the distinctions of gender, class, race, tradition and place.

Angel is a dialogic body bearing both the self and other within her as she experiences both cultures. As a mixed-blood young woman, she is capable of coming to terms with multiple and altering identities, of listening to multiple voices, of respecting multiple views as long as they do not give any harm to anything, and of bearing multiple characteristics in herself. As Angel begins to heal, the indigenous community also begins to recover respect and integrity because the world is not a collection of isolated beings and objects but rather a network of interrelated and interdependent

corporealities. In this sense, Hogan's novel tells the story of the struggle for survival of all inherent parts of that web of life, including Angel herself, native community, plants, animals and the land. Hogan's deep ecological novel invites readers to make deep connections with all human and nonhuman characters in the novel and, thus, encourages them to participate in Native American world to get rid of Western, non-native, anthropocentric, androcentric, ethnocentric and hierarchical views since the natural world, as Naess expressed, is not "something to be dominated or conquered; it is something with which [humans] coexist" (Bodian, 1995: 26).

Hogan seeks to "recover […] lost stories and cultural practices" (Womack, 2008: 19). She writes her novel "out of respect for the natural world, recognizing that humankind is not separate from nature" (Hogan, 1995: 12). Humility, reverence, love and balance are the healing principles of the relation between the human self and nature for Hogan. Upon changing their anthropocentric visions of nature, human beings can enter into a compassionate and mutual relationship with the natural world. Storytelling is a significant medium in the novel as traditional stories in native culture are told to honour the land, animals, plants and every slightest entity in nature, and to pass down indigenous customs and history. These traditional stories enable native people to find out their origin, identity and their position in the natural world. On her way to Self-realisation, Angel listens to multiple stories that enable her to bring pieces together, to learn who she is, to resist anthropocentric, authoritative and hierarchical ideologies and beliefs, and to gain an ecological understanding of the responsibilities humans have towards nonhumans because "all of us together formed something like a single organism. We needed and helped one another" (Hogan, 1997: 262). Story, therefore, "is a power that describes our world, our human being, sets out the rules and intricate laws of human beings in relationship with all the rest" (Hogan, 1998: 9). Hogan's stories, in this case, describe a tribal world and tribal members' relationships with each other, with the nonhuman and with Western world. Creation of stories, which are powerful forces that shape human worldviews and material realities, share equal significance with the creation of the universe and its contents: "On the ninth day was the creation of stories, and these had many uses […] [T]hey taught a thing or two about doing work, about kindness and love," and "there were even stories to show a way out of unhappiness" (Hogan, 1997: 181). Therefore, stories do not only influence worldviews but also construct a dialogic and polyphonic world.

The concept of mapping is another carnivalesque feature in the novel. The novel is based on the building of the James Bay-Great Whale hydroelectric project in Quebec, Canada. It is possibly set in the Boundary Waters between Minnesota and Canada though the author does not clearly identify the location (Cook, 2003: 43). The setting of the novel is a space not recognised by the authoritative culture and not mapped officially. It is a fluid and transcending uncharted space that can be reached in native stories. Native people are against the use of Westerners' maps that spatially chart and label the area as these maps contain artificial and hierarchical boundaries, anthropocentric and official divisions, fixed and stable measurements, and monologic and authoritative labels that prevent dynamic relations in nature. Maps shape views, beliefs and spatial relations of human communities. That is why native communities refuse to be shaped and defined by these charted boundaries much as "the land refuse[s] to be shaped by the makers of maps" (Hogan, 1997: 123). Natural elements and landscapes in native tradition should not be claimed, defined and confined by maps because water is broken apart by land and land is split open by water, land surrounds forests and water is surrounded by forests. However, these separations are not barriers but "doorways into the mythical world" (Hogan, 1995: 19). Nature itself is a carnivalesque agent that effaces human communities' spatial boundaries through its fluidity since "earth has more than one dimension. The one we see is only the first layer" (Hogan, 1997: 123).

Hogan degrades maps of rational geographies drawn by positivistic, anthropocentric and official ideology by offering the reader a carnivalesque and heteroglossic, or counter-centric, attitude of learning the language of the land, being sensitive to the nonhuman world and beings in it, and acknowledging the agency of nature. Mapping is an element of great importance in the novel because "that whole notion of categorizing the land, and charting it, and naming it, and putting things in their place, is really significant in terms of how [humans] think about the world" (Harrison and Hogan, 2011: 172). For Hogan, the land bears human and natural history as well as tribal stories in itself. As she pointed out, "[t]o walk on this earth is to walk on a living past, on the open pages of history and geology" (Hogan, 1995: 79). Regarding the land as a living being that creates stories and possesses environmental knowledge carnivalises two-dimensional maps of Western mapmaking practices. As Mark Warhus wrote, "[u]nlike western cartography", which "'scientifically' depict[s] a static

landscape", "Native American maps are pictures of experience […] formed in the human interaction with the land" (1997: 3).

Believing that there is "a place inside the human" that can speak "with land", Hogan stresses heteroglossic communication with the natural world as it encourages more holistic understanding of the nonhuman (Hogan, 1997: 170). Hogan carnivalises hierarchical and authoritative theories of space through her efforts to reset and re-imagine reality by portraying her characters' social and environmental relations within native framework that focuses on the inseparability of nature/culture and human/nonhuman. Her carnivalisation of space presents the resistance of both nature and native people to maps, walls and borders. She favours a "dynamic view of a world in constant flux" and "transformation" in her writing (Best and Kellner, 1991: 82). By the same token, Angel degrades the European understanding of marked, fixed, stable and terminal land by favouring a place where death leads to birth and endings to beginnings. As she says, "change was the one thing not accounted for" by Euro-American map-makers because there are no boundaries and solidity in nature (Hogan, 1997: 123).

While spiritual elements are ignored in Euro-American political decisions, spiritual decisions become political decisions in native culture. As exemplified in the novel, indigenous people have to fight in American court for the termination of the dam project that ruins their land, plants and animals and their future grandchildren. Civilised Americans have come without informing the dam and telling native people to leave their homes since they will tear them down. However, these native people do not have paper ownership, and the event goes to court. They win in court because they know all the land, plants, animals and insects and hold a museum exhibition in order to show American people all that are sacred to them. Hogan also presents in the novel how Native Americans make use of some Western achievements for their own political purposes and for the good of nature. For instance, they use electricity, printing press, photography and the radio for their protests, and they defend their rights in American courts. In this way, Hogan conveys that both cultures can be harmonised for a better and dialogic world.

Hogan endeavours to break down the human/nonhuman dichotomy and do away with the alienation between culture and nature that has caused environmental degradation. She actually exposes how Europeans, who are called "the reverse people" by Bush and "the ones who invented hell" by Dora-Rouge, have "trapped themselves

inside of their own destruction" of the natural world (1997: 86, 180). Europeans have removed "spirit from everything, from animals, trees, fishhooks, and hammers, all things the Indians had as allies. They [have] forgotten how to live […] Now most of [people have] inarticulate souls, silent spirits, and despairing hearts" (180). Therefore, both Euro-American and Native peoples suffer the destructive effects of the ecological degradation. To make spirit meet matter once again, Hogan favours fluid interchange with all other life forms, which negates distinction, hierarchy and dichotomies of nature/culture, object/subject, human/nonhuman. The novel, therefore, "suggests the value of alternative representations based on a logic of nonhierarchical interconnection and a radically materialist view of land as a living, agentic force and source of stories" (Harrison, 2019: 16). Hogan believes that nonhuman entities and the land are alive and they are inherent parts of the web of life, having their own voice and agency. As Alaimo also noted, Hogan "rewrite[s] the body, not as a mute, passive, abject space that signifies the debased or inferior part of our natures, but as a place of liminality, connection, and knowledge" (1996: 51). To exemplify, water is a significant natural element that has its own agency in the novel. Dora-Rouge, Bush, Agnes and Angel see a river that does not exist on their tribal maps, in their memories or stories. They realize that the route of the river has been changed by some commercial development. Dora-Rouge listens to the river roaring "so loud it sounded like earth breaking open and raging" and says that it is angry (Hogan, 1997: 192). Then Dora-Rouge talks to "the churning river, the white and muddy foam of it, the hydrogen and oxygen of it" and asks for a safe passage, which shows native people's covenant with forces of nature (193).

Hogan, in doing so, does not exalt or romanticise nature, she rather seeks to show its agency and significance in human life. Wolverine is another example for the agency of nature. Wolverine reminds the trickster god Coyote of the American Southwestern tribes (Fitzpatrick, 2006: 22). He is depicted both as "a human gone wild" and "a dark animal, large-jawed, with strong teeth and a terrible smell" (Hogan, 1997: 84). Wolverine, as a trickster, grotesque figure and transcorporeal body, represents the carnivalesque by its break of dualities and oppositions. He is considered sometimes as "a human returned to his animal shape" and as an "animal inhabiting a strange, two-legged body, wearing human skin" at other times (253). Playing some jokes on humans and being responsible for uncanny mischief, he is a "witty agent" of nature (Haraway, 1991: 199), despising humans by "steal[ing] the flints and other things of value to

human beings" and "spoil[ing] the things they needed to live by" (Hogan, 1997: 253). His tracks are seen when Hannah dies and when Tulik's house is ruined by fire. He is an agent acting beyond the human control and not necessarily caring about human needs and desires. He "watches to see how humans treat the animals […] A person must be careful what they say about the animals. They have another kind of listening. They can even hear your thoughts" (84). Wolverine is a carnivalesque figure in the novel in that he is known as both co-creator of the world and a nemesis of humankind: "it was Mondi, Wolverine, who'd made the world and the sun and the moon […] Wolverine wanted the people to leave, he wanted to starve them out of his territory, his world" (321-322).

Hogan believes traditional indigenous wisdom has much in common with the ecological knowledge, including

> knowledge about the natural law of Earth, from the beginning of creation, and the magnificent terrestrial intelligence still at work, an intelligence now newly called ecology by the Western science that tells us what our oldest tribal stories maintain – the human animal is a relatively new creation here; animal and plant presences were here before us; and we are truly the younger sisters and brothers of the other animal species, not quite as well developed as we thought we were. (1998: 10)

Knowledge of land is a significant concept in Hogan's indigenous and ecological wisdom. She is convinced that nature is a living, conscious, active and intelligent agent having its own will and voice: "It was against the will of land, I knew, to turn rivers into lakes, lakes into dry land, to send rivers along new paths. I hoped the earth would one day forgive this breach of faith, the broken agreement humans had with it" (1997: 330). Hogan's female native characters are also convinced of this ontological fact. As Hogan portrays many times in the novel, "[t]he people at Adam's Rib believed everything was alive, that we were surrounded by the faces and lovings of gods […] The stones, too, were alive, the stinging nettles, the snails of Fur Island, leaves when touched by human hands" (81). The wind can speak (102), the ice can cry out or groan (115), the northern lights have their own sound (119), and an island can call out (169). The land can resist, and it can show "mischief and trickiness" and even "stubborn passion" (123). Water can be furious and it "would do what it wanted and in its own way" (224). Nature can be merciful, helpful, welcoming, embracing and warming on the one hand while it can be merciless, deadly, indifferent and cold on the other hand. How nature treats someone

depends on the interaction and dialogue between the participant and nature because nature is an "unmediated flux, a stream of potential experiences that will happen differently for differently situated observers" (Hayles, 1995: 413).

Hogan focuses on a dialogical encounter with the nonhuman "as a source of wonder and wisdom in a revelatory framework of mutual discovery and disclosure", which diminishes monological perception of nature to recognise its agency, voice, history and power (Plumwood, 2002: 233). As Haraway pointed out, "in a sociological account of science all sorts of things are actors, only some of which are human language-bearing actors, and that you have to include, as sociological actors, all kinds of heterogeneous entities", which is an "imperative" that "helps to break down the notion that only language-bearing actors have a kind of agency" (Penley and Ross, 1991: 5). Although nature is considered "speechless, without language, in the human sense" by the authority, it is "highly articulate" indeed when humans try to comprehend its articulation (Haraway, 1992: 324). As long as humans understand the language of nature, they "do not exploit a nature that speaks to them" (Duerr, 1985: 92).

As Barbara J. Cook wrote, Hogan can be considered as "an interpreter" as "she has listened to and lived the language of the land, written it, and passed along its wisdom and its terrestrial spirit" (2003: 32). Hogan presents in the novel that the official language does not "hold a thought for the life of water, or a regard for the land that sustained people from the beginning of time" as they do not "remember the sacred treaties between humans and animals" while native people feel the need of talking to the nonhuman world since they "knew the languages of earth, water, and trees […] For tens of thousands of years [they] spoke with the animals and they spoke with [them]" (Hogan, 1997: 279, 334). For instance, the river speaks to Dora-Rouge and women remain alive. Hogan's heteroglossia is revealed in her "land language", which is a language that "demonstrates genuine respect for the land, assumes [human] interconnectedness with organizing ecosystems, acknowledges [human] role in relation to other life-forms" (Cook, 2003: 29). Bakhtin's social heteroglossia becomes ecological heteroglossia in Hogan's novel because she fuses human language with the land language, which have been divided from each other by anthropocentric and ethnocentric ideologies. While listening to the land is one of the important components of deep ecological movement, speaking with love and reverence for the nonhuman life is one of the important components of Bakhtinian critical theory. Land language, which is "a deep moving underground language" in humans (Hogan, 1995: 57), with its

currents passing between the human and nonhuman, requires experience in and with the nonhuman world and calls for humans' responsibility for answerability, addressivity and co-existence in the natural world since "[human] lives, the old people say, are witnessed by the birds, by dragonflies, by trees and spiders", and "[humans] are seen, [their] measure taken, not only by the animals and spiders but even by the alive galaxy in deep space and the windblown ice of the north that would soon descend on them" (1997: 80).

Dora-Rouge, Agnes, Bush and Angel are the epitome of deep ecology movement with their focus on "*total-field image*", "*biospherical egalitarianism*", diversity and symbiosis, heterarchical and anti-class attitude, "*fight against pollution and resource depletion*", complex relations, "*local autonomy and decentralization*" (Naess, 1995: 151-154; emphasis in original). These women show deep commitment to their traditional communities, taking care of the elderly and their children and fighting back for the land, animals, plants and water. They see themselves in nonhuman entities, which is an indication of Self-realisation. For instance, Dora-Rouge makes a contract with the river for a safe passage through during their journey. Agnes kills a bear in her youth to finish its agony caused by white people, and she sings bears songs and learns bear medicine since then, and let her flesh be eaten by wolves and wild animals after her death. Bush reconstructs animal bones out of respect and honour, and stands up to the contractors at the negotiation meeting by asking "[w]hy are only white laws followed? This will kill the world. What is the law if not the earth's?" because "darkness came in the guise of laws made up by lawless men" (Hogan, 1997: 268, 283). Agnes's tendency towards bears and Bush's tendency towards animal bones make them more animal-like figures, which puts them in Haraway's cyborg world in which there is no distinction between humans and animals: "[S]he had the brilliant soul of an animal, that she lived somewhere between the human world and theirs" (Hogan, 1997: 95). Bush, as "a woman of heart, of land" also decrowns anthropocentric and hierarchical thinking by letting her interior world fuse with the exterior world (120). For instance, there are no defined boundaries between outside/inside and human/nonhuman in her house. The vines worm through the windows and grow along its walls. Finally, Angel learns to be a plant dreamer and understands the healing power of nature. These women interact with the nonhuman world in a great number of ways, engaging in conversations and exchanging ideas.

Hogan, nevertheless, deconstructs gendered essentialism, or naturalised gender attitudes, in terms of the relation between motherhood, nurturing and nature in that these caring women are not all biological mothers. For instance, Bush is "a brooding type of woman" though she is Angel's step-grandmother having no biological child or grandchild while Hannah is more destructive than nurturing though she is Angel's biological mother (75). These caring women also have masculine qualities in patriarchal Western culture in that they are independent and physically strong and they speak up and participate in political acts and conflicts. Some of the men in the novel, on the other hand, have female qualities in that they are more nurturing and tender than some women in the community. It indicates that women and men are equally responsible for taking care of the natural world and nonhuman beings, and that they can establish close relationships to nature on equal terms. In Native American worldview, indigenous community is gender-balanced in its interaction with and in nature because native women and men fight the oppression of the hierarchical and official culture together.

Although women are often presented in the novel to be the ones who feel more connected to and responsible for the natural world, men are also sensitive and related to nature. Hogan depicts some male characters who are immersed in nature and nurturing. Husk is a male character who bears ecology of mind, fusing Western scientific worldviews and indigenous ways of knowing together. He admires science and keeps "stacks of magazines and books that divulged the secret worlds of atoms and galaxies, of particles and quarks" (35). He has studied theories of time, particularly Einsteinian time. He is also aware of the intrinsic connection between the human and nonhuman, believing that humans and animals made an agreement to take care of one another (35). But he sees that humans have broken the agreement and animals got hurt. He knows that the world is alive and has its own agency, "even the tools and the fishhooks were alive" (81), but he wants to prove it through science: "His main desire in life was to prove that the world was alive and that animals felt pain, as if he could make up for being part of the broken contract with animals" (35). He once told Angel "how metal bridges were taken down, collapsed by the song of wind. A certain tone, a certain pitch of wind. If wind spoke across a bridge just right, he said, the bridge would fall" (102). Husk also believes that native communities have a cyclical worldview of time and space as "Einstein believed time would bend and circle back to itself" (64). Hogan, in this way, explores the connection between the human and nonhuman from Native American perspective, not merely from a female perspective because men like Husk, Tommy, who

is Angel's lover, and Tulik, whose house women have stayed in during their challenge against the governmental dam project, have respectful relations to nonhuman beings and landscape. Even LaRue begins to recognise the relation between human beings and nature though he was not respectful before. For instance, LaRue cries for an animal that was the last of its species when one of his customers shoots the animal. For this reason, the novel reflects multiple voices and perspectives of the environmental justice movement in gender-neutral terms rather than in ecofeminist view. Rather than being a woman or a man, Hogan questions what it means to be a human being because humans have forgotten to "ask to become human beings", and what its requirements are since environmental justice can be achieved through non-sexist tendency (347).[17] According to Hogan and the native tradition, being human requires connections to true self, family, friends, community, nature and to the entire life forms, and feeling the land. In other words, humans should remember what they have forgotten, which is "to respect the bond", as Bush said (82).

To recap, while the novel deals in particular with Angel's transformation from a lost soul wandering around the universe into a realised young woman aware of her position in the natural world, it also focuses in general on the recovery of the land, river and the entire life forms in the natural world from anthropocentric and ethnocentric ideologies and on the revival of native tradition. At the end of the novel, Angel stands for a carnivalesque symbiosis of native communality and Western individualism, a harmony of two different cultures that Hogan regards as the only possible way to end anthropocentrism, ethnocentrism, patriarchal authority and hierarchy. Such symbiosis is also reflected in Hogan's writing style in that she mixes indigenous oral tradition with her written text, inviting readers of both cultures to take part in her cross-cultural novel. In this way, Hogan tries to reveal the dialogic relationship between two spheres, two worldviews, two cultures and two writing styles, which celebrates multiplicity, reciprocity and regeneration over monology, exploitation and destruction. That is why Hogan's novel is polyphonic and multivocal in that it incorporates voices and dialogue of the human, nonhuman and the land; it is chronotopic and multitemporal in that it connects the past, present and future; and it is multiscalar in that it relates the personal, communal and global. Hogan consciously uncharts the rational, authoritative,

[17] See the discussions on pages 55-61 in Chapter 2.

hierarchical, ethnocentric and anthropocentric borders between the human and nonhuman, providing the reader with living, acting and articulating geographies.

Unlike Cartesian dualism or Western understanding of binary opposition which sees nature as a raw material or an object to be exploited for humankind, nature is conceived as a dialogical partner, or a life-time companion, in Hogan's deep ecological novel. Hogan portrays humans' deafness to what nature says and attempts to recover a long forgotten tradition of hearing nature, concentrating on the agency of the nonhuman in human lives. Although the novel describes human and nonhuman beings as casualties of anthropocentric, ethnocentric and phallocentric ideologies and depicts past social and environmental injustices, irreversibly transformed landscapes and mourning for an ecological past, it still encourages some positive changes in the reader in particular and in human beings in general in their attitudes towards nature for the future of all entities:

> [W]e had to believe, true or not, that our belated victory was the end of something. That one fracture was healed, one crack mended, one piece back in place. Yes, the pieces were infinite and worn as broken pots, and our human pain was deep, but we'd thrown an anchor into the future and followed the rope to the end of it, to where we would dream new dreams, new medicines, and one day, once again, remember the sacredness of every living thing. (Hogan, 1997: 344)

With her ability of plant dreaming and her careful handling of human and nonhuman resources in her social and physical environments, Angel stands for a new generation of eco-conscious human beings who will take responsibility for the nonhuman world. Angel's plant dreaming signifies polyphonic relations, carnivalesque joy and dialogic interaction that encourage an increase in environmental justice, ecological wisdom, material and spiritual agency and in humans' environmental responsibility. Such hope is described at the end of the novel when Angel, upon the touch of the wind through her hair, gets Dora-Rouge's message that "human is alive water, that creation is not yet over" (350). The novel ends with a direct address to the reader: "Something beautiful lives inside us. You will see. Just believe it. You will see" (351), which means denial of any kind of conclusions for the sake of new beginnings, becoming, growth and wider Self. The end of the novel, thus, suggests ongoing resistance and survival as well as some hope for a better future in social and ecological terms as long as those who struggle for the environment go on believing in themselves.

3.2. Dialogue between the Human and Nonhuman in *Power*

Linda Hogan in her Native-American novel offers a vivid description of societal conflicts, Euro-American hegemony and oppression, tribal and environmental degeneration in multiple contexts, leading the reader into questioning monologic and hegemonic discourses of anthropocentrism and ethnocentrism. Questioning the binary constructions of self/other, story/history, human/nonhuman, nature/culture, native/non-native, material/spiritual, dream/reality, and ethnic and gender boundaries, Hogan gives voice to the lost, forgotten, oppressed and marginalised, including all human beings without regard to their sex and all nonhuman beings so as to degrade authoritarian power relations and societal discrimination and to encourage one to find her/his true self and identity. *Power* (1998) is fairly viable to study through Eco-Bakhtinian practice in order to create dialogic, counter-hegemonic and environmental discourse since the novel can be regarded as an attempt to diminish Cartesian dualism and official and hegemonic power relations of patriarchy, hierarchy and ethnocentrism. This part of the chapter brings *Power* into new dialogue with Bakhtinian concepts about complex and dialogic relations between the human/nonhuman, nature/culture, native/non-native bodies, material/spiritual selves, ancient/modern lives, forgetting/remembering and mother/daughter. The novel emphasises environmental concerns and is concerned with the recovery of environmental and social justice, through its dreamy, satiric and polyphonic voice as well as dialogic and carnivalesque tendency, narrating the events during the 1900s when political, social and environmental conflicts of the Florida Everglades in southern part of the U.S. state of Florida are told through the perspectives of Janie Soto, Annie Hide, Ama Eaton and Omishto.

Power tells the story of Ama and Omishto in their travel through a storm-destroyed and storm-reconstructed landscape in a world turned upside down. Therefore, the novel offers a Bakhtinian reading for the argument of the thesis through its quasi-apocalyptic, ecologically troublesome, satiric and dialogic content, which is encircled by a deep ecological treatment of Native American fiction. The novel carnivalises hegemonic discourses of Euro-American culture, anthropocentrism and ethnocentrism, which all have profound effects on negative transformation of the natural world. Linda Hogan presents an ecocentric novel that uncovers environmental injustice and ecological degeneration on local scales and offers dialogic and deep ecological solutions. Hogan degrades binaries and fervently discusses that fixed categories of nature/culture, human/nonhuman, material/spiritual, mind/body, dream/reality,

belief/truth, life/death are unstable and constantly in flux. Her ecology of mind that does away with the borders between these binaries provides an integration of Bakhtinian critical theory into deep ecological movement. In doing so, the forgotten, neglected, ignored, muted and oppressed human and nonhuman beings can reassert their presence, subjectivity, voice and agency in the novel.

Hogan fuses oral tradition with contemporary events in the novel so as to unveil the damage Euro-American people have done to native lands and (non)human inhabitants. Drawing on real events of the destruction of the Florida Everglades with its Seminole people and golden panthers during the 1800s and 1900s, which began with the Spanish colonisation, Hogan retells native people's history by narrating alternative and personal stories that jump from one reality to another and from one view to another. In this sense, the novel presents a factually fictional account of the negative transformation of the Florida swamp and its human inhabitants, the Taiga people, caused by the anthropocentric modernisation and desire for financial gain. In the novel, she presents Cartesian, hierarchical and ethnocentric relationships, and portrays anthropocentric people trapping themselves in a linear sense of time and a separate two-dimensional sense of space and disregarding the nonhuman world and all its entities. Time flows backwards and forwards through memories and stories of the characters. There are multiple narrators and insert narratives, which forms a kind of chain in the novel as Omishto passes along stories told by Janie Soto, Annie Hide and Ama Eaton to readers. Although the novel has mostly been examined through ethnic studies, theories of memory and mere ecocriticism, this part of the chapter studies the novel through deep ecological movement of the ecocritical theory within the framework of Bakhtinian concepts of the carnivalesque, dialogism, polyphony and chronotope.

Power, consisting of nine chapters, narrates the stories of Omishto, a sixteen-year-old native young girl who lives in a modern white society; Ama Eaton, a Taiga Indian woman living alone in her native community and a distant relative of Omishto; and Sisa, an endangered Florida panther whose name means "godlike, all-powerful" (Hogan, 1998: 73). The novel is a story of coming-of-age, transformation and healing, which centres on the fates of Omishto, Ama and Sisa, the sacred animal to which Hogan dedicates her novel: "For the Florida panther. May their kind survive" (1998: n.p.). To make a brief plot summary of the novel, Omishto visits Ama in the Florida Everglades, as she often does. In her last visit, a storm blows up, blocking roads and disabling power lines, which isolates Omishto from the civilised world and causes her to stay with Ama

in the woods. Establishing the conflict of the novel by binary oppositions between the natural/built environments, older/younger generations, traditional/civilised worlds, reason/myth, dream/reality, seeing/feeling and extinction/revival, the storm leads Ama to the magic journey of search for the golden panther and Omishto to follow her and witness Ama's killing of the panther.[18] Ama goes on trial in the white court, accused of murdering an endangered animal, at the end of which she is not found guilty owing to the lack of evidence to condemn her, while she is found guilty on the Taiga trial for not bringing the dead body of the panther to the oldest member of the tribe and is consequently exiled from the native land. After Ama is exiled, Omishto does not feel anything about her mother and her house in the white society, and, thus, she decides to return to Kili, the camp of the Taiga tribe, to live among Taiga people at the end of the novel.

Hogan writes at the intersection of environmental matters and historical treatments of indigenous people in white American culture. She sets a carnivalesque and dialogic space in which both nature and culture, human and nonhuman, the Native American and Euro-American, the ancient and modern, the traditional and contemporary come together to achieve balance and harmony. Comparing and contrasting the ecological and colonised Native with the anthropocentric and ethnocentric European coloniser, Hogan presents a carnivalesque mode of interrelationship between individuals, communities and cultures "counter-posed to the all-powerful socio-hierarchical relationships of noncarnival life" (Bakhtin, 1984b: 123). In the novel, she deals with the political, legal and spiritual consequences of a colonial encounter between the exploiter white Western culture and the exploited native culture. She reads colonisation of the nonhuman world in terms of survival with her tale of mystery, power and corruption. She offers "alternative notions of what it means to inhabit the earth as human beings (Rainwater, 1999: ix). In accordance with deep ecology movement, Hogan seeks to raise dialogic and carnivalesque awareness to unearth sources of ecospherical egalitarian life that have been desecrated by Euro-American people's efforts to conform to the "urbanized, techno-industrial mega-

[18] Hogan's storm in the novel also provides a reference to Native American people's religious movement during the second half of the nineteenth century – the Ghost Dance, a traditional dance performed in a circular community. The Ghost Dance was suggested by the Northern Paiute spiritual leader Wowoka, who is renamed Jack Wilson, so that deceased ancestors would return to guide the living indigenous people, the white colonists would leave them in peace, prosperity and unity with their traditions and lands, and that the world would turn "into a paradise where no one would die, and there would be no distinction between the races" (Hazen-Hammond, 1997: 202).

society" (Naess, 1989: 24). Hogan offers deep ecological change in her writing for a better, dialogic and polyphonic future for human and nonhuman beings beyond the borders of human history. She offers her readers stories of characters from different cultural backgrounds to change the way they consider about their relations with their human and nonhuman environments. She combines stories of Native American traditions, belief systems and lives in the past, and the interaction of indigenous people with Euro-American destruction and deception in history through fictive representation in order for native people and culture to survive, stay alive and flourish again.

The novel starts with an ethereal scene in which Omishto is lying in her father's boat, which evokes some kind of suspension and mystery: "This is the place where clouds are born and I am floating (Hogan, 1998: 1). Omishto is presented in the beginning as a stereotypical contemporary native young girl, disconnected from her indigenous customs and beliefs. Her worldview has been shaped by the dominant white culture until she participates in Ama's ancient and traditional world. Omishto is a carnivalesque character in the novel, with her transformation from a lost, westernised and troubled teenager into a recovered and conscious young woman. Omishto seems uncomfortable with Ama at the beginning as she considers her weak, ugly and insane, but then she finds peace with her after comprehending that Ama is actually strong, capable and wise. Omishto feels safe at Ama's home away from her physical and spiritual pain and abuse in her mother's house because of her stepfather Herman's sexual and physical abuse and her mother's blindness to it. The more she spends time with Ama, the more she relieves her pains and discovers the natural world, which results in Omishto's questioning of the white modern world she has been living in:

> The land and the trees have needed rain. It has been a drought. This is the year of wildfire in places that were swamp, the year Lake Okeechobee was opened and the water level down here rose so much it drowned all the fawns. The wardens had to kill all the starving deer that were standing up to their necks in water, and it broke my heart to see the little deer with their white undersides lying along the high roads in a line, counted out and numbered as if they were nothing more than rocks or coins. It seemed cruel to me, even though they said it was the only thing to do and they tagged them so they could examine their hungry insides later. I told my mom I was mad about it because it was the building and farming and sugarcane that were killing the deer, and she said, "Why do you always have to fuss so much about everything?" She thinks it's the small price you pay for progress. I think it's the way to kill a world. That's how different we are from each other. (Hogan, 1998: 27)

Omishto learns to see deeper by calling into question her preconceived notions and predetermined laws of Western ideology. She is on the horns of a dilemma over two worlds, one which struggles to keep its traditional ways away from hegemonic white culture with the other which colonises and dominates the former. She is torn between what her school, preacher and mother teach her and what she feels and believes to be true:

> The preacher thinks different from the Taiga way of thinking. He thinks a snake is the devil. The old ones think it is a god. He believes in angels, children with wings in the sky, but he doesn't believe in what's on earth or birds; he says it's all an illusion, this life on earth, a dream, a miserable place we will one day escape into the golden streets of heaven. I would like to think this way. Then I could believe this storm, as I suppose, as I wish, was not real. The black clouds, the broken trees. I am in the world, the preacher says, but not of it. (Hogan, 1998: 40)

Questioning the notion of being in the world and/or of the world, Omishto regards herself as a disappointment to her mother and friends, and to her Indian and white communities in the first place. She seeks to find her true identity and sense of place by participating both in the white world and the Taiga community. Facing with some conflicts between these two spheres during her physical and spiritual journey towards true identity, sense of place and belonging, she realises the destructive attitudes and actions of the authoritative culture against the native land, animals and people:

> I want to cry now out of loneliness and misery and the confusing possibility of my two possible fates, each distinct, each real. One fate exists in the white people's world, the other exists in the older world of my own people. Our lives, any of us, could break and fall outward in any direction, but for people like me there are only two ways to fall" (Hogan, 1998: 215).

Mediating between these two worlds, she recognises that the native world and its indigenous culture are absorbed by the non-native world and its white culture. Time, reality and knowledge lose their influence as Omishto loses her affinity with her modern house, her school where she studies "war and the numbers that combine to destroy life", her uninterested mother and abusive stepfather, surrogating them with the traditional, magical and caring world of Taiga beliefs (105). At the end of her journey to reach Self-realisation, Omishto makes a significant choice that will change her life and the Taiga

community by denying the official white world to restore the peace, unity and ecology of the Taiga community to heal herself and the world and to balance the two cultures.

The story in the novel is narrated by Omishto, the introspective narrator, as she witnesses all that happens throughout the novel, which indicates continuity and process, instead of narrating the past after all events have happened, which implies finality or completion. In this sense, her name is significant as it means "the One Who Watches" (Hogan, 1998: 4). Omishto not only watches but also comprehends the significance of what she witnesses. Her introspectivity encourages readers to participate in the novel and to reconsider their relationship to the nonhuman world. Her search for true identity and for answers to reach Self-realisation prompts readers to comprehend her struggles. Readers also witness what Omishto herself witnesses, particularly, how Ama sacrifices the panther. Like Omishto, readers also seek to decide whether Ama has done the best to kill the panther and try to comprehend the spiritual beliefs that lead her to it. In other words, "the narrator becomes, by extension, spokesperson for the reader's own responsibilities and culpabilities, bringing to light what would otherwise have gone unremarked and thus misunderstood" (Schweninger, 2008: 193). In this way, Omishto mediates between two conflicting cultures, between readers of different belief systems, and between the author and reader.

Becoming more of a caring and guiding mother to Omishto than her birth mother, Ama is an eco-conscious human being who lives in harmony with animals, plants and natural elements. Ama is a deep ecologic individual who feels deep sympathy with all life forms, leads ecologically-responsible and caring life, knows her interrelation with the web of life, in which all elements of the system, including humans and the slightest nonhuman entities, are interwoven in complex relations and inherently depend on each other. Ama lives in a world in which the majority of people are European and white, in which non-native people do not care about the loss of human and nonhuman lives and about the transformation of green landscapes into buildings and fences, in which modern people plant artificial flowers and trees in their gardens as they are pretty, in which boys shoot a panther for fun, and in which all the people seek a scapegoat to blame for everything they do instead of taking any responsibility for their actions. As in Hogan's *Solar Storms*, an older female relative comes to the young female protagonist's aid by guiding her and providing the love and care that Omishto's mother has failed to give. Omishto begins to heal at Ama's home, learns from Ama how to survive and be friend with the nonhuman environment. Like Bush in *Solar Storms*,

Ama is also presented as an in-between character that acts as a surrogate mother to Omishto and helps Omishto heal her spiritual and deep suffering in the same way Bush does for Angel. Besides, Bush kills a bear while Ama kills a panther, which are both their totemic animals they love.

The novel does not only depict a young girl's journey to her native land and her healing process but also uncovers an indigenous community's struggle for survival and environmental justice. In the novel, there are thirty surviving Taiga Indians and thirty surviving panthers in Florida. By these similar numbers, Hogan connects the tragedy of the Taiga people to that of the endangered Florida panther so as to reveal the suffering and destruction caused by the dominant white culture because the fates of nonhuman beings are "interwoven with our own human fates in this world we humans have diminished because we have failed to understand how each thing connects with all the rest" (Hogan, 2001: 25).

The title of the novel is also significant to discuss at this point because 'power', means 'respect for nature' in indigenous culture while it conveys domination, hierarchy and oppression in white culture. In native communities, 'power' stands for the interrelatedness of all entities in the universe. As Paula Gunn Allen pointed out,

> [t]he concept of power among tribal people is related to their understanding of the relationships that occur between the human and nonhuman worlds. They believe that all are linked within one vast, living sphere […] and that its essence is the power that enables magical things to happen. (1986: 22)

Other references for power in the novel could be the power of nature, power of the spirit world, power of law, power of endurance, power of survival, power of knowledge, power of language, power of death, and power of rebirth.

The storm, which blocks roads and disables power lines, isolating Omishto from the white world and causing her to stay with Ama in the woods in native lands, leads Ama to the magic journey of search for the golden panther and Omishto to follow her and witness Ama's killing of the panther. The journey is magic because Ama dreams that she has been told to find the panther, the totem of the Taiga tribe, and to sacrifice this endangered species so as to restore balance in the world. The reader later finds out that this dream is similar to the Taiga myth of Panther Woman, which is told to Omishto by Ama, and told to Ama by Janie Soto, who is the oldest living member of the Taiga tribe:

> Years ago, Panther walked on two feet. A woman lived in the dark swamp of the early world in those days. She was raised by wild animals because her human family had rejected her, but the animals favored her. It was given this woman to keep the world in balance. […] Like memory, she was there to refresh our thoughts and renew our acts.
> [...] One day a storm blew with so much strength that it left an opening between the worlds. Panther Woman saw that opening, and followed the panther into that other world. […] What she saw there was rivers on fire, animals dying of sickness, and foreign vines. The world, she saw, was dying.
> The unfortunate thing was that the door blew closed behind her and she had to find a way to open it again.
> […] A sacrifice was called for and if it was done well, […] In Taiga, the word for sacrifice means "to send away," and the animal returns to the spirit world.
> […] she had killed it for that reason and it would bring life back to this once-beautiful place.
> When the panther returned, this woman went back to where she came from and transformed herself into one of the catlike creatures. She went away with it to live in that place no one has ever entered, the place where a person could be lost for years and never find a hint of direction. Because it's the opening between the worlds, opened by a storm. Under the sky. (Hogan, 1998: 110-111)

It is during this storm that Omishto experiences a spiritual and psychic change. The storm, as a power of change, provides her initiation into the natural world, ecological insight and sense of place in indigenous world. The storm is the embodiment of the wind as well as the indication of the power of the wind. In Taiga tradition, the wind is called "the spirit" and "the breath", and it is named "Oni" (Hogan, 1998: 4): "The wind is a living force. We Taiga call the wind Oni. It enters us all at birth and stays with us all through life. It connects us to every other creature" (28). The reader also finds out that the word Oni is the first word the panther has taught the Taiga people to speak (73). The wind is a forceful agent of voice, a creative power, regeneration, breath of life and dialogue, connecting all human and nonhuman beings physically and spiritually: "Oni, first and foremost, is the word for wind and air. It is a power every bit as strong as gravity, as strong as a sun you can't look at but know is there. It tells a story. Through air, words and voices are carried" (178).

For Merleau-Ponty, language is acquired through the body's participation with an external world experienced as alive, and "[t]hat living world is none other than the Earth" (Abram, 1988: 101). David Abram expounded that language, according to Merleau-Ponty, is not born inside the human body but with the interaction of the

feeling, sensing, desiring, libidinal and emphatic body with the geographies of a living world (116). It could be interpreted in Eco-Bakhtinian sense in the way that the world itself is the body of language, and, thus, the ability of speaking cannot be perceived as a power attributed to the human species alone since every nonhuman entity and landscape has their own voice. As Abram also pointed out, "[i]f language is born of our carnal *participation* in a world that already *speaks to us* at the most immediate level of sensory experience, then language does not belong to humankind but to the sensible world of which we are but a part" (1988: 117; emphasis in original). In other words, language is what is realized in human beings, but in no way is their property because "language is everything, since it is the voice of no one, since it is the very voice of the things, the waves, and the forests" (Merleau-Ponty, 1968: 274, 155). Language, for Abram, is rather "a call for and response to a gesturing, sounding, speaking landscape – a world of thunderous rumblings, of chattering brooks, of flapping, flying, screeching things, of roars and sighing winds" (Abram, 1988: 118). Abram also expressed that language human beings speak could even be the voice of Earth itself, which "sing[s] through the human form, for the vitality, the coherence, and the diversity of the various languages [they] speak may well correspond to the vitality, coherence, and diversity of Earth's biosphere" (118). He offered that what comes after Merleau-Ponty's Logos is Eco-logos because human beings should "respond to the voice of the threatened rainforests, the whales, the rivers, the birds," and they should speak for all nonhuman entities, from the slightest to the largest (119).[19]

The storm that brings chaos also brings rebirth as Omishto says "the wind that is our life, that could be our death" (34). While Omishto's mother thinks that the storm is chaotic, destructive and punishing for humankind, Ama and Omishto believe that it is a regenerative and saving force for human and nonhuman worlds:

> This was how the world was created, Ama told me once, out of wind and lashing rain. "We were blown together by a storm in the first place." It was all created out of storms. The mud was blown in with the trees and the seeds of growing things already planted in it. She said, too, that the white egrets were carried here from Africa in the eye of a storm that bellowed in from across the ocean in 1927. There were no white egrets

[19] Merleau-Ponty ardently argued that "the only pre-existent Logos is the world itself" and thus all "the words, vowels and phonemes are so many ways of 'singing' the world" (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: xx, 187). He thus believed that human language is "the continuing efforts of [human] species to sing the world in call-and-response, carrying with them the past and anticipating the future" (Westling, 2011: 137).

> here before that time. They were carried in the eye of that storm. (Hogan, 1998: 42-43)

The storm, having torn off her dress, becomes a new beginning for Omishto in the way that she is reborn, wet and naked, into her destiny as Ama's successor – as the saviour of and dialogue between the human and nonhuman worlds:

> "What do you want?" I ask the wind that closes me in, but I fear that what it wants is more than I have to give. I've fallen into this creature of air. It is stronger than I am and I will do its bidding whether I want to or not because it has created me and my heart and mind; my body is only what the breath lives in, at its mercy like an old dress that can be blown into a tree. It was wind, after all, that set all these things in motion. (180)

The wind, which indicates its power through storm, brings Omishto to life because "[i]t is the breath of life translated from trees. Because of this, there is no such thing as emptiness in our world, only the fullness of the unseen. It is the sea of creation we live inside" (178). That is, storm can be helpful, welcoming, embracing and warming for those who believe in the power of nature on the one hand while it can be destructive, chaotic and cold for those who deny the power, agency and subjectivity of nature on the other hand, which means how forces of nature treat someone depends on the interaction and dialogue between the participant and forces of nature. That is why "the wind leaves you changed without knowing how, just knowing something unsayable has changed and it has changed forever and you cannot go back and you can never be the person you were only a day before" (67).

The storm is a carnivalesque element as it does away with distinctions between the land and sea: "The strong winds have blown water all across the land. There are no edges, no borders between the elements because everything is water, silver and glassy. The whole ground moves and shimmers as if it is alive […] Heaven has fallen" (46). During the storm, land becomes water, snakes take refuge in human houses, deers fly through the air, and a 500-year-old tree falls without a sound. The storm is a carnivalesque element that restores balance in the world by both creating and destroying life. For instance, it allows for the survival of younger trees while leading to the death of the ancient tree Methuselah. Methuselah, a figure from Judeo-Christian myth, is believed to have lived 969 years, becoming the oldest biblical figure (Genesis 5:27): "Methuselah falls and I hear nothing but only see that what has lasted this long is being taken down now as if it were nothing, as if it had never been anything that counted. This

tree planted by the Spanish conceived on another continent" (Hogan, 1998: 37-38). The tree is acknowledged to have been transplanted from Spain, which shows European usurpation of American land through colonisation. The uprooting of this ancient tree by the storm shows removal of the official and dominant culture, and elimination of hierarchical burden of history and its repressive influence on the lives of the indigenous people and lands. Acknowledging the power of the wind, Omishto states:

> From the Chevy I look out at the dozers still clearing trees that fell in the storm, and at the houses with their roofs blown off. What once seemed solid looks like nothing more than broken toothpicks. Human creations don't hold a candle to wind. That's how I know something is greater than human will. And even though it's a tragedy, I feel better seeing how small we are. It makes me think that all our crimes against the world will be undone in just one rage of wind or flood. (Hogan, 1998: 99)

Florida is a region conquered first by the Spanish, as a result of which animals vanish, the land and water are polluted, native plants are crept by kudzu and belittled by Methusaleh, which are all the effects of European Americans. Nevertheless, nature is not depicted as a passive victim in the novel. Nature is a living entity rather than an inanimate object. Although natural resources and elements are presented fading, dying, ravaged, despoiled and maltreated to emphasise environmental degradation and ecological crises, they actually possess their own voice, power and agency as the storm and the panther shows, which are revealed through Ama's actions and Omishto's eyes.

Like Angel in *Solar Storms*, Omishto recognises that there were times when nonhuman and human beings spoke the same language before humans broke their pact with the nonhuman world. Janie Soto and Annie Hide tell Omishto "how sometimes the animals used to help the humans, how they would teach them the plants that were healing, sing songs for them to learn, how they would show the people the way to renew the broken world" (29). Omishto's recognition that the native world and its indigenous culture are absorbed by the non-native world and its white culture results from her close relationship with Ama, which is strengthened by Ama's killing of one of the endangered Florida panthers, the most sacred animal in the Taiga community because "[b]efore the human people entered this world, there was the great cat, Sisa […] Sisa was the first person to enter this world" after the storm (15). This is the point in the novel at which Omishto steps into adulthood although she does not completely comprehend Ama's motivation for the murder of the Florida panther in the first place. Although Omishto

recognises the suffering and power of the natural world, she rather draws her own mature conclusions: “I think she doesn’t want the outsiders to kill this cat. She doesn’t want it to die by poison or be hit by a car like the others. In this, maybe she is right. But she is also wrong” (62). For Omishto, Ama is wrong because “[s]he has committed a terrible act; she has sinned against the earth, the animals who are our allies, the one who was our ancestor. She has broken natural law” (169).

Omishto’s initiation into a traditional knowledge of a world where human and nonhuman beings are united in harmonious relations is a ceremonial passage from a spiritually-wounded westernised teenager to a self-sufficient, strong and eco-conscious young woman who is involved in her tribal community’s struggle for survival. Omishto notices that she must re-establish the interrelatedness and dialogue between the human and nonhuman in order to recover the peace and balance within herself, her tribe and within the biosphere because

> [t]he world has grown small where Sisa lives. It has lost its power and given way to highways and streets of towns where once there were woods and fens and bodies of water. The world is made less by these losses. Because of this, humans have lost the chance to be whole and joyous, reverent and alive. They live in square lots, apart even from one another. What they’ve forgotten is large and immense, and what they remember is only a small, narrow hopelessness. (Hogan, 1998: 191)

Ama’s killing of the panther is an ancient ritual in the Taiga community as it celebrates revival of the ecological community. Her action is not an indication of human power and hegemony over the nonhuman but is a selfless and sacrificial act to recover balance in human and nonhuman worlds since “the power of humans depends on the powers of earth” (185). Just as the panther in the myth wants to be sacrificed to be replaced by a stronger and healthier cat, Ama is also willing to sacrifice herself to be replaced by younger, stronger and healthier Omishto. Though based on an ancient tradition, Ama’s sacrifice is not about going back to the past but preparing for the future. By sacrificing the panther and herself, Ama imagines all humans becoming eco-consciously humanised and reborn. Omishto states that Ama is “like rain that is nourishing but has to fall. And when it does, the world rises up once again and grows” (186). Ama’s and the panther’s offering themselves up as ritual sacrifices brings out environmental and social regeneration because they believe in “a union between life and death”, which is “ascribed to the cycle of the seasons, the annual rebirths and deaths” in

the realm of nature (Girard, 1977: 255). That is why death "contains the germ of life. There is no life on the communal level that does not originate in death" (255).

Ama, as a shortened form of Mama, means "landlady" or "housekeeper" with suggestions of "love" and "soul" in Spanish (Hardin, 2003: 146). In the novel, she is actually the keeper of the land and nonhuman beings and is the soul of her tribe, sacrificing herself for the sake of the environment and tribe. As Michael Hardin wrote, Ama "is the keeper of the land, the soul of the tribe, the one whose love for the tribe and the environment transcends her own welfare. Everything about Ama is grounded in both her physical and spiritual environment" (Hardin, 2003: 146). She "lives in a natural way at the outside edges of our lives, […] 'keeps up relations,' […] with nature and the spirit world" (Hogan, 1998: 17). Ama's home is part of the natural world, where nonhuman beings are welcomed and take shelter during the storm. There are no boundaries between the human/nonhuman and inside/outside in her house. Like Bush's house, Ama's house is also made up of native material like cinder blocks and palmetto fronds and the moss is grown while the vines climb on its walls. Signifying "liminality, connection and knowledge", both the storm and the panther communicate with Ama (Alaimo, 1996: 51). Through her character of Ama, Hogan conveys that animals and humans conversed with one another at one time in history, which means that they cared for each other and maintained their survival. However, this affinity between animals and humans ended when humans started to disrespect their animal relations and ignore their needs. Hogan indicates in the novel that nonhuman beings are not a measure for nature's otherness or of human superiority, but living proof of human alienation from and blindness to nature. As Schweninger expressed, "nature is no more nonhuman than humans are nonnature" (2008: 188).

Both Omishto and Ama are in a liminal position in aspect of traditional and contemporary existence. They both seek to unite the ancient with the modern, human with nonhuman, culture with nature, death with life, and dream with reality. They both try to make sense of the old and indigenous stories in a world that has been transformed by white culture, and both are in-between cultural spaces of conflicting discourses and ideologies. As Hardin pointed out, "[t]he world is changing, the ancient is confronting the modern; but instead of abandoning one for the other, Ama and Omishto seek the space between the two, the space that is neither, or the space that encompasses both" (2003: 151). Regarding Ama as a spiritual healer and guide is a significant step for Omishto in her Self-realisation. Gaining new insight after witnessing Ama's killing of

the panther, Omishto acknowledges that she belongs to a sacred whole. Her witness to Ama's killing of the panther enables her to develop new insights into human and nonhuman relations and to gain ecological understanding of animals and other nonhuman beings. Omishto is now aware that Ama "killed her guardian, the sacred cat that taught [them] the word for wind […] that she killed it for [their] people to go on, traded its life for [their] lives, and that it will return, new and healthy, and so will the world of [their] people" (Hogan, 1998: 189). As Omishto begins to understand Ama's killing of the endangered and sacred Florida panther, she starts to identify with the tragic experience of the Taiga people, the land, the panther and Ama. This identification enables Omishto to fulfil the promise Ama asks of her, following Ama's guidance for the hope and survival of the remaining Taiga people, nonhuman beings and the land:

> I am both at home and a foreigner here in their presence. I am at home here in a way I don't feel; I am at home like a little tree with roots connected to these taller, older ones, reaching deep for water and mineral, and these big trees all around me are not the ones that were felled by the storm. In their eyes, I am the future, and I am not strange or savage or beautiful in ways they are not, living in the empty regions of an unloved world. Neiher is Ama. I know they'd like to wash civilization off them and wash it all onto her just the same as the lawyers and judge in the courthouse wanted to clean all the wildness off them, onto her. (161).

Having the experience of sensitivity to natural qualities, she develops "*eco-dentity*" by integrating her mind and body into natural elements and nonhuman beings (Murphy, 2013: 46: emphasis in original). When Omishto finds her true self, she also finds the self of Taiga tribe because the sense of being in native culture is more communal than individual since the world is not a collection of isolated beings and objects but a network of interrelated and interdependent corporealities instead. Hope is crucial to survival, and Omishto becomes the hope for the Taiga community because of her youth and courage after the tribe banishes Ama. Although she has been part of the modern white world before, she is now a part of the traditional native world. She acknowledges that she is an inseparable part of a complex ecosystem, a web of life that is in an ever-changing and a cyclical natural process that challenges anthropocentric and hierarchical notions of superiority, hegemony and priority. She admits her position as the Taiga hope: "I know our survival depends on who I am and who I will become" (Hogan, 1998: 161). Experiencing a kind of pyschic transformation, Omishto reassesses

her place in the nonhuman world. Her new position becomes her own ecosophy, which is a carnivalesque tendency that enables her to feel at home.

As in Angel's jouney in *Solar Storms*, Omishto's search for her true identity, belonging and sense of place and her deep ecological journey to reach Self-realisation can be associated with Bakhtin's chronotope of "the life course of one seeking true knowledge (1981: 130). During her journey, Omishto's life is separated into some phases starting with anthropocentric ignorance, heading through her sceptical self-criticism towards green experience and ultimately to Self-realisation that cannot be achieved utterly. For instance, she is brought up with more Western culture in her family, taught at school more about human domination, lives away from her native traditions, and feels uncomfortable in Ama's house, in which the moss is grown and the vines climb on its walls while snakes are welcomed. However, she then recognises that she is an inseparable part of the natural world. She manages to unveil her hidden side that has been covered by the distinctions of gender, class, race, tradition and place. Therefore, she becomes a dialogic body bearing both the self and other within her and experiences both dislocation and relocation as she is in dialogue with both cultures. As a mixed-blood young woman, Omishto could make terms with multiple and different identities, listen to multiple voices, respect multiple views as long as they do not cause any damage to anything, and could hold multiple characteristics in herself.

With the exception of Omishto's mother who does not believe in Taiga traditions and native ways of life and who does not want Omishto to spend more time with Ama, women in the novel are eco-conscious agents who practice non-exploitative use of nonhuman elements and natural resources. They have equal roles with men in constructing and maintaining harmonious relations among humans, animals, plants, land and water. Janie Soto sacrifices her leg to save an ancient sea turtle from men stealing newly laid turtle eggs. She uses an artificial leg made from a tree that gives off shoots while she wears it. She is also a shapeshifter, thus a trickster, which is the ability to come and go at will in the physical form of the panther. Therefore, Janie Soto is a grotesque figure because of both her artificial leg made from a tree that gives off shoots while she wears it and is a transcorporeal body due to her shapeshifting. Annie Hide, an old woman of the Taiga tribe, is a healer who helps her community. She tells old stories to Omishto and knows how to use natural resources wisely. Ama, following the myth of Panther Woman, tries to restore balance in the world by killing the panther, sacrifices herself as a result of her exile from her native lands, and becomes a Panther Woman,

which is also a grotesque figure. Janie Soto's shapeshifting into a panther and Ama's tendency towards becoming a Panther Woman as in the myth make them more animal-like figures, which places them in Haraway's cyborg world in which there is no distinction between human animals and nonhuman animals.

Like Dora-Rouge, Agnes, Bush and Angel in *Solar Storms*, Janie Soto, Annie Hide, Ama Eaton and Omishto are the embodiment of deep ecology movement with their focus on "*total-field image*", "*biospherical egalitarianism*", diversity and symbiosis, heterarchical and anti-class attitude, "*fight against pollution and resource depletion*", complex relations, "*local autonomy and decentralization*" (Naess, 1995: 151-154; emphasis in original). All women are deeply committed to their traditional communities and natural environment, finding themselves in nonhuman entities, which is an indication of Self-realisation. These women act in unison with the nonhuman world in a great number of ways, engaging in conversations and exchanging ideas. However, Hogan breaks down gendered essentialism, or naturalised gender attitudes, in aspects of the relation between motherhood, nurturing and nature in that these caring women are not all biological mothers. To give an example, Ama is more nurturing and caring type of woman, though she is Omishto's aunt having no biological child of her own, than Omishto's biological mother who is more indifferent and destructive. These caring women also share some masculine qualities in that they are individualistic in their aims and beliefs, independent and physically strong to speak up for nature and have the endurance to kill to restore balance in the world. That is why Hogan, establishing a gender-neutral motive for and non-sexist tendency towards environmental justice, questions what it means to be a human being instead of being a woman or a man because "[i]n the old days it was said that we were humans" (Hogan, 1998: 229). As the native tradition in general and Hogan in the novel provide, the requirement for being human is integration into and dialogue with true self, family, community, nature, and into the entire life forms because "humans are nothing more than a vision the gods had. [They] are only one song, one of the births of this singular word, one of the deaths, too, all of it blown together by the winds of a storm" (72).

Hogan does not present in her novel a simple dichotomy of right/wrong, good/evil, or innocent/corrupt. She rather provides a space for diversity of ways of resistance, knowledge and understanding. She degrades anthropocentric and ethnocentric dualisms of naturalised and stereotyped identities by creating a carnivalesque world comprised of storytelling, history retelling, survival and resistance

to do away with the Euro-American hegemony. She is more dialogic and carnivalistic than dualistic as she "conflates singular experience into plural, individual into communal, human into animal" (Bowen-Mercer, 2003: 164). Hogan wants Omishto and her readers, equally, to ask themselves "what to do to protect the endangered animals in southwestern Florida from the draining of swamps, the proliferating of industrial, agricultural, and residential development, and the building of highways" (Schweninger, 2008: 184). Hogan endeavours to connect all humans in a constructive manner with the nonhuman world by revealing how human and nonhuman interrelations provide for possibility of revival, benevolence and wholeness. Paula Gunn Allen also pointed out that "a person's every action, thought, relationship, and feeling contributes to the greater good of the Universe or its suffering" (1998: 42). For this reason, Hogan suggests that all humans participate in the nonhuman world to protect and better it. Thus, Ama's act of panther murder has positive consequences in the sense that it contributes to Omishto's healing, her reach to her true identity and her journey towards Self-realisation, and to hope among Taiga people to revive their native land. It helps Omishto attain integrity by accepting her intrinsic tribal other, an ecocentric tendency which suggests essential norms of deep ecology that are symbiosis, biodiversity and egalitarianism in the world and respect for all organic and inorganic life forms.

Ama goes on trial in the white court, accused of murdering an endangered animal, at the end of which she is not found guilty owing to the lack of evidence to condemn her, while she is found guilty on the Taiga trial for not bringing the dead body of the panther to the oldest member of the tribe and is exiled from her native land as a result. Omishto expresses at this point that "it doesn't matter what was decided in the marble building in town. It doesn't matter what's written on paper. The old people are the ones who know the laws of this place, this world, laws stronger and older than America" (Hogan, 1998: 160). Ama hides from her tribe the fact that she has killed a diseased, weak, flea-ridden and loose-skinned panther instead of a strong and healthy one, which could lead her people into hopelessness:

> It is their belief that has brought them this far in their lives, all the way to old age. If they saw the face of it, that skinny cat dead on the black grasses, they would no longer believe or have hope. They would lie down on the ground and never get up again in this world where the cars pass through on the cut roads and the roar of machines breaks through the swamps among the dying fish. If I told, would the trees here bear fruit? Would the fish return? I think not. (167)

Omishto, witnessing both trials, recognises, more and more, how the white world is wrong, destructive, racist and coloniser and how her Taiga part suits her much. During the trial in the white court, Ama is jailed in the first place, which leads Omishto to see that Ama is imprisoned not for killing the panther but for becoming a Taiga and a native woman refusing to belong to any of the two worlds. Ama's trial in the white court actually unveils destructive attitudes of the white people towards the native lands since they are the guilty ones for having threatened the existence of the panthers. It is not the traditional Taiga sacrifices that have endangered the panthers but the white people's actions of clearing the land for cattle, sugarcane, highways and concrete buildings that have destroyed the habitat of panthers and endangered their existence, which is a guilt they have not been arrested for. As Omishto points out, it is not tradition but history that has committed crime: "[I]n this changed world, it will call down ruin and helplessness like a dark rain upon us, and we – all of us – will die if we go against the will of nature, as we have already done even before this crime committed by Ama, a crime created by history, not tradition" (Hogan, 1998: 183).

After Ama is exiled, Omishto does not feel anything about her mother and her house in the white society, and, thus, she decides to return to Kili, the camp of the Taiga tribe, to live among Taiga people at the end of the novel. Believing in the truth of the myth of Panther Woman, Omishto understands clearly that Ama's pain is inseparable from the pain of the panther and the pain of the whole nonhuman world since what happens to nonhuman beings and to the land and what happens to Ama and Taiga people are the same thing. She is now aware that her journey with Ama for the panther is only the beginning of her spiritual healing and deep knowledge of native people and lands: "I am more, at this moment, than myself. I am them. I am the old. I am the land. I am Amma and the panther. It is all that I am. And I am not afraid anymore of the future or the past. But still I'm torn through. I sit and can't move" (173). Through her character of Omishto, Hogan encourages dialogic, polyphonic and ecologically-conscious transformation in her readers as well.

Involvement of dream, reality and myth in the novel blurs boundaries. Dreams are significant in the novel in that Omishto decides to live in her Taiga community after her dream of lizards and snakes. Unlike Western understanding that reptiles are evil beings, snakes and lizards evoke "the circular life philosophy of continuity, reciprocation, and holistic living (nurturing spiritual, mental, physical, and emotional needs)" for Hogan (Dreese, 1999: 8). After her dream, Omishto recognises that she

belongs to the Taiga world and embraces native ways of living: “I leave this world. I leave war and fear. I leave success and failure, owned things, rooms of the light that was once a river and is now reduced. I leave the radio, the manners of living” (Hogan, 1998: 232). It reveals the power of dreaming in that dreams become part of reality and encourages one to reach inaccessible points as Omishto’s dream guides her towards her wider Self and true home. In a similar vein, Ama dreams that she has been told to find the panther to sacrifice it in order to restore balance in the world. She “believes her faintest move or thought is governed not only by spirits but by the desires and dreams of animals who are people like ourselves, in different skins” (189). The myth of Panther Woman is also a carnivalesque removal of binaries as it intermediates between human and animal worlds, engaging both worlds in dialogue. The myth becomes Ama’s reality and an essential part of her life, which Omishto inherits after Ama.

Ama is a Native American trickster in the novel with her Bakhtinian dialogic tendency (Vizenor, 1989: 191). She is “comic and communal, individual and tribal, whole and freestanding, signified and signifier, a contradiction, healer and destroyer, often a necessary ‘evil’ that brings ‘good’” (Bowen-Mercer, 2003: 167-168). Becoming Panther Woman to bring her community hope for survival by sacrificing herself, she is a carnivalesque trickster that crosses the borders of all time and space. She is changeable, “admired and ridiculed”, and she is in dialogue with the nonhuman and spirit worlds (Hogan, 1998: 16). She is both human and animal, both past, present and future, both the killer and the killed, both creator and destroyer. Living between the Taiga and white worlds, she lives “halfway between the modern world and the ancient one” (23). Though she exists in the present time, she is like “from another time […] and out of place in this world” (23).

Exploring the crossroads of lives and cultures and intersections of times and spaces, Hogan questions the linear continuum that separates one time from another and one space from another. She rather favours tribal time in her writing as it provides a paradoxical “stillness within the present moment within the immediate setting, and [a] reconnection with the past and the present rather than [a] flight toward an ever-receding future” (Rainwater, 1999: 115). While the Euro-American looks ahead to reach the exit and to get the ending without living, the Native American moves in a circle living everywhere in time and space. As Paula Gunn Allen wrote, “the traditional concept of time is timelessness, as the concept of space is of multidimensionality. In the

ceremonial world the tribes inhabit, time and space are mythic" (1986: 147). As Omishto expresses, referring to multidimensionality and timelessness:

> Ama once said that space is full and time is empty; I think now I understand this. We are surrounded by matter, but time disappears from us. Or maybe, as Ama says, there are other worlds beside us all the time and every now and then we cross over and enter one, and every so often, too, one passes over and enters ours. (Hogan, 1998: 55)
> For Ama the other world is visible. It lives beside us in trees and stone. She can see it, like a path of light across water, and hear it in the swamps at night. She has touched it. The strange visitors she sees from out of the past are proof that time is not a straight line, that the course of time is a lie, and earth is still growing as it did a million years ago. (189)

Although the novel is a product of imagination and is so considered as a fictional story, it actually has references to some real events in history as in *Solar Storms*. For instance, the Taiga tribe presented in the novel reminds the reader of the Seminoles, who are a small Indian tribe in southern Florida. Similar to the Taiga people in the novel, the Seminoles believe that they are relatives of the golden panther, which is on the verge of extinction in South Florida as well. Winona LaDuke explained that the Seminoles and the golden panther lived in most parts of the Florida Everglades two hundred years ago. However, the increasing intrusion of anthropocentric developers in the region resulted in environmental pollution, ecological degradation of the land and fights between the Seminoles and the panther to survive in the little remaining part of the land (1999: 27). It shows that native people, land and the panther all depend on each other, and when one of them is abused, so are the others. Native people, the land and the panther have all been colonised and are on the brink of extinction. In addition, Ama's trial is based on a true event, the trial of James E. Billie, a Seminole Indian, in 1983, for violating the U.S Endangered Species Act for hunting a Florida panther, at the end of which he was not found guilty as well ("United States v. James E Billie", 1987). Such interrelation between the fact and fiction, or truth and imagination, provides harmonious transition of an objective and unalterable reality into multiple subjective realities and intercultural possibilities. Therefore, stories and storytelling become very significant for Hogan and for the American Indian people. Omishto utters towards the end of the novel that "[e]veryone has their theory. But these are only their stories and they need their stories, even if they aren't the truth. Stories are for people what water is for plants" (Hogan, 1998: 227). Stories are of great significance for Omishto on her way to Self-

realisation to find her true identity, to resist anthropocentric, ethnocentric, authoritative and hierarchical ideologies, and to develop an ecological awareness of the responsibilities human beings have towards nonhuman beings. Since stories do not only effect worldviews but also create a world, Hogan seeks to restore the natural world and indigenous land through native rituals and by "re-story[ing] a narrative lineage that links [readers] to the natural whole" (Schauffler, 2003: 21).

At the end of the novel, Omishto stands for a carnivalesque transformation from Western individualism into native communality, combining within herself two different cultures and backgrounds that could end anthropocentrism, ethnocentrism, patriarchal officialdom and hierarchy, which is also displayed in Hogan's writing style in which she unites native oral tradition with her written novel. In this way, Hogan invites readers of both cultures to participate in her cross-cultural text so as to set up a dialogic relationship between two backgrounds, two worldviews and two spheres, which celebrates dialogism, polyphony, multiplicity, mutuality and revival while ending monologism, exploitation and devastation. To put it in Eco-Bakhtinian terms, Hogan's novel is polyphonic and multivocal as it involves voices and dialogue of the human, nonhuman and nature; it is chronotopic and multitemporal as it connects the past, present and future in an ecologically-imbalanced landscape, and it is multiscalar as it addresses to individuals, communities and to the entire globe. The author indicates humans' blindness to the nonhuman agency and deafness to what the nonhuman world says, and endeavours to recover a forgotten tradition of listening to nature, focusing on the agency and answerability of the nonhuman as "[t]he animals have eyes that see us. The birds, the trees, everything knows what we do" (Hogan, 1998: 59). Although the novel describes some human and nonhuman beings as victims of anthropocentric, ethnocentric and phallocentric ideologies and hierarchies, portrays social and environmental injustices in the past and irrevocably changed landscapes, and presents yearning for a dialogic and an ecologically-balanced past, it still prompts some positive changes in the reader in the first place and then in all humans in their attitudes towards nature for the future of all entities.

To sum up, dealing with the renewal of the self, restoration of the nonhuman world, and healing of a broken connection between human and nonhuman beings, Hogan offers the reader a creative ecological imagination of an anthropogenically ruined indigenous world, which can be explained by a carnivalesque cyclical renewal, as Omishto goes home to her self and identity, to her native people and to the

indigenous way it was in the native lands before "humans have broken their covenant with the animals, their original words, their own sacred law" (190). As Florida is a region conquered first by the Spanish, Hogan can combine both American Indian and Latin American literary traditions in her narrative, providing dialogic tendency and cross-cultural understanding to enable her readers to respect and protect natural environment, to help threatened indigenous cultures and people, and to embrace holistic and ecological thinking as their worldview. That is, the author asks her readers to develop a dialogic and an eco-conscious worldview that embraces connection instead of fragmentation. As in the relationship between Omishto and Ama as well as Ama and the panther, Hogan asks her readers to open their minds to alternative and eco-conscious ways of knowing the animals and the realm of nature. Acknowledging on her road to Self-realisation that she is part of something larger than herself, Omishto has healed her spirit and revived in a new, dialogical and an ecological life among her Taiga people in her indigenous land.

Throughout the novel, Hogan reminds the reader to recover their ecological sense and to restore what connects them to the land they inhabit as "[i]n the old days when we were beautiful and agile, we asked the animals to lay down their lives for us and in turn we offered them our kinship, our respect, our words in the next world over from here, our kind treatment" (229). What Hogan emphasises in the novel is that balance can only be maintained by inclusion instead of exclusion, which can be attained by active and dialogic participation of all human and nonhuman entities in the world. Hogan reveals that the real power comes from ecological reciprocity, complex negotiation and dialogic relations. The novel ends in carnivalesque atmosphere with Omishto's dance and song, suggesting hope for survival: "I dance and as the wind stirs in the trees, someone sings the song that says the world will go on living" (235). Inviting her readers to bear witness to destruction and reconstruction and to participate in healing of the nonhuman world and in ecological integrity of both human and nonhuman worlds, Hogan tries to show the reader that change happens and that hope for survival and possibility for a meaningful and green existence still exist. Power, thus, actually lies in such hope for environmentally responsible humans and possibility to change the world for a better, greener, dialogic and polyphonic future.

CHAPTER FOUR
ECO-BAKHTINIAN ANALYSES OF JEANETTE WINTERSON'S SELECTED ENGLISH NOVELS

This chapter intends to study how Jeanette Winterson degrades anthropocentric, patriarchal and hierarchical discourse in her selected novels in order to reconstruct environmental discourse in the face of anthropogenic environmental crises and to show Eco-Bakhtinian space. This chapter, through Eco-Bakhtinian analyses of Winterson's selected novels, discusses what positions human and nonhuman beings take in each other's worlds, whether human beings establish dialogues with nonhuman entities, how Bakhtin's concepts of carnivalesque and grotesque are related to Winterson's ecological stance, and how dialogic relations and polyphonic voices in selected novels reflect Winterson's deep ecological imagination.

Sexing the Cherry (1989) is examined in the first part of this chapter while *The Stone Gods* (2007) is analysed in the second part to find out agency, subjectivity and voices of nonhuman entities within the white human community. These novels, which portray the effects of the human on the nonhuman and those of the nonhuman on the human in ecologic sense, are studied with references to Bakhtin's concepts of carnivalesque, dialogism, polyphony, grotesque and chronotope, which are re-evaluated in ecocritical theory, and to Arne Naess's ecophilosophy of deep ecology movement.

4.1. Grotesque Responses to Eco-Crises in *Sexing the Cherry*

Winterson in her grotesque novel offers a vivid description of societal restrictions, political hegemony and control, authorial inequalities and environmental degradation in multiple contexts, leading the reader into questioning monologic discourses of anthropocentrism and androcentrism. Questioning the master constructions of self/other, the real/fantastic, story/history, natural/unnatural, material/immaterial, human/nonhuman and nature/culture, Winterson gives voice to the monstrous, the mostly-feared, the ignored, the muted and to the oppressed, including all human beings regardless of their gender as well as nonhuman life forms in order to deconstruct authoritarian power relations and societal discrimination and to eliminate patriarchal prejudices. *Sexing the Cherry* (1989) is quite viable to examine under the lens of Eco-Bakhtinian approach with the aim to create environmental discourse since

the novel can be regarded as an attempt to disable Cartesian dualism as well as authoritarian power relations of patriarchy, hierarchy and religious dogmatism. This part of the chapter brings *Sexing the Cherry* into new dialogue with Bakhtinian concepts about complex relations between human/nonhuman and natural/unnatural bodies, the material/immaterial selves, the beautiful/monstrous, time/space, mother/son and man/woman. The novel focuses on conveying environmental messages, with its satiric and polyphonic voice as well as grotesque and carnivalesque tendency, about the effects of authoritarian, hierarchical and patriarchal attitudes of the human on human and nonhuman communities, by focusing on events during the periods between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries in which religious, monarchical, political, societal and environmental conflicts of England are narrated through the perspectives of Jordan, Dog Woman, Nicholas Jordan and the unnamed environmentalist woman.

Sexing the Cherry provides a Bakhtinian reading for the argument of the thesis through its non-apocalyptic yet environmentally problematic, grotesque and satiric content which is framed by an ecocritical treatment of historiographic fiction. The novel carnivalises dominative discourses of religious dogmatism, Puritanism, monarchism, anthropocentrism and androcentrism, which all have greater impacts on negative transformation of nature. Winterson provides an ecocentric novel that reveals environmental problems on local scales and offers carnivalesque and deep ecological solutions. The author carnivalises authoritarian binaries and ardently argues that the fixed categories of mind/body, culture/nature, male/female, human/nonhuman and material/immaterial are actually unstable and constantly fluid. Her ecological imagination that encourages the fluidity of borders between nature/culture, female/male, human/nonhuman and material/immaterial contributes to the merging of Bakhtin's grotesque with ecocriticism. The aim of grotesque ecological imagination here is to bring forth the ignored and silenced human and nonhuman beings, to explain their presence and subjectivity, and to reveal their voice and agency.

Focusing on the relativity of history to every person in reality, or to any character in the novel, Winterson rewrites history by offering alternative narratives that leap from one reality to another, one view to another, and one time period to another. The novel consists of three parts: the past that goes back to the seventeenth century, the present which is a short twentieth-century interval portraying the doubles of the seventeenth-century characters, and the fable which draws on the story of twelve dancing princesses who have now become eleven since one of them has escaped and

appears here and there in the novel. All these three parts are interconnected because each event is defined by what it connects to and where it heads owing to their inherent dialogical dynamism. Each part crosses with the others at changing points of time, place, gender and atmosphere. Time flows backwards and forwards, and the multitude of genres including history, fairy tale, philosophical meditation, numbered aphorisms, didactic sermons, numbered paintings and fruit images intervene in the novel breaking the main narrative and temporospatial unity. The first part, which is the story of the past, is the main frame of the novel and focuses on Dog Woman, her adoptive son Jordan and the traveller and naturalist John Tradescant. They all live in London in the seventeenth century, experiencing the political and social upheavals between the faithful and ardent monarchists and pleasure and luxury-denying Puritans, and witnessing the trial and execution of King Charles I, the civil war, the Great Plague and the Great Fire of London. The story is alternately narrated from two internal points of view, two involving narrators who are given at the beginning of each section with the fruit image of a banana for Dog Woman and a pineapple for Jordan. Dog Woman tells accounts of historical events and everyday life of the period in comic and self-ridiculing tones while Jordan tells his fantastic voyages to unmapped lands in dreamy and more poetic tones. While Dog Woman describes the reality and possesses more masculine qualities, Jordan describes the fantastic and utopian and has more feminine qualities, which manifests a kind of reversal of sexual and gender identities. While Jordan lives a fantastic life during his journeys by transgressing time and space in quest of identity and meaning, Dog Woman remains in a real society struggling to overthrow authority and hierarchy in human and nonhuman communities. Jordan questions the fixity and linearity of time and space through his fantastical wanderings while Dog Woman questions stability of the body. That is why Jordan is described by time and space whereas Dog Woman is described by her grotesque body.

The second part is the present which is a short contemporary interval portraying the doubles of the seventeenth-century characters. The second part begins with the portrayal of an unknown artist, standing for the royal gardener John Rose, presenting the pineapple to King Charles II, the very same fruit that Jordan had presented to the new king after his return from Barbados. Winterson explained in an interview that she was inspired for the novel by a painting, by some unknown Dutch artist, who pictures the presence of the first pineapple in England to King Charles II (Selway, 1992: 45). This part is centred on the young sailor Nicholas Jordan (Jordan) who joins the Navy

and the unnamed environmentalist woman (Dog Woman) who carries out a research about the contamination of a river in the twentieth century. The narratives of these two twentieth-century versions of Jordan and Dog Woman are given at the beginning of each section with the fruit image of a banana for the unnamed environmentalist woman and a pineapple for Nicholas Jordan, but these fruits are sliced into two halves this time. In the second part, in which the future of the past is handled, Nicholas Jordan touches on transition from Earth into space. He thinks that space films reflect humankind's undiminished hope for "a beginning, not a tired old end", which makes him want to cry (Winterson, 1990: 138). Through the history books under Nicholas Jordan's bed, the present moves back to the past without informing the reader but with the re-appearance of the fruit images of banana and pineapple as a whole.

The third and the last part is the fable section in which the story of the twelfth princess Fortunata's search for Artemis is told. Fortunata is a dance teacher and teaches her students to become points of light, which is a theme given in one of the epigraphs of the novel about the nature of light, time and space.[20] Fortunata is the woman whom Jordan has been searching for in all his travels and imagining to be reunited with in the end. At the end of this part, multiple identities of Fortunata and Artemis, who are one and many dancers, one and twelve, and one and the other at the same time, are imbricated on each other. Winterson rewrites the "Twelve Dancing Princesses" fairy tale to signify her rejection of patriarchal expectations and exploitation. Unlike the conventional tale, Winterson's tale represents the princesses emancipating themselves from their husbands' authority. They gather under the roof of a female community rather than yield to the tradition of living happily ever after. The silver city where the Twelve Dancing Princesses inhabit is a carnivalesque space since it is depicted as an ideal place in which the inhabitants' only occupation is to dance and since it liberates women from patriarchal bounds. All these temporospatial dimensions are connected to each other through different variations of the main characters, who are Jordan/Nicholas Jordan and Dog Woman/the unnamed environmentalist woman. Characters are dialogic in the novel as they are constantly engaged in a relationship with each other and the outer world intertemporally and interspatially.

[20] "Matter, that thing the most solid and the well-known, which you are holding in your hands and which makes up your body, is now known to be mostly empty space. Empty space and points of light. What does this say about the reality of the world?" (Winterson, 1990: v).

The novel has dual narrators, including a 'masculine' female narrator, Dog Woman, characterised by her grotesque features and a 'feminine' male narrator, Jordan, whom Winterson uses to deconstruct the concepts of gender identity and suggest fluidity of borders between female/male and nature/culture. These two narrators, together with their twentieth-century correspondences Nicholas Jordan and the unnamed environmentalist woman, reveal how identity transgresses temporal and spatial boundaries through the time-shift between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries. Jordan and Dog Woman are the characters of the seventeenth century, and each has a twentieth-century alter ego that shows similar qualities and attitudes. While Dog Woman of the seventeenth century is portrayed as an angry attacker on the Puritans who execute King Charles I, the unnamed woman in the twentieth century is presented as an environmental activist who fights against the contamination of a river with mercury by big business corporations and the government. Both Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman can be read as positive and assertive characters, signifying female empowerment and agency.

The twentieth-century unnamed environmentalist woman shares Dog Woman's fantasies, behaviour and sense of self. Like Dog Woman, the unnamed environmentalist woman is also very disillusioned and annoyed after her unfortunate sexual intercourse and fantasises cannibalism. Just as Dog Woman fights the Puritan hypocrites, with sometimes grotesque results such as the mutilation of two of them in a brothel, the twentieth-century woman also fights modern Puritans, politicians and businessmen for environmental reasons. The latter woman envisions destroying the World Bank, reconstructing the Pentagon and kidnapping world leaders, which she recalls having similar memories and feelings about the year 1649. While Dog Woman threatens the hypocrisy of the Puritan society with her unearthly form of existence, the unnamed environmentalist woman threatens the anthropocentric society with her unattainable otherness. As Paulina Palmer emphasized, however, "[b]oth women are ridiculed as 'monsters' – Dog Woman on account of her exceptional size and strength, which are regarded as unfeminine, and the present-day figure on account of her radical views and commitment to a politics of direct action" (1993: 103). In other words, both Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman share their aggression against the patriarchal order of society in that the former challenges phallocentric oppression for a more egalitarian community while the latter is hostile to phallocentric authority, dreaming about compelling men to change their views about the natural world and

teaching these men the principles of feminism and ecology so that human/nonhuman beings and female/male sexes could live in harmonious collaboration. That is why it is pertinent to say that Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman have "the strength to change self and world" (Rosemergy, 2000: 258).

Besides, Dog Woman's body extends in the unnamed environmentalist woman's body, though not grotesquely. She imagines herself to be Dog Woman. As she uttered, "[w]hen the weight had gone I found out something strange: that the weight persisted in my mind. I had an alter ego who was huge and powerful, a woman whose only morality was her own and whose loyalties were fierce and strong" (Winterson, 1990: 142). Dog Woman's filthy and grotesque body becomes beautiful and politically powerful in her twentieth-century manifestation. Through Dog Woman and her twentieth-century correspondence, Winterson introduces the grotesque body into the political realm in order to show "how the relation between the symbolic and cultural constructs of femininity and Womanness, and the experience of *women* (as variously identified and subject to multiple determinations), might be brought together towards a dynamic model of a new social subjectivity" (Russo, 1995: 54; emphasis in original). The author, thus, introduces the unnamed environmentalist woman into the same realm in order to reveal how the relation between the symbolic and the cultural constructs of nature and ecology/greenness, and experience in/with nature might be brought together towards a dynamic model of a new social and ecological subjectivity.

Jordan is Dog Woman's adopted son and he is portrayed as an apprentice who sails with John Tradescant – the historical botanist and plant collector, for early modern geographical exploration and scientific discovery. Jordan brings exotic fruits from his voyages to England. Dog Woman finds Jordan floating on River Thames, "[tying him] between her breasts whose nipples stood out like walnuts" (1990: 3). Jordan's name, thus, comes from the river since he was found in a river: "I wanted to give him a river name, a name not bound to anything, just as the waters aren't bound to anything. When a woman gives birth her waters break and she pours out the child and the child runs free" (4). Jordan's subjectivity suggests that identity is multiple and consists of fluid selves for each character. The fluidity between selves and characters is illustrated in his pursuit of Fortunata, who is the dancing princess whom he spends so much time questing for while inquiring whether he is seeking for the living woman or he is imagining his own dancing self. Being a male character in drag, Jordan cross-dresses to be closer to the twelfth princess Fortunata, which makes him a carnivalesque and

dialogic character. His cross-dressing provides him an understanding of women's private language and narrative and gives him the chance to get away from the patriarchal burdens of meeting gender expectations temporarily:

> I have met a number of people who, anxious to be free of the burdens of their gender, have dressed themselves men as women and women as men.
> After my experience in the pen of prostitutes I decided to continue as a woman for a time and took a job on a fish stall.
> I noticed that women have a private language. A language not dependent on the constructions of men but structured by signs and expressions, and that uses ordinary words as code-words meaning something other. (29)

When he takes a job on a fish stall, the female owner of the fish stall warns him "never to try and cheat another woman but always to try and charge the men double or send them away with a bad catch" because the female owner degrades men seeing them as "children with too much pocket money" (29-30). In crossing into feminine territory, Jordan recognises the fluidity of reality and transitoriness of feelings. Winterson reflects the hopeful power of travesty and masquerade in case of Jordan's attempt to take part in women's world. In other words, the author "redress[es] the wrongs of monstrous patriarchy" when Jordan questions why women are not given space by men (Martin, 1999: 203). In doing so, Jordan disables the binary between masculinity and femininity. His search for Fortunata can be read as a quest for his own feminine side as he "began to find evidence of the other life" (Winterson, 1990: 3). Jordan's travesty, which is "cultural perversion as cultural subversion", is "only a temporary strategy to facilitate a break from imposed restrictions; it cannot enact permanent authentic social change" (Doan, 1994: 151). Another event that reflects Jordan's carnivalesque side is that he shares his story of soul-search with the locals at a marketplace in which "exotic fruit and speckled fish" are sold, which is a carnival space that allows him for exploration, expression of his desires, and seduction (Winterson, 1990: 37).

While Jordan in the seventeenth century searches for Fortunata, Nicholas Jordan in the twentieth century, a modern sailor who has the same passion for boats and sailing as Jordan has, also pursues a woman who has aroused his interest due to her environmentally activist protests against the pollution of a river with high mercury. Both Jordan and Nicholas Jordan share a striking resemblance in that they are interested in becoming a hero, which they can never attain. Jordan cannot fulfil the heroic ideals of masculinity as he is overwhelmed by his grotesque mother who acts more resolutely. By

the same token, Nicholas Jordan cannot perform heroic acts despite his upbringing with the *Boys Book of Heroes* as he is overshadowed by the unnamed environmentalist woman who possesses more heroic qualities in her defence of the mercury-contaminated river. Additionally, Jordan admires his mother while Nicholas Jordan admires the unnamed environmentalist woman.

Winterson compares and contrasts two main narrators whose bodily depictions challenge the narrative categories of narrator and agent. While Jordan is considered to be the representative of traditional heroic story on the surface, it is actually Dog Woman who undermines male heroic values and suggests an alternative carnivalesque story. Therefore, Dog Woman becomes both the narrator and agent of her own story as her story environs Jordan's. In a similar vein, while Jordan seems to be the agent in the story of his happily-ever-after search for twelfth princess, Fortunata is actually the agent in Jordan's story as she refuses to go with him. Women are represented as more influential agents of carnival than men in the novel because of the intrinsic sexual features of the former to construct alternate meanings.

There happens trans-corporeality between human bodies by travesty and temporal correspondence. All these four carnivalesque and dialogic narrators become a trans-corporeal site of non-officialdom, non-hierarchy and freedom as they are not stable, fixed and hierarchical bodies, but rather free, fluid, changing, developing, non-hierarchical and non-authoritarian bodies interacting and intra-acting with the physical and social environments. Dog Woman and Jordan represent the possibility of unfixed, fluid and free selves and gender identities with their twentieth-century reincarnations. The connections of Nicholas Jordan and the unnamed environmentalist woman of the twentieth century with their seventeenth century counterparts deconstruct linear history of progress and displaces identities into diverse fragmented selves. Winterson opposes the notions of monologic voice and of singular, self-determining, fixed and finished selves by insisting on dialogism, multiplicity, fluid and changing bodies and minds. By depicting twentieth-century incarnations of Dog Woman and Jordan, Winterson refuses to limit their existence and location in single time and space.

Set in the periods between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries, *Sexing the Cherry* questions the nature of history and the history of nature with a focus on the relation of fact to fiction. Although the novel has mostly been studied through theories of the postmodern, grotesque, queer, psychoanalysis and historiography, this part of the chapter examines the novel through ecocritical theory within the framework of

Bakhtinian concepts of the carnivalesque and the grotesque. The novel begins in the middle of the political and social turmoils of England in the seventeenth century with the execution of King Charles I and extends to the political and environmental turmoils of England in the twentieth century. Winterson carnivalises grand narratives in the novel through the use of historiographic metafiction, which includes postmodern techniques of parody, intertextuality, pastiche, fragmentation, frame breaks, self-reflexivity and rewriting of history, and degrades hierarchical ideology by negating closure, authority, boundary and giving value to instability, fluidity and transgression so as to oppose and undermine anthropocentric, androcentric and heterosexist discourses.

Kenneth McLeish finds the novel as culturally wide-ranging and considers it to be representative of the carnivalesque (1989: G7). The intertextuality of history, fairy tale, myth[21] and fantasy, multiple discourses of narrators of both sexes in two separate time periods, and thematic and formal structures of both pairing and counterparting are carnivalesque elements that convey multiple truths rather than a single absolute one. Winterson "rewrites the origins of European modernity – colonial exploration, the rise of empirical science and Enlightenment notions of the unified self" (Moore, 1995: 116). In doing so, the author retells modern understandings of single subjectivity, fixed identity and bounded body produced by the demands of the Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment, suggesting postmodern understandings of multiple subjectivities, fluid identities and unfinished bodies. Winterson creates a carnivalesque space that disturbs hierarchical and patriarchal structures in order for freedom, egalitarianism, mutual relationship and communality. Throughout the novel two different times occupy the same space, one of which is the historical time in which proper names and discoveries of men are given while the other is the fabulous time in which nameless female characters and their carnivalesque attitudes and grotesque actions as well as male characters' carnivalised worlds are given. That is why the novel is a hybrid of historical events and fantastic elements that challenge the anthropocentric, androcentric and hierarchical version of history. Winterson's employment of metafiction in the novel accomplishes two goals of environmentalist concern, the first of which is to raise the awareness of the reader about the existence of (an)other world(s) outside the given time-space dimension while the second of which is to bring out the connections and

[21] Winterson refers to the myths of Lotis and Priapus, Diana and Actaeon, and Sappho, which are all about metamorphoses concerned with the grotesque feature of death and birth at the same time: "Those who seem dead, who are already returning to the earth, can be restored to life, quickened again by one who is warm" (Winterson, 1990: 39).

relationships between two worlds. Winterson's idea of two-world systems, which refers to a well-running ecosystem, reflects Bakhtin's carnivalesque as these two worlds of the real and the fictional do not contend but cooperate, providing the text with multiple and intertwined stories that recount many worlds, lives and life forms interacting and evolving.

Winterson deals with the concepts of time, matter, history and reality through her interest in Einstein's relativity theory. The execution of King Charles I leads to an unpredictable and ambiguous future, at the point of which a continuing present stops time both in history and in the novel. As Alison Lee wrote, the novel "is set in the years leading up to and following 1649, the year in which King Charles was beheaded and Cromwell and the Puritans assumed power. […]", adding that "[b]oth these dates are very specific transitions, moments in which time seems to stand still because, although the past has led to these moments, nothing can explain how they are going to lead into the uncertain future" (1994: 220). Winterson negates the traditional concept of time, by exploring it as imaginatively-constructed carnivalesque dimension in which past, present and future can exist at the same time, which can be exemplified by the distinction between philosophical and experiential aspects of time. For instance, Jordan experiences absolute time and space, which is Newtonian linear time, yet thinks about simultaneousness of time and space, which is Einsteinian relative time, because time cannot be stopped. The novel challenges the traditional concept of linear time and distinctions between the past, present and future in order to emphasise different simultaneous presents so that Dog Woman and Jordan can exist both in the seventeenth and twentieth centuries simultaneously:

> Thinking about time is like turning the globe round and round, recognizing that all journeys exist simultaneously, that to be in one place is not to deny the existence of another, even though that other place cannot be felt or seen, our usual criteria for belief.
> Thinking about time is to acknowledge two contradictory certainties: that our outward lives are governed by the seasons and the clock; that our inward lives are governed by something less regular – an imaginative impulse cutting through the dictates of daily time, and leaving us free to ignore the boundaries of here and now and pass like lightning along the coil of pure time, that is, the circle of the universe and whatever it does or does not contain. (1990: 101)

The novel's epigraph about the Hopi Indians and their tenseless language heralds Winterson's intention in that time is continuous to the Hopi Indians because the tenses

in the Hopi language are grammaticalised with the distinction between future and non-future tenses whereas the English language is based on the distinction between past and non-past tenses (Malotki, 1983). In the novel, human history repeats itself but differently, which thus connects the past and present so as to do something better about the future. The novel's discussion of Newtonian physics and seemingly absolute truths allows for carnivalesque deconstruction that suggests Einsteinian relativity and alternative temporospatial dimensions. As Lee pointed out, "[i]f there is a field in which time and space exist together, as Winterson suggests, then readers are as much part of that as the fiction we are reading" (1994: 228). That is, Winterson wants her readers to participate in the novel actively to track the narrative shifts and interweaving polyphonies so that readers can look for logical and thematic connections underneath the surface, which provides ecocentric tendency for the reader to recognise ecosystemic relations, which are not apparent all the time, in the real world of human and nonhuman beings:

> So what the universe doesn't contain is as significant to us as what it does. There will be a moment (though of course it won't be a moment) when we will know (though knowing will no longer be separate from being) that we are a part of all we have met and that all we have met was already a part of us. (1990: 102)

Dog Woman is the most outstanding grotesque character in the novel, with her flat nose and heavy eyebrows, with a few black and broken teeth, with caves in her face that are home for fleas, and with "fine blue eyes that see in the dark" (19). She is a Rabelaisian giant, raging against the hierarchy and authority of the patriarchal society. Causing a lot of trouble for the Puritan hypocrites in the novel, Dog Woman is a grotesque body ingesting the entire corpus of the Puritan culture by degradation, mockery and inversion. Her grotesque body shows carnivalesque resistance to patriarchy and hierarchy and presents agency against authoritarian and puritanical values. Instead of portraying Dog Woman with conventional female grotesque images of the womb, cavern or birth, Winterson rather presents her as the defender of freedom, boundlessness, complexity and reciprocity because she has the power to liberate society from dogmatism, monologism, completion and limitation. Dog Woman goes beyond the aspects of the traditional feminine beauty in her size and hideousness:

> I know that people are afraid of me, either for the yapping of my dogs or because I stand taller than any of them. When I was a child my father swung me up on to his knees to tell a story and I broke both his legs. He never touched me again, except with the point of the whip he used for the dogs.
> When Jordan was new I sat him on the palm of my hand the way I would a puppy, and I held him to my face and let him pick the fleas out of my scars. (21)

Her size degrades patriarchal culture's endeavour to control women's body and beauty in particular, and deconstructs anthropocentric and androcentric norms and boundaries in general. Dog Woman has a carnival body that overthrows gender identities and destabilises masculine power and potency. Having been certainly female by sex but not feminine by gender, Dog Woman's grotesque size makes traditional relationships within patriarchal culture unfamiliar and degrades power relations in androcentric society. Although she has the female anatomical structure, she can never consummate a sexual relationship with a man. She ridicules the phallic power when she sees that her male partner's penis is too small for her large vagina. She diminishes masculinity when she leaves her lover impotent and childlike as she comforts him in his failure of sexual intercourse and sings to him. What Winterson parodies or satirises here is not Dog Woman herself but the male in general in their reaction to a figure or an object that does not meet societal expectations. She is not fearful or violent by nature, she is rather considered to be monstrous because male characters think her to be savage and murderous. In this sense, she challenges the male gaze and androcentric worldview of her community.

By portraying grotesque female monster, Winterson denies "men the privilege of being the sole producers of monstrous portraits of women" in order to take "female monstrosity away from the hands of patriarchy" since "women have re-invented the carnivalesque image of the female body in order to use it to their own advantage" (Martin, 1999: 195). Winterson re-evaluates the image of woman as monster by celebrating Dog Woman's heroic qualities and by representing the insubordinate and transgressive aspects of femininity which patriarchy suppresses. However, Winterson's focus on the female grotesque does not mean privilege of women against the existence of men. The grotesqueness of the female body rather suggests an alternate space of survival for different kinds of entities in the face of anthropocentric, patriarchal and hierarchical dominion. This alternate space of survival, according to Canguilhem, "is

almost always a 'space' of some kind […], and this space is coded *feminine*, as *woman*" (1978: xix; emphasis in original).

Winterson employs gender-bending motif in her characters and, thus, has trans-corporeal attitude in her representations of the human and nonhuman. She produces the monstrous at the border between the male and female and between the human and nonhuman. She parodies stereotypes and traditional heroines so as to challenge boundaries. Likewise, deep ecologists also stand against all kinds of stereotyping by a central power because it leads to authoritarianism, monologism and alienation. For instance, Dog Woman is both heroine and ugly and has female anatomy and masculine power at the same time. Winterson's grotesque view of the female, therefore, suggests a positive and powerful image of womanhood and offers a kind of natural connection between the female body and the earth in terms of porosity since the grotesque, though associated with "the cavernous anatomical female body", is actually about the "low, hidden, earthly, dark, material, immanent, visceral" (Russo, 1995: 1). Dog Woman is protective and destructive as well as nurturing and overpowering at the same time. Dog Woman is an "incarnation of this world at the absolute lower stratum, as the swallowing up and generating principle, as the bodily grave and bosom, as a field which has been sown and in which new shoots are preparing to sprout" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 27). Having a sort of symbiotic life with fleas on her face and dogs she feeds, Dog Woman is closer to nonhuman than human beings and to nature than culture. Dog Woman herself associates nature with nurturing when she expresses her grotesque bond with Jordan and nature: "I nourished him as a hill of dung nourishes a fly, and when he had eaten his fill he left me" (Winterson, 1990: 4). Furthermore, Susan Onega points out her connection with nature, with the earth in particular, by explaining that "her love for Jordan and her mountainous shape clearly identify her with the earth, with its connotations of maternity, cyclical renewal and cosmic regeneration" (2006: 81).

Dog Woman is integrated into the world with her outgrowing and transgressive characteristic. She recognises that "London is a foul place, full of pestilence and rot", referring to the corruption, pollution and waste in the city (Winterson, 1990: 6). When Dog Woman warns men against their carelessness in terms of their phallocentrism by saying that "[i]t seems a great mistake on the part of nature, since men are so careless with their members and will put them anywhere without thinking", Winterson actually seeks to warn them against their thoughtless androcentric intervention in nature (120). Male characters in the novel are mostly portrayed as an intervention in the process of

nature. What lies beneath men's desire of domination, taming and exploitation of nature is their fear of the unexpectedness or cosmic terror in Bakhtin's words. Winterson attempts to eliminate such cosmic terror in all human beings through the grotesque laughter.

Dog Woman is "'thick' with the materiality of the bodily present" (Pearce, 1994: 178). The reader is constantly reminded of her size, form, strength and filth. Her body cannot be separated from her identity because "it is hard to know where Dog-Woman's body ends and her personality begins, since she expresses herself by virtue of her bodily excesses" (Russell, 2000: 188). Dog Woman, who is called so as she keeps many dogs, does not want to be defined by a name, but she rather wants herself to be explored through her body which provides a transgressive space. The term Dog Woman, in this sense, implies a grotesque hybrid being that challenges conventional characteristics of womanhood. Winterson intermingles human and nonhuman body parts in intricate and fantastical designs in Dog Woman. She is actually a social body and is inseparable from the rest of the world since she is "blended with the world, with animals, with objects" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 27). She is depicted not to have been born but to have been released by a woman from a bottle like a genie. Her not having been born in natural ways can be associated with the subversive power of the cyborgs who are interested not in where they come from but in how they can survive (Haraway, 1991). That is why Dog Woman's grotesque body "is part of her ability to survive" (Russell, 2000: 188). In this way, Winterson rewrites the cultural myths of origins, motherhood and beautification by scatologically boasting the grotesque, ugly and the abject.

Although Dog Woman is grotesque physically, she has clean and lovely voice to be heard despite her rejection by the church and being despised within the community due to her appearance. Winterson, therefore, creates a female narrator whose body and voice are contrasting. Only through the act of singing that Dog Woman engages in fantasy world and liberates her imagination from boundaries and societal norms:

> Singing is my pleasure, but not in church, for the parson said the gargoyles must remain on the outside, not seek room in the choir stalls. So I sing inside the mountain of my flesh, and my voice is as slender as a reed and my voice has no lard in it. When I sing the dogs sit quiet and people who pass in the night stop their jabbering and discontent and think of other times, when they were happy. And I sing of other times, when I was happy, though I know that these are figments of my mind and nowhere I have ever been. But does it matter if the place cannot be mapped as long as I can still describe it? (Winterson, 1990: 8)

Dog Woman asks readers twice how hideous she is, which is a rhetorical question left unanswered by herself but left to be resolved by the reader (19, 21). Dog Woman's appearance and actions lead to carnivalesque feelings in readers in that they cannot decide whether they are supposed to be horrified or amused by her and her doings, by means of which Winterson provides grotesque laughter for readers with mixed emotions of horror and fascination as well as repulsion and laughter. Living up to her own morality, Dog Woman is ambivalent in that she "debases, brings down to earth, lends a bodily substance to things, and destroys" but she also protects and nurtures (Bakhtin, 1984a: 240). However, Dog Woman's degradations and destructions bring joy instead of fearful debasement to the society as she seeks to cleanse the city of hypocrisy. By invoking the grotesque in her novel, Winterson attempts to exorcise the world of its evilness imaginatively (Kayser, 1957: 185). To cite an example, Winterson carnivalises the Great Fire of London in 1666 by presenting in the novel that it is Dog Woman who burns the city to cleanse it of the Puritans, plague and corruption. Dog Woman, in this way, seeks to destroy the patriarchal society and hierarchical order in favour of more egalitarian and heterarchical community. By the same token, the unnamed environmentalist woman, along with Nicholas Jordan, burns the mercury factory to prevent it from polluting the river, which thus conveys that both men and women should work together to preserve nature and better the world because "the world [should] always be here, strong and certain, at the end of a day, at the end of a journey" with "[b]rown fields and a yellow moon" as depicted in the painting *The Sower* by Van Gogh (Winterson, 1990: 166). Nicholas Jordan emphasises that all roads lead to the nonhuman environment, to the wilderness, after all because all journeys are actually internal, down in humankind's "time tunnels and deep into the realms of inner space" that houses human's wider Self and provides deep ecological connection to the physical world (138).

To challenge Cartesian dualism that has alienated the human mind from the effects of the entities of the external world, which has given rise to anthropocentric tendency towards reducing the natural world and all its nonhuman inhabitants to knowable objects, Winterson tries to revive these nonhuman effects on human body and mind by degrading authoritarian social norms and hierarchical laws of the universe while elevating nonhuman subjectivity and agency. Both Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman refuse to be indifferent to the devastation of natural resources and environment and to the exploitation and oppression of the poor and nonhuman. Dog

Woman frequently mentions the pollution of River Thames, depicting the rubbish, dark mass and mud in the river: "The smells were the same, the river was filthy, the dredgers still bobbed about up to their necks in rubbish" (69). She also warns future generations about environmental problems because she believes that human beings are transforming nature against their welfare: "Now the future is wild and waits for us as a beast in a lair" (93). Dog Woman's twentieth-century reincarnation strengthens her relationship with nature more explicitly through her protests for the environment. She is presented as the renewed body of Dog Woman, possessing the same force but better organised. For instance, she envisions herself visiting the Pentagon and the World Bank, putting its members into large sacks, going "on foot to the butter mountains and wine lakes and grain silos and deserts and cracked earth and starving children and arms dealers in guarded palaces", forcing "all the fat ones to go on a diet" and compelling "all the men line up for compulsory training in feminism and ecology" to better the world and overthrow power and hierarchy for co-operation, symbiosis and equality, which are all fantasies about getting rid of hierarchy, patriarchy and anthropocentrism (Winterson, 1990: 141).

The unnamed environmentalist woman also ridicules the biblical creation of the world and suggests that they "have a party at the wine lake" on the seventh day after they change the world, and "make pancakes with the butter mountain and the peoples of the earth keep coming in waves and being fed and being clean and being well. And when the rivers sparkle, it's not with mercury…" (141-142). Protesting the post-industrial and capitalist state she lives in, the unnamed environmentalist woman tries to find the meaning of life in her pursuit of making the world ecologically better. Considered grotesque, not physically but spiritually, by the government, she seeks to make the ignored and the overlooked noticeable since she is also ignored and overlooked due to her activist campaigns:

> 'Stupid women's camping by some tiny river in the middle of nowhere and moaning on about the mercury levels. What does she want? Does she think industry can just pack up and go home? They've got to put it somewhere. It's not as though they're chucking it in the Thames'. (159)

Dwelling in a hut by the river just like Dog Woman who has also lived in a hut she built herself, the unnamed environmentalist woman lives closer to nature as well. She liberates herself from the conventionally accepted space for housing, offering an

alternative way of living. The image of river is also carnivalistically and chronotopically significant in that it signifies alternative temporospatial coordinates, or illustrates a new spatio-temporal consciousness, and describes the nature of time. That "[t]he river runs from one country to another without stopping" implies that time is a flow and there are no borders in the world because "even the most solid of things and the most real, the best-loved and the well-known, are only hand-shadows on the wall" (169). In addition, Dog Woman finds Jordan floating on River Thames, Jordan leaves her mother on the bank of black Thames, and the unnamed environmentalist woman sits by the same river contemplating her body, self and identity.

Jordan is another carnivalesque character with his sea voyages of the real and the magical real. According to Dog Woman, "[h]is head [is] stuffed with stories of other continents where men have their faces in their chests and some hop on one foot defying the weight of nature" (33). He lives a fantastic life during his journeys by transgressing time and space in quest of identity and meaning. He questions the fixity and linearity of time and space through his fantastical wanderings:

> Time has no meaning, space and place have no meaning, on this journey. All times can be inhabited, all places visited. In a single day the mind can make a millpond of the oceans. Some people who have never crossed the land they were born on have travelled all over the world. The journey is not linear, it is always back and forth, denying the calendar, the wrinkles and line of the body. The self is not contained in any moment or any place, but it is only in the intersection of moment and place that the self might, for a moment, be seen vanishing through a door, which disappears at once. (89-90)

Jordan's voyages disturb traditional view of colonisation, categorisation and wealth since he travels not to colonise or exploit but to find his true self and identity, not to categorise or limit but to blur the boundaries and graft diverse and complex lives onto each other since "every mapped-out journey contains another journey hidden in its lines" (19). Winterson criticises colonisation of untouched lands through Jordan's journeys to uncharted lands because journeys are done when human beings "[swarm] over the earth with [their] tiny insect bodies and [put] up flags and [build] houses" (90). During his non-linear and complicated journey, Jordan sails to the uncharted routes to reach his self, but every time he tries to narrow down his intent he expands it, and straits and canals still lead him to the open sea, and then he realizes how the matter of mind and self is vast. He is astonished by "the shining water and the size of the world" (117).

Both Jordan in the seventeenth century and Nicholas Jordan in the twentieth century sail out on a male-dominated ship, knowing masculinity's restrictions as they imagine an alternate supplement to their characters. In this sense, the ships become chronotope of passage through which these two male heroes have to pass before they can revise their gendered identities (Pearce, 1994: 182). Voyages of discovery become characters' internal journey of discovery since real geographical places are described in accordance with psychic travels, which means that time, space and consciousness are interporous and flexible. Journeys are of great significance in that characters adopt different perspectives and voices in different journeys through different imaginary spaces because "[e]very journey conceals another journey within its lines: the path not taken and the forgotten angle" (Winterson, 1990: 2). In this sense, these voyages offer multiplicity of form and voices and overturn Western patriarchal norms and anthropocentric subjectivity: "The inward life tells us that we are multiple not single, and that our one existence is really countless existences holding hands like those cut-out paper dolls, but unlike the dolls never coming to an end" (102).

Struggles of Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman as well as voyages of Jordan and Nicholas Jordan show that all these four characters seek to reach Self-realisation through different ways, either by their grotesque behaviour, cross-dressing, journeys to uncharted lands, protests and activism or by questioning time, space, future and gender issues. They are representatives of the deep ecological challenge that supports acknowledgement and admiration for differences in the world around human beings and that teach humans to live with (an)other life form(s). They all believe that they are inseparable parts of other nonhuman bodies in the physical environment – they are parts of a mountain, of the sea and of a plant which sustain their life.

Another carnivalesque feature in the novel is the fruit imagery. Winterson overturns the binaries of nature/culture and female/male by means of the fruit metaphor, which she uses to affiliate each character with a fruit against traditional expectations. In doing so, the author carnivalises the established Freudian symbolism by turning inside out the fruit images of pineapple and banana so as to underline the instability of matter and transience. She aligns Jordan and Nicholas Jordan with the pineapple, a conventionally female fruit, while Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman with banana, a traditionally male fruit. The reversal of the preluding fruits means reversal of gender roles and overthrowing cultural assumptions about femininity

and masculinity. Besides, each character in the seventeenth century is identified with the entire fruit whereas the twentieth-century characters are identified with the fruit sliced or split in two (Doan, 1994: 150). The sliced fruit denotes a transition between Jordan/Nicholas Jordan and Dog Woman/the unnamed environmentalist woman. If the fruit is split, then self-identity and gender identity are also split and not fixed, which is represented by Jordan's drag or masquerade. Cross-dressed as a woman, Jordan recognises transgression of fixed differences between female and male, nature and culture, and good and evil when he sees that women move from the bawdy house to nunnery nearby. Winterson, through such carnivalesque fruit imagery, challenges patriarchal gender constructions by degrading the differences between the female and male. In reference to Bakhtin's concepts of the observer and the outsideness, it can be here pointed out that Winterson argues that no object can be viewed as a whole because each observer, which means each participant in the world ecosystem, sees that object in different circumstances and from different perspectives.

The metaphor of plant grafting is another carnivalesque element of great significance. The title of the novel draws on the sexing of a cherry tree onto which Jordan practices the act of grafting after bringing exotic seeds and pods with him from the Bermudas. Jordan performs "the grafting of Polstead black cherry on to a Morello cherry stock, the resulting hybrid being a female" (Makinen, 2005: 82). Winterson has preferred the cherry fruit because it stands for the cycle of life as well as death and rebirth (Chevalier and Gheerbrant, 1996: 187). According to Jordan, grafting is "the means whereby a plant […] is fused into a hardier member of its strain, and so the two take advantage of each other and produce a third kind, without seed or parent" (Winterson, 1990: 84). This third kind is a hybrid being that represents diversity, complexity and possible identities, which becomes a carnivalesque and dialogic challenge to categorisation of species and identities hierarchically and structurally. Jordan is very attracted to the idea of plant grafting since he wants to "become someone else in time, grafted on to something better and stronger" (87). As Jordan believes that his body limits him and he longs to go beyond his body, he wants to abandon his male body in order to "be free of the burdens of [his] gender" (28), and give himself the slip (2). While Winterson uses the image of grafting to challenge binaries of fixed categories, to upset the hegemonic order of authority and patriarchy, and to suggest new possibilities and fluid alternatives in terms of plants, gender identities and dialogic relations on the one hand, she also uses it to ridicule the anthropocentric and

androcentric attitude of sexing the fruits in order to stress subversively humans' non-ecological intervention in the natural world and exemplify humankind's unnatural practice on the other hand. Sexing the fruit is a source of grotesque laughter because both black cherry (Prunus serotina) and Morello cherry (Prunus cerasus austera) – and most cherry fruits – are hermaphrodites, which means they have both male and female organs and are pollinated by insects and bees respectively (Plants for a Future, n.d: n.p.). Considering the grafted female-sexed cherry as grotesque and monstrous, Dog Woman consequently opposes the idea of plant grafting and believes that "the world [should] mate of its own accord […] or not at all" (87).

The concept of naming is another carnivalesque issue in the novel. Like Dog Woman, the unnamed environmentalist woman also refuses to be named and she wants to be described not by a single quality but by multiple qualities: "If I have a spirit, a soul, any name will do, then it won't be single, it will be multiple. Its dimension will not be one of confinement but one of space. It may inhabit numerous changing decaying bodies in the future and in the past" (144). Although women are generally nameless or they are called by various names except for their own in traditional texts, both Dog Woman and the environmentalist woman deliberately refuse to be named because naming categorises and limits them according to the societal norms of patriarchy. In this way, Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman could be any woman, including the prostitutes, degraded urban dwellers, a witch living in the kennel and Artemis, that share similar aims and dreams within society. They are monsters and heroes at the same time, liberating humankind "from all forms of inhuman necessity that direct the prevailing concept of the world" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 49). Refusals of Dog Woman and the unnamed environmentalist woman to be defined mean anomaly or grotesque for the official society as they are considered to threaten the so-called integrity of anthropocentric and androcentric culture. However, they are microcosms mirroring a broader system – ecosystem. Their grotesque sides show their resistance to the male gaze and reveal their consciousness of the natural elements of fire, earth, water and air within them (Bakhtin, 1984a: 318). These two characters, in this sense, signify a transversality of Bakhtinian and ecocritical theories as they are grotesque bodies, diverse female selves, agents instead of objects, and protagonists instead of minor characters in the world of men.

Winterson reflects her ecological stance in her narration style as well. The novel's chronology reflects the narrator's cycling motion. The narrators direct their

ways through diverse spatiotemporal pathways, telling the same story, or narrating the same event, from different perspectives to reject anthropocentric and phallocratic grand narratives and to provide for other characters in the novel and readers in the reality with an ethical compass for ecology. The end of the novel turns out to be its beginning in that Jordan walks in the fog at the beginning of the novel while he touches a face in the fog after the Great Fire at the end of the novel:

> "I began to walk with my hands stretched out in front of me, as do those troubled in sleep, and in this way, for the first time, I traced the lineaments of my own face opposite me" (1990: 1-2).
> "For a second the fog cleared, and he saw that the stranger was himself" (1990: 168).

In conclusion, Winterson criticises the hypocrisy of the dominant social order, hierarchy, organised religion and pre-established morality through her grotesque representation including the distortion of natural size and shape, the suspension of category of entities and the fragmentation of the historical order and the self. Fruitfully fusing together historiographic fiction and magical realism, the novel is comprised of history, fairy tale, fantasy, irony and parody. It retells historical events, characters and places in a detailed way through the voices and perspectives of larger-than-life characters that diminish authoritarian and hierarchical norms. Winterson seeks to create a carnivalesque space with multiplicity of self and voice and a dialogic world with infinite possible ways of existence. In this carnival, she desires that nothing be bought or sold and that only the instability, fluidity and interdependence of beings be explored.

Throughout the novel, Winterson focuses on the desire to change, the endeavour to create a new life out of its ashes and the insistence to celebrate all kind of existences without regard to norms and hierarchies. Winterson's novel tries to amend human relations through a re-assessment of the idea of the autonomous self by negating the patriarchally and hierarchically controlled and restricted self. The novel overthrows patriarchal gender and identity, attempting to offer a more open and free recognition of cultural differences, anotherness and monstrosities, providing a carnivalesque and dialogic remapping of cultural and social order. The self of characters in the novel is articulated in various languages of social and environmental interaction. Winterson believes that all human and nonhuman bodies are grotesque because all "physical bodies have a natural decay span, they are one-use-only units" (1990: 102). There is no clearly delineated static self of the characters as they constantly move between two worlds and

times imaginatively and materially. That is why neither the lands nor the selves can be completely charted as the landscape of selfhood shifts continuously. Winterson discusses the difference between the material and the cultural with references to the concepts of time, space, mind, body, sex, gender, human and nonhuman. Destabilising conventional norms, she degrades the priority and solidity of the material because matter is now "empty space and points of light" and it does not reflect the reality because "atoms is all [beings] are" (x). The idea of matter as empty space and points of light opposes not only the linearity of time but also the authority of bodily materiality and cultural meanings. As Winterson wrote in the introduction, the novel "is a challenge to the solid world of objects" (x). That is why the size, monstrosity, travesty or natures of the characters in the novel cannot be judged in traditional manners.

Winterson degrades the traditional body of the bourgeois and official culture that is "transcendent and monumental, closed, static, self-contained, symmetrical, and sleek" by portraying the grotesque body of the low and non-official culture that is "open, protruding, irregular, secreting, multiple, and changing" (Russo, 1995: 8). The four main characters in the novel want to escape the human limits of the body attributed by the official culture. Their desires, which nearly find expression in their own carnivalesque space, thus, imply unattained possible futures and spaces. Winterson rewrites history and re-depicts geography with fantastical wanderings and dreams, which all reveal the truth within the speakers – a truth that cannot be set in a single mind and body. The novel offers a fluid space for transgression in which characters exist in multiple time periods and have multiple voices and bodies. The author presents bodies without a beginning or an end as they transgress their own bodies, time and space.

Winterson emphasises her intention in writing the novel towards the end when she states that "[t]he earth is being murdered and hardly anyone wants to believe it" (1990: 145). She stresses that Earth is the only world and "the rest is rich imaginings. Either way it doesn't matter" because humans "have to protect both possibilities. They seem to be interdependent" (148). Winterson slips through the past in order to find out where characters in particular and humans in general have made a mistake and, thus, to recover what has been lost, which are love and respect for human and nonhuman beings. Liberating her characters from class, age, gender status and hierarchy, Winterson represents a carnivalesque world of optimism and of equality and union with the natural world. Bakhtin's view of carnival is, in some ways, nostalgic for a socially and

ecologically circulative context which has been lost, but which is possibly more significantly expressive of a future social and ecological horizon that may deliver new potentialities or chances of diverse speeches and social awareness for the natural environment and green performances.

4.2. The Carnival of Survival in *The Stone Gods*

Winterson in her highly imaginative futuristic novel offers a vivid depiction of environmental devastation and related issues of societal violations and inequalities in a multitude of contexts, urging the reader to think on the interrelated discourses of androcentrism and anthropocentrism that insist on binary oppositions. Questioning the master constructions of culture/nature, human/nonhuman, animate/inanimate and self/other, Winterson gives voice to the muted, marginalised and the oppressed, including women and nonhuman life forms so as to deconstruct authoritarian power relations and social discrimination. *The Stone Gods* is quite viable to examine through Eco-Bakhtinian approach with the aim to construct environmental discourse since the novel can be considered as an attempt to decrown Cartesian dualism and authoritarian power relations of patriarchal discourse. This part of the chapter brings *The Stone Gods* into new dialogue with Bakhtinian concepts about complex and dialogic relations between human and nonhuman beings, organic and technologically-enhanced/-altered bodies, animate and inanimate entities, and material and immaterial selves. The novel concentrates on conveying environmental messages, with its satiric, futuristic and carnivalesque voice, about the effects of anthropogenic transformations on the human, nonhuman and Earth. With this aim, this part of the chapter analyses these elements of complex relations in connection with Bakhtin's theories on carnivalesque, dialogism and chronotope in the late capitalist, high-tech and post-war community which is underlined by the obsession of consumption, aging and mastery as manipulated by financial corporations, media and hyper-technologies.

The novel gets its title from the Moai statues, which are known as stone idols made for pagan ceremonies, in Rapanui, whose indigenous name was changed to Easter Island after being colonised by Europeans. Before engaging in the critical exploration of the novel, it would be better to see how Winterson gave a recapitulation of the novel on her website:

> *The Stone Gods* is written in four parts; the first part begins on Orbus, a world very like earth, and like earth running out of resources and suffering from the severe effects of climate change. This is a world where everyone is bio-enhanced and bored to death. It is a world that has run out of possibilities. Then, a new planet is discovered, perfect for human life. This planet, Planet Blue, has only one drawback – the dinosaurs. A mission leaves Orbus to get rid of the dinosaurs. Our guide through the novel is Billie Crusoe, a disillusioned scientist in Parts 1, 3, 4, and a young sailor, (Billy), in Part 2, which is set on Easter Island in the eighteenth century. Billie is part of the mission to Planet Blue, and so is Spike, a perfect robo-sapiens. What happens between them explores the boundaries between carbon and silicon life forms – in other words, what is a human being, how do we define what is human, and how do we define what is love and what is possible when love is present? (qtd. in Antakyalıoğlu, 2012: 977)

The Stone Gods provides a Bakhtinian reading for the argument of the thesis through its apocalyptic, dystopic and satiric content which is framed by a Bakhtinian ecocritical treatment of science fiction. The novel carnivalises dominative discourses of imperialism, nationalism, capitalism, anthropocentrism and androcentrism, which all have greater impacts on negative transformation of nature. As ecological devastation has been increasing more and more on local and global scales every day, Winterson has provided an ecocentric novel that strikingly reveals environmental problems and suggests ecologically carnivalesque solutions. Eco-Bakhtinian study of her novel shows that views, discourses, attitudes and tendencies of humankind should be examined together with positions of the nonhuman to recognise their mutual influences. Winterson carnivalises binary constructions and illustrates that the fixed categories of the human/nonhuman, animate/inanimate, material/immaterial and culture/nature are actually unstable and in constant flux. Her ecological imagination that encourages fluidity of borders between such binaries contributes to the merging of Bakhtin's carnivalesque with ecocriticism. The aim of carnivalesque ecological imagination here is to elicit the silenced nonhuman beings and show their presence, subjectivity, agency and voice at work. Such combination creates polyphonic voices and heteroglossic tendency which reveal the interaction of multiple human and nonhuman voices that express multiple ideologies from different ideological strata of human community and from different species in nature, which encourages intertextuality, intersubjectivity and intra-action. Micro-events and macro-events in the novel are explained by the principle of interconnectedness because each event is defined by what it connects to and where it heads because of their inherent dialogical dynamism.

This carnivalesque tendency and dialogical dynamism manifest itself within each of the novel's four parts, which follow "Planet Blue", "Easter Island", "Post-3 War" and "Wreck City" respectively. "Planet Blue", constituting the bulk of the work, is about the discovery of a new planet and tells the story of a new beginning for people in Orbus, which is a dying planet similar to Earth and is destructed by its people beyond the point of possible renewal. "Easter Island", dating back to the eighteenth century and breaking the science fiction frame for a while, deals with the power rivalry between patriarchal tribes that demonstrate their supremacy through grand stone idols on the island, which ends up with the destruction of both its human residents and the nonhuman environment. The parts "Post-3 War" and "Wreck City", narrating how planet Orbus has been transformed into an uninhabitable world, portray a crisis-ridden planet that has severely suffered from nuclear war. All these four parts are independent yet interrelated in the sense that social and environmental discourses and events converge in multiple contexts and different chronotopes. As the conflict of the novel, Winterson problematises the authoritarian attitude and its monologic discourse that imposes mastery, separation, alienation and otherness, which cause environmental calamities in the planet. In each part, the author carnivalises such power relations and dominant discourse through her characterisation and narration by subverting social and cultural binaries, official systems of thought and authoritarian style in literature that regulate human relations to nonhuman, culture to nature and gender identity.

There are five chronotopic settings in the novel, which are followed as Orbus, a futuristic planet similar to Earth, the entire resource of which is devastated and exploited by humankind; Planet Blue, a newly-discovered and an untouched planet to which Orbus people plan to move before life in Orbus completely ends; Easter Island, an island of the eighteenth century, which is ruined by its native people because of the power struggle; Wreck City, a futuristic city destructed by the nuclear war between the Central Power and the Eastern Caliphate; and Tech City, a futuristic high-tech city constructed after the nuclear war as a challenge to the Eastern Caliphate by the MORE Company, which is a corporate Company that controls the Central Power. As in *Sexing the Cherry*, Winterson's chronotopes in the novel synchronise the past, present and future because "everything is imprinted for ever with what it once was" (Winterson, 2007: 207). As the novel focuses on the story of "a repeating world", Winterson believes that future is a recalled past (59, 175, 241). All these five chronotopes are connected to each other through different variations of the main characters who are

Billie Crusoe/Billy and Spike/Spikkers like the double characters in *Sexing the Cherry*. The fact that there are distinct characters with similar names in the novel suggests that different bodies tell the same story or reality from their own points of view in their own time and space.

Billie Crusoe is the narrator and protagonist of the novel, who is mostly presented as a thirty-year old scientist working in Enhancement Services for the Central Power. Billie/Billy is androgynous and bisexual in her/his altering temporal and spatial dimensions throughout the novel. Winterson draws Billie Crusoe with various characterisations in each of the chronotopes. Billie in Orbus and Planet Blue is characterised as a woman scientist who is regarded as an activist by the government; she is casted, with the name Billy, as a seaman in Easter Island; she is drawn as an employee of the MORE Company in Tech City and interviews Spike, the first Robo *sapiens*; and she is presented as a wanted suspect of a terrorist act in Wreck City. Winterson uses the story of Robinson Crusoe as a pre-text in the novel, which shows carnivalesque mode of intertextuality. Through her character Billie/Billy Crusoe, Winterson carnivalises Daniel Defoe's titular character Robinson Crusoe, who stands for notions of imperialism and anthropocentrism, exploitation of nature, hierarchy and Western binaries between nature and humankind. Although Billie works to enhance lives of people in the Central Power, she/he opposes sacrificing the nonhuman world for the sake of hyper-technologisation of human lives, bodies and selves. In the same way, Billy opposes the power struggle between natives and colonisation of Easter Island by Europeans because these events have destroyed the nature of the island. Billie/Billy is the one who always questions the state of humanity in a so-called civilised, advanced and democratic futuristic world as well as in a religious, explored and colonised island because she/he is suspicious of humankind when the ecology of the planet is concerned.

Spike is also portrayed in two characterisations. Spike is depicted as a sexy, clear-skinned, dark-haired and green-eyed first Robo *sapiens*, who is the most recent achievement of the MORE Company, in Orbus and Planet Blue as well as in Wreck City and Tech City while portrayed as Spikkers, a native man and son of a sailor in Easter Island. Both Spike and Spikkers endeavour to prevent human beings from destroying nature by helping them take ecologically reasonable decisions and trying to end power struggles between different parties, in the end of which both Spike and Spikkers crumble to death. It must be thus stressed that Billie and Spike are carnivalesque manifestations that suggest travesty and cross-gender in aspects of

identity construction and are liberal and subversive in terms of their protesting, homosexual and interspecies tendencies in temporary and fluid settings. By destabilising gender differences, Winterson allows her characters to enter the lives of readers instead of laying passively on the page waiting for readers' interest. Accordingly, Winterson's figure of the gender-neutral narrator who undermines gender difference for the sake of human and nonhuman individuality is central to Bakhtin's carnivalesque decrowning of binaries. As Haraway also pointed out, "[g]ender might not be global identity after all, even if it has profound historical breadth and depth" (1991: 180).

The genderfree narrator in the novel destabilises readers' assumption of normative heterosexuality through bisexual and lesbian representations in order to close up the distance of difference in relationships between human and nonhuman beings through poetic metaphors. Just as deep ecologists Marti Kheel (1991) and Warwick Fox (1995) offer gender-neutral and non-sexist concept of the self in humans' experience of nature and their interaction with the nonhuman,[22] Winterson also makes use of gender-bending motif in her characters and, thus, has trans-corporeal attitude in her representations of the nonhuman because "[g]ender is a human concept […] and not interesting" (Winterson, 2007: 76). By disabling these anthropocentric and androcentric binaries in readers' mind, the novel offers deep ecological challenge to acknowledge and admire differences in the world around human beings and to teach them to live with (an)other life form(s). Such deep ecological stance encourages readers to change the way they perceive and interact with nonhuman environments without authoritarian norms and hierarchical binaries. Winterson, in this way, effaces the binaries of gender and sexuality, inspires respect for (an)otherness, and offers awareness of an existence of a reality outside the human self.

In *The Stone Gods*, Winterson focuses on three views that all emphasise carnivalesque and dialogic interconnection between the human and nonhuman. The first one is the thought that "[t]he universe is an imprint", which means that human beings are part of the universe because "it imprints [them], [they] imprint it" (Winterson, 2007: 105). The image of the imprint represents the inseparability of humans from the universe since they affect the universe with their doings in a destructive manner, which is why human beings "can never forget" the universe as "it isn't a 'something'" but it is

[22] See the discussions on pages 55-61 in Chapter 2.

an intrinsic part of them (105). This image embodies the carnival which "has a universal spirit" and "is a special condition of the entire world, of the world's revival and renewal, in which all take part" so as to live in it rather than seeing it as a spectacle (Bakhtin, 1984a: 7). The image suggests that the universe is neither imagination nor an abstract idea, it is rather experienced. The carnival sense of the world can be understood in the light of Bakhtin's view of the "great experience" (1996: 99), which can be associated with Naess's wider Self. The great experience suggests a global view of the complex and intricate life of human and nonhuman bodies and signs, and stresses the unavoidability of bodily contacts, which reveals how each human and nonhuman life is implicated in another's life. According to him,

> […] in the great experience, the world does not coincide with itself (it is not what it is), it is not closed and finalized. In it there is memory which flows and fades away into the human depths of matter and of boundless life, experience of worlds and atoms. And for such memory the history of the single individual begins long before its cognitive acts (its cognizable 'Self'). (Bakhtin, 1996: 99)

So Winterson, through Billie's voice, questions "what if [life] is a memory? What if this new world isn't new at all but a memory of a new world?" (2007: 105). Such great experience and wider Self are maintained through dialogics which rejects a closed view of meaning presented by a single voice and which opposes reductionism of living beings and spaces to a single authorial perspective. Billie and Spike experience that greatness in their relationship with and in their attitudes towards Planet Blue. According to Ivone Gebara, the universe is an animate and evolving organism, and human beings are inseparable part of the never-ending creative process in it. What Gebara expressed is that "[p]articipating in the creative evolution of life, we re-create ourselves. This is manifest in our ability to reflect and love, in our ethical behaviour, and in all the other capabilities that make us what we are" (1996: 14).

The second view is that human beings are entrapped in "[a] repeating world" due to their blindness to learn from their mistakes and their insistence on repeating the same mistakes again and again (Winterson, 2007: 59, 175, 241). In different chronotopes in the novel, human beings continue to destroy the planet they inhabit. Accordingly, Winterson replies her question about the memory of a new world by expressing "[w]hat if we really do keep making the same mistakes again and again, never remembering the lessons to learn but never forgetting either that it had been different, that there was a

pristine place? Perhaps the universe is a memory of our mistakes" (105-106). People in Orbus get a second chance of a lifetime when they find out a pristine and habitable new planet. It is Billie who questions whether people in Orbus merit a second chance as they are the ones who are completely responsible for the destruction of the planet and as there is no guarantee that they will not do the same thing on the new planet. Unless humans take on more responsibility for the care of the planet, the nonhuman environment will be continuously exposed to human damage and will be looked for alternative ones which are also doomed to destruction. The third and the last view is that "[l]ove is an intervention" that affects the outcome of human actions on the universe and that changes androcentric, anthropocentric, authoritarian and monologic tendencies towards more biocentric, ecocentric, egalitarian and dialogic ones (Winterson, 2007: 83, 217, 244). Winterson questions why human beings do not choose love instead of war (244). Therefore, Winterson emphasises love and respect for nature, landscapes and nonhuman entities in the first place, and then agrees to the use of technology for nonhuman and human survival, for contribution to resources of the planet, and for fixing the mistakes, which refers to Naess's idea of "tread[ing] lightly on Earth" (Naess, 1989: 97).

The Stone Gods is a cautionary novel about climate change, technocracy and ecological degeneration that reflects humans' ways of living in today's world. Winterson materialises the Anthropocene by storying it on an interplanetary scale. That is, Winterson's novel presents "humans as biosphere-altering geologic agent" and provides readers with "the chance to scrutinize in advance a geological record that will be legible only to the future" (Merola, 2014: 125-126). The narrative begins in the midst of Orbus citizens' plans about moving to Planet Blue and colonising the verdure of the new world, an event which is commercialised and advertised on radio and TV all the time:

> Red carpet, spinning lights, big band, girls in bikinis throwing blow-up beach balls of Planet Blue into the audience. Down the lit-up centre-aisle crucifix comes Martin Moody, TV host to the stars. The audience goes wild. Moody Media is mega.
> […]
> Martin Moody lifts up his hands like a politician —
> *There were two questions*. . . DRUM ROLL.
> *There were two answers*. . . DRUM ROLL.
> WHAT IS THE NAME OF THE NEW PLANET?
> WHAT DOES THE NEW PLANET WEIGH?

> TIE BREAKER: If YOU were in charge of Planet Blue, what would you do first? Tell us and Win!
> WIN! And you could be one of the first to visit the new world for the weekend! Sponsored by MORE *Life*, on-line on-land, the global company working for YOU. (Winterson, 2007: 40-41; emphasis in original)

Planet Blue, introduced to public through a speech like an advertisement in a kind of marketplace, is presented as a product to meet humans' needs. There are air pollution, global warming and nuclear contamination in Orbus planet, which are all anthropogenic destructions happening in the name of economic growth, technological development and governmental progress. Orbus is stripped of natural fauna and flora because of environmental devastations. Meat and vegetables are cloned in labs and produced in factories by means of high technologies since the natural and organic is perceived as dirty and diseased. People in Orbus have low IQs as they neither have knowledge of their history nor read and write. They also lose their ability to use a proper language because they are so engaged in using the language of advertisement and technology which is based on single-letter recognition lacking in syntax. Robots function in every corner of life, doing all the things for humans. Meeting every need of Orbus people, robots are numerous and have multifarious functions ranging from being house cleaners, cops, partners, tourist guides to pets, computers, cars and so on. However, the most advanced type of robot in Orbus is Robo *sapiens*, who is able to know, remember, think, evaluate, examine and criticise for the well-being of humankind. After destroying the planets they have inhabited, humans decide that they need Robo *sapiens* in order to survive in a destructed planet and to fix their previous mistakes in unspoiled Planet Blue:

> "What are you going to do?" [Billie] said. "Overthrow us?"
> Spike laughed. "Revenge of the Robots? No, but you see, Robo *sapiens* is evolving –
> Homo sapiens is an endangered species. It doesn't feel like it to you now but you have destroyed your planet, and it is not clear to me that you will be viable on Planet Blue."
> "Robots can't exist without humans," [Billie] said.
> "That was once true," said Spike. "It isn't true any more. We are solar-powered and self-repairing. We are intelligent and non-aggressive. You could learn from us." (Winterson, 2007: 79)

Spike, as the first example of Robo *sapiens*, is the most outstanding carnivalesque figure in the novel. Spike undermines the dichotomy between the creater and the created in the relation between the human and robot. Designed to help human leaders take planet-sized decisions, Spike is a carnivalesque body that challenges humans by bearing both human and nonhuman characteristics. Her being a cyborg also contributes to the carnivalistic interpretation of the text in the way that Spike is a Robo *sapiens* that destabilises the boundaries and hierarchical binaries between nature/culture, human/nonhuman, woman/man, animate/inanimate, natural/unnatural, living/dead, useful/useless and organic/inorganic among others:

> And yet. And yet Robo *sapiens* are not us, but they may become a nearer relative than the ape.
> ‘Humans share ninety-seven per cent of their genetic material with apes,’ said Spike, ‘but they feel no kinship.’
> ‘Do we feel kinship with robots?’
> ‘In time you will, as the differences between us decrease.’ (34)

Donna Haraway defined a cyborg as “a cybernetic organism, a hybrid of machine and organism, a creature of social reality as well as a creature of fiction” (1991: 149). Winterson carnivalises the border between a human being and a cyborg in the example of Spike by questioning the meanings of flesh, blood, metal, human and cyborg. As Billie uttered: “I forget all the time that she’s a robot, but what’s a robot? A moving lump of metal. In this case an intelligent, ultra-sensitive moving lump of metal. What’s a human? A moving lump of flesh, in most cases not intelligent or remotely sensitive” (Winterson, 2007: 99). Spike is a heteroglot body of both science and technology and material and social reality that offers historical and environmental transformations. This cyborg body, which is a not-human, not-nonhuman, not-woman and not-man corporeality, possesses an agency that influences human bodies and minds in trans-corporeal interchanges with nonhuman entities and landscapes. Spike as a cyborg signifies transgression of boundary between human and nonhuman in the way that “[f]ar from signalling a walling off of people from other living beings, cyborgs signal disturbingly and pleasurably tight coupling. Bestiality has a new status in this cycle of marriage exchange” (Haraway, 1991: 152). Spike combines the elements of both human and nonhuman in her body dialogically, standing for a symbiosis of two different species. What Winterson intended by creating this cyborg character is that she sought to do away with the otherness of all kinds since humankind achieves integrity by

accepting its intrinsic other, an ecocentric intention that suggests essential norms of deep ecology, which emphasize symbiosis, biodiversity and egalitarianism in Earth and respect for all organic and inorganic life forms.

Another carnivalesque feature in this cyborg is that Spike is wiser and more objective than humankind and knows more about human nature and history than humans know themselves, which is an ironical situation that turns inside out the mastery of human beings and degrades their anthropocentric hegemony. This wiser robot, designed to help humans correct their recurrent mistakes, signifies the better half of human beings. She can potentially reach Self-realisation in deep ecologic terms "because she isn't motivated by greed or power, because she isn't political or ideological" (Winterson, 2007: 160). Spike as a cyborg attempts to teach humans that they should not be "afraid of their joint kinship with animals and machines, not [be] afraid of permanently partial identities and contradictory standpoints" (Haraway, 1991: 153). Spike is evolving into an eco-conscious cyborg, presenting ego-conscious Homo sapiens "the hybrid natural-cultural, organic-technological, authentic-artificial nature of contemporary subject" (Hollinger, 2009: 274). What is ironic here is that Homo sapiens devolves into an object and monologic existence, losing her/his ability to use brain, while Spike as a Robo *sapiens* evolves into a dignified, dialogic and an eco-conscious subject. Spike's evolution is also carnivalesque in that it celebrates the grotesque principle of the open and constantly changing body in contrast to the disciplined or programmed body that the MORE Company circumscribes. Spike, in this way, claims her uniqueness and right to the self and individual consciousness instead of yielding to the orders enforced by the authority that has created and programmed her.

Along these lines, Spike is as animate as Homo sapiens in that she has evolved from being a mere superego function into a subject having its own ego although Robo *sapiens*, which is "the big breakthrough", is created for reason rather than feeling (Winterson, 2007: 17). She is a cyborg that can feel, love, have sex, empathise and read poetry among other things. Bakhtin's focus on the process, becoming and growth of the individuals and communities in folk culture is represented through the evolution of the robot in the novel's case. To give a simple example, just as the king becomes the clown during Bakhtin's carnival, humankind also becomes the clown degraded by Spike, a gay half human-half robot entity, in Winterson's novel. Spike illustrates Eco-Bakhtinian theorisation of the body, which means that the carnivalesque body is not regarded as a hierarchical, subordinate, static, fixed, stable and unalterable entity and its presence is

not confined to only one temporal and spatial territory. "[C]ontinually return[ing] to the idea that the self is not fixed" (Andermahr, 2009: 29), Winterson deconstructs the fixity and hierarchy of the non/human entities and gendered selves by focusing on the carnivalesque ontological flexibility and fluidity of human and nonhuman subject positions in terms of overstepping Cartesian dualities as well as anthropocentric and patriarchal boundaries because "[n]othing is solid […] Nothing is fixed" with "[t]hings dying ... things new-born" (Winterson, 2007: 111-112). In other words, the novel "promotes ontological relativism and a subjective understanding of the world, rejecting the idea of a fixed self", which is a rejection that holds Bakhtinian ideas (Andermahr, 2009: 28-29).

Parenthetically, the difference between what Spike thinks and other humans believe forms the point of Bakhtinian transgradience, another means of the carnivalesque, for readers. For instance, Billie, a Homo sapiens, cannot see the whole thing in the same way as Spike, a Robo *sapiens*, sees because the latter perceives the world through tempo-spatial position of both the self and other as well as human and nonhuman. Spike's carnivalesque characteristic conveys that the more humans have evolved physically and technologically, the more they have become paralysed to take action for nature's sake. Spike manifests how technology has obstructed the organic integration of human members with nonhuman members in the same environment. The more human beings yield to machines and robots, the more they lose their humane sense and nonhuman contact. As a result of such mechanisation and technologisation, human beings have gradually lost communication with their own self, their own kind as well as with nonhuman entities in Orbus.

Winterson criticises the dominance and authority of technocracy because people in the Central Power are transformed into something other than human due to the abuse of biotechnology and biogenetics. Humans in Orbus lose their organic side since they are enhanced artificially. They are artificially young and beautiful, and everyone looks alike. Their bodies are reconstructed with the use of biotechnology and biogenetics. It is seen that humans are mechanised by means of genetic modifications which erases the difference between a human and machine. As Donna Haraway pointed out, "the distinction between human and machine no longer makes sense" because humans "have all become cyborgs" due to "the rapidly increasing developments of medical technology, which provide [humans] not just with replacement prostheses such as artificial legs or hearing aids but also with mechanical devices to replace key organs

such as the heart", and because of "the imaginations of contemporary culture that is intensified with robots that have become humanized" (Haraway, 1991: 149). However, Spike is a different cyborg who develops Self-realisation and is unlike the mechanised humans. It is quite ironic that Orbus, the planet itself, is ageing and dying because of the mistakes of its human inhabitants while these inhabitants are getting younger in it. Although people in Orbus repair and renew their bodies, they do nothing for their planet and its natural environment because it is easier for them to misbelieve that Orbus "is evolving in a way that is hostile to human life" instead of owning up to their mistakes (Winterson, 2007: 8). What could be inferred at this point is that Winterson questions the meaning of being a human as these new technologies also create carnivalesque corporealities that deconstruct anthropocentric and androcentric boundaries of nature/culture, human/nonhuman, human/machine, body/mind, animate/inanimate, man/woman. As Winterson wrote in the novel, "[e]very human being in the Central Power has been enhanced, genetically modified and DNA-screened. Some have been cloned. Most were born outside the womb. A human being now is not what a human being was even a hundred years ago. So what is a human being?" (77). Winterson encourages readers to re-evaluate the meaning of a human being under the impending total destruction of the planet.

Winterson's questioning of what counts as a human being also echoes in Neil Badmington's view: "'Man' is not the privileged and protected center, because humans are no longer – and perhaps never were – utterly distinct from animals, machines, and other forms of the 'inhuman'" (2011: 374). It is thus clear that Bakhtinian carnivalesque and dialogic discourse upsets the anthropocentric view that humans are central actors in the world, and effaces boundaries between the human/nonhuman, men/women and human/machine. As Spike mildly said, "[t]here are many kinds of life […] Humans always assumed that theirs was the only kind that mattered. That's how you destroyed your planet" (Winterson, 2007: 80). It is in this regard that humankind is not alone and is not the only voice in the universe. In deep ecological sense, Winterson emphasises in the novel that the human body is an inseparable part of nonhuman bodies in the physical environment. As Spike stated, "[t]he universe is an imprint. You are part of the imprint – it imprints you, you imprint it. You cannot separate yourself from the imprint, and you can never forget it. It isn't a 'something', it is you" (105). Human beings are part of the universe and the universe is contained in them. That is why boundaries between the human and nonhuman blur towards both positive and negative directions with the

biotechnological transformations in human societies and ecosystems in the novel. As also put by Ollivier Dyens, "when the body is transformed, whether naturally or artificially, its relationship to the environment is affected, and it can no longer exist exactly as before" (2001: 55).

Carnivalisation of human and nonhuman bodies leads to trans-corporeality, which Stacy Alaimo defined as "interchanges and interconnections between various bodily natures (2010: 2). Trans-corporeality refers to the inseparability of human and nonhuman entities from the physical and social environments. In this sense, the carnivalesque body becomes a trans-corporeal site of non-officialdom, non-hierarchy and freedom since it is not a stable, fixed and hierarchical entity, but rather a free, fluid, changing, non-hierarchical and non-authoritarian body interacting and intra-acting with physical and social environments. What Winterson illustrates in her novel is that all human/nonhuman and animate/inanimate bodies are intermeshed within each other's bodies, grafting onto each other as in *Sexing the Cherry*. Through her carnivalesque tendency and trans-corporeal discourse, Winterson introduces fluidity, flexibility and instability for non-gendered, non-hierarchical and non-authoritarian human and nonhuman subjectivities in order to support the idea of deep ecological total-field image, diversity, symbiosis and complexity as well as ecospherical egalitarianism.

The idea of deep ecological interconnectedness in the novel could be examined within Bakhtinian context of the material bodily principle in that nature is a living organism that is constantly in the process of development, transformation and growth. Spike believes that "[e]verything on Planet Blue is at the experimental stage. All these life-forms will evolve and alter. Almost all will disappear to make way for something better adapted" (Winterson, 2007: 99). It shows that there is a continuous cycle of birth and death in nature so as to make more room for life. The material bodily principles manifest human beings' awareness of their materiality and bodily nature, which are all about the life of nature, the awareness which is achieved during the carnival. That is why all humans, sharing carnivalesque existence, are the protagonists of the carnival, who are "the absolutely merry hosts of the earth flooded with light, because they know that death is pregnant with new life, because they are familiar with the gay image of becoming and of time" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 250). This carnivalesque tendency demands collective consciousness of earthly and historic eternity and of constant revival and growth like the cycle in the natural world because the carnival "transgresses all limited objectives. Neither can it be separated from bodily life, from the earth, nature, and the

cosmos. The sun shines in the festive sky, and there is such a thing as 'feast-day' weather" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 276). The fact that Spike believes in this ongoing process of evolution more than human beings do reveals her carnivalesque and dialogic attitude towards nature. Spike's deep ecologic carnivalesque position finds its voice in Gebara's words as well:

> Plants, animals, forests, mountains, rivers, and seas from the most diverse combinations in the most remote and varied places. They attract one another, couple with one another, blend with one another, destroy one another, and recreate themselves in species of pale and exuberant colors. They grow and feed on one another's lives, transforming or adapting to one another, dying and rising in many ways within the complex life process to which we all belong. (Gebara, 1996: 17).

Gebara echoes Bakhtin's material bodily principle upon Bahktin's example of the death of one-cell organisms: "when the single cell divides into two other organisms, it dies in a sense but also reproduces; there is no departure from life into death" (Bakhtin, 1984a: 52). Another example for the importance of deep ecology movement in environmental conservation is manifested through the dialogue between Spike and Manfred, Billie's boss. When Spike utters that "Orbus is dying", Manfred denies her argument by suggesting that technology will take care of the planet, the same technology that have also destroyed the planet: "The techies will fix it – they always do. I say this morbid doomsday stuff is just to keep people in their place – not wanting too much. We're doing great. I'm upbeat. It's different for you – being a robot, y'know" (Winterson, 2007: 86). Despite hyper technologies, which can solve some problems to some degree, people in Orbus cannot avoid the effects of the toxic atmosphere of their planet on human and nonhuman beings. That is why the Central Power begins to seek for a new planet to colonise for a chosen human community. In the novel, planets are treated "as a reserve of energy that can be turned perpetually and ceaselessly toward technological ends" (Norris, 2011: 113), which leads to transformation of nature into a "standing-reserve" as Heidegger wrote (1993: 322). Such anthropocentric understanding misleads human beings in their perception of the essence of nature, true nature of being human and the true function of technology. What could be inferred from Manfred's statements is that employment of technology to make amendments to save the planet, which is an indication of shallow ecology movement, reinforces anthropogenic interventions in the natural environment. In other words, the practices of the shallow

ecology validate humanity's damage to nature because shallow ecology movement lacks ecosophical compensations for nature's revival. It rather renders the planet as a thing to use and throw away when humanity is done with it:

> "But Orbus is dying."
> "Orbus is not dying. Orbus is evolving in a way that is hostile to human life."
> "OK, so it's the planet's fault. We didn't do anything, did we? Just fucked it to death and kicked it when it wouldn't get up. (Winterson, 2007: 8).

Carnivalisation in ecocritical sense implies that each entity including all human/nonhuman organisms and inorganic beings as well as all other material formations are "irreplaceable and nonsubstitutable" in aspects of participation in the planet (Murphy, 2011: 160). One of the reasons for ecological crisis, for Patrick D. Murphy, is that human communities and individuals do not let nonhuman beings participate in aesthetic memory of the world as subjects and in the self-apprehension of humans' external personalities and perceptions of themselves as characters within their own stories (Murphy, 2011: 157). As Bakhtin wrote, "I myself cannot be the author of my own value […] The biological life of an organism becomes a value only in *another's* sympathy and compassion with that life" (1990: 55, 105; emphasis in original). Winterson recurrently emphasises in the novel that human beings' engagement in technology reduces their organic participation in nature, and consequently increases their indifference to anthropogenic changes in the natural environment and to the effects of these changes on all human and nonhuman entities. Human beings utilise technology not to keep the planet in balance but to tame it. In this process, they begin to become blind to realities and lose their humane feelings about nonhuman entities. A major irony is presented at this point that Spike, as a robot designed to think with no feelings, is a more tender-hearted entity who sympathises with all nonhuman beings in the planet becoming more humane with each passing day. In other words, a sentimentally and conscientiously humanised Robo *sapiens* identifies with nature more than the insensitive and mechanised Homo sapiens does, which is a carnivalesque degradation the author invokes throughout the novel. While humans ignore their mistakes towards Orbus and go on their luxurious lives, Spike tells the true story to Billie by explaining that "Orbus, a planet becoming hostile to human life after

centuries of human life becoming hostile to the planet. It was inevitable – Nature seeks balance" (73).

Carnivalisation in the novel promotes some instances of hope by means of personal relationships with another living being, which stands up to anthropocentrism, authoritarianism and normativity. 'Anotherness' is used instead of 'otherness' in this case because the former implies another part of human selves just as humans are another part of nature. Anotherness is achieved through love that challenges hegemonic boundaries. Love between Billie and Spike in the temporospatial unlimitedness creates a carnivalesque and dialogical union beyond anthropocentric and official norms. Love is one of the most significant themes in the novel because it is love that will help human beings to acknowledge the differences of others and to recover their humanity in the face of degrading nature and it is love that will enable humans to respect for other human and nonhuman beings. Humans should love because "[t]ruth tell, anywhere is a life, once there is a love" (Winterson, 2007: 138). Nature provides life when it is loved and respected because nature is home and humans are within nature. Love, in this sense, means a way of survival for the author since it is love that frees humankind from the authority and hierarchy created by the anthropocentric, patriarchal and capitalist worldview. Freedom, equality and eco-consciousness are achieved through "[l]ove without thought. Love without conditions. Love without promises. Love without threats. Love without fear. Love without limits. Love without end" (146). Love prevents humans from using violence on human and nonhuman beings. As the ecosophical idea suggests, Earth is a living being and all of its entities and components have their own intrinsic value. Therefore, any harm done to one of Earth's nonhuman members by humankind is equal to the one done to a member of humankind, including women, men and children, because all of the human and nonhuman inhabitants of Earth are affected by violence to the same degree. Besides, it is through love that Billie and Spike become unified, forming their own heteroglot and hybrid world in which both human language and cyborg language fuse in a single utterance of environmental ground.

Spike argues that it is love and respect for the nonhuman world that will save the planet and humankind. Although science and technology are inevitable parts of human lives, they are not the sole answers to all questions in universe because it is only love and respect that matter. This carnivalesque tendency of Spike reverberates deep ecological idea of Self-realisation which could be achieved through identification with nature and with all its nonhuman entities. According to Naess, identification begins with

sharing joys and sorrows with others and with the development of the narrow human ego into a wider Self that embraces all entities. When identification with other more-than-human entities is achieved, the natural environment is not regarded as strange and hostile then because humans acknowledge that nature is a valuable living being to be treated with joy and respect rather than be feared, which helps humankind overcome cosmic terror. Identification also suggests rendition of love because "in love one loses part of one's identity by gaining a greater identity" (Rothenberg, 1989: 11). However, this 'losing part of one's identity' does not make the one as non-existent because identification of human beings with nonhuman parts in nature happens as these parts share equal status with humankind but have a certain independence from human beings and their valuing, which is called by Naess as 'the intrinsic value of nature' (Naess, 1989: 29). This term emphasises that natural entities are to be appreciated for their own sakes, simply because they exist 'in here' and close to humans. Expressed by Winterson as "love is an intervention", such change of consciousness leads to a more egalitarian tendency towards life on Earth, to richer and more diverse existences for all the species and entities (2007: 83, 217, 244).

Developing eco-dentities, humans should rather feel the wonder and see the beauty in nature than reminding each other of musts and must-nots, which hence provides carnivalesque rejuvenation in deep ecological sense. That is why shallow ecology movement is not enough to provide intrinsic insights into the well-being of nature with its surface laws and regulations passed by governments and states. This joy-creating mentality is adopted through deep changes in the structure of human communities in technological, economic and political aspects. That is, deep ecology movement is concerned with both concrete resolutions to environmental conflicts and philosophical principles for the human-nonhuman relationships. Ecosophical attitude shapes one's sense of self as well as self-respect, and increases an individual's wider Self along with ecological interactions with other organic and inorganic beings. When human beings step away from nature and stay away from nonhuman beings, they keep distance from a part of their own, and thereby lose their self-respect. Thus, deep identification stimulates the senses of oneness and wholeness within the (S)elf.

Deep ecology movement also stands against the stereotyping of humankind by a central power and capitalist markets because it leads to authoritarianism, monologism and alienation. This process is illustrated in the novel with the political, cultural and technological takeover of the Central Power community by the MORE Company in

Tech City. The name MORE, in capital letters, stands for the libido-based economy of the system, greediness and insatiable desires of the society for excessive consumption. Orbus people's brains, desires, dreams and feelings are all manipulated by the MORE Company. Having the supreme power, the company stands for the authority that numbs its people and denies their free will. That is, "human culture" which "in organic terms, should reflect the wide diversity in nature [is] reduced to monoculture, a simplification solely for the benefit of marketing" in the novel (Plant, 1990: 157). Refusing to return to Tech City by her free will and so opposing the officialdom and authority, Spike, as a festive body that celebrates "liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order", functions as a bridge between culture and nature and signifies Self-realisation of deep ecology (Bakhtin, 1984a: 10).

Orbus is divided into three governmental institutions, which are the Central Power, the Eastern Caliphate and the Sino-Mosco Pact. While the Central Power is generally considered as the West and the powerful, other areas and administrative systems are considered as the rest. Transition from Orbus to Planet Blue is interpreted by the citizens of Tech City in the Central Power as a new beginning for humankind:

> Chance of a lifetime – new start – brave new world – wipe the slate clean – blue-sky moment – open the box – never too late – historic opportunity – commemorative plaque/T-shirt/travel mug/bath towel. Fifteen minutes of fame – live for ever – immortalized in space – happy few – happy ever after – don't look back – no regrets – something to tell the grandchildren – giant leap for mankind. (Winterson, 2007: 55-56)

However, it turns out that it is not a big change for humankind. It is rather a leap for the powerful and rich members of the Central Power who see themselves superior to the rest of the world: "[W]e'll leave this run-down rotting planet to the Caliphate and the Sino-Mosco Pact, and they can bomb each other to paste while the peace-loving folks of the Central Power ship civilization to the new world" (7). The Central Power represents the master identity while those outside it represent subordinate and marginal identities. The Central Power stands for the authority of the established order, the immutability, and class and gender distinctions, which are all roots of environmental crises for deep ecologists. The members of the Central Power are the most responsible ones for environmental crises besides the fact that they are the richest and dominant ones in the planet. They also claim the unspoiled Planet Blue as their own. The space-liner the MORE Company is building is called Mayflower, which is a carnivalesque

reference to the ship that transported the English pilgrims to the New World in 1620. That Mayflower will take people only who can afford it to Planet Blue shows the hierarchical and monologic structure of the Central Power and class distinction within the community. It means that the community depends on the hierarchy of economic class to decide who stays in the ruined Orbus and who has the opportunity to go to the unspoiled new planet. The Central Power community also relies on the hierarchy of gender-based power. Winterson carnivalises androcentrism in the novel through her Robo *sapiens* Spike because the hierarchy of gender and boundary between the male and female still exist in the hyper-technologised society of the Central Power. Women are sexualized, objectified, oppressed, controlled and technologically re-fixed in Tech City. Women's presence and dignity are diminished in the society through genetic reconstruction of women's physical appearances and ages.

Male characters of the novel are mostly portrayed as an intervention in the process of nature. This is evident in the desire of the MORE Company to colonise the newly-discovered Planet Blue and in the company's mastery over Orbus in non-ecological ways which have led the planet into devolution that has transformed the planet "in a way that is hostile to human life" (Winterson, 2007: 8). Throughout the novel, there exists retelling of stories of destruction by different yet related characters that tell men's destructive attitudes towards nature, their home and the very thing they need to survive. The reader can clearly notice that Easter Island has been destroyed by native men while Orbus has been ruined by the male rulers of opposing views during the Post-3 War. What lies beneath men's desire of domination, taming and exploitation of nature is their fear of the unexpectedness, or cosmic terror in Bakhtin's words. Men have designated machines, robots, and high-tech societies in order not to give in to their fear. However, creation of such a civilisation, according to Carolyn Merchant,

> is the final end, the telos, toward which "wild" Nature is destined. The progressive narrative undoes the declension of the Fall. The "end of nature" is civilization. Civilization is thus nature natured, *Natura naturata* – the natural order, or nature ordered and tame. It is no longer nature naturing, Natura naturans – nature as creative force. Nature passes from inchoate matter endowed with a formative power to reflection of the civilized natural order designed by God. (Merchant, 2014: 44; emphasis in original).

Manfred displays male intervention in nature when he goes to Billie's farm and forces her to leave Orbus and join in the colonisation of Planet Blue in Captain

Handsome's ship. While Billie is not interested in the newly-discovered planet though she works for Manfred, Manfred is excited about colonising the new planet since he desires to repossess mastery as a man over the pristine nature of the new planet. He looks down on her for her natural, or primitive, way of life, to him:

> Manfred looked down at my notebook. He frowned his older-man-thinker-type-sexy frown. "Billie, if you weren't so eccentric, you'd fit in better here. Why are you writing in a notebook? Nobody reads and writes any more — there's no need. Why can't you use a SpeechPad like everybody else?"
> "Notebook. Pencil. They have an old-fashioned charm that I like."
> "And I like the present just as it is. You still living in that bio-bubble thing?"
> "You mean the farm? Of course I am. If I'd been able to make it pay I wouldn't be working for you. But a world that clones its meat in the lab and engineers its crops underground thinks natural food is dirty and diseased." (Winterson, 2007: 9)

Billie is regarded as a marginal person who still uses pencils and notebooks although there are SpeechPads; reads printed books although books are not printed any longer; lives on a farm while there are no longer farms or uncontaminated land; and tries to grow her natural food on the farm while all food is artificially produced now. It must be here discussed that food is concerned with labour on and with land since humankind's agricultural labour with the earth produces food. In this sense, food represents the cooperation between humankind and the earth, each of which constitutes the whole. This collaborative work is destroyed if food is considered exclusively for the survival of humankind because it is more an ecological and a social event than mere biological act (Bakhtin, 1984a: 281). Such acts embody social justice and regenerative cycle in the entire ecosystem, which, in some way, celebrate revival and life over extinction and death. Everything that was once natural and humane is now artificial and mechanical in Billie's society. Manfred seeks to deprive Billie of her natural farm, which is her home, by threatening and ridiculing her resistance to artificiality, which is now considered to be the natural way of life in Orbus.

Handsome is another male character who is happy to intervene in natural process of the new planet. Handsome, who appears as the captain of the space shuttle, is in charge of exploding the dinosaurs in Planet Blue upon the Central Power's demand so that rich people in Orbus could settle there. At this point, Winterson carnivalises the scientific knowledge of a meteorite that wiped out all the dinosaurs on Earth: "What use

is a planet that belongs to the dinosaurs? […] This is a Central Power Mission. Flags, bells, whistles. Yes, I am travelling for the President. My job is to get rid of the dinosaurs – and when I do, we're going back to a fairy tale. I will defeat the dragon and be offered the kingdom." (Winterson, 2007: 57). Having the control and economy of Orbus, the Central Power, along with the MORE Company, competes to possess the newly-discovered planet and do with it as it wishes. Handsome stands for the colonising ideology of the authoritarian regime of the Central Power by serving the monolithic system. He also wants his share on the new planet as an intruder and a destroyer of the indigenous life forms: "The Central Power will own Planet Blue. I will take my share, a vast virgin country bounded by rivers. Dragon, kingdom and... princess..." (58). He ambitiously seeks to colonise his "new-found land" (81), intervenes in nature and nonhuman beings in Planet Blue and identifies with the planet as his kingdom, by quoting from John Donne's poem "The Sun Rising": "*She is all States, all Princes I, Nothing else is*" (6, 80; emphasis in original). However, Handsome makes a big mistake of calculation in his mission to explode the dinosaurs in the new planet and leads the planet into an ice age: "Outside the Ship, the noises grew more desperate and more terrified. In the darkening filthy air, the creatures whose world we had interrupted sought the sun, rearing their heads towards the sky, bellowing and crying through this fading light" (97-98). He miscalculated "because life cannot be calculated. That's the big mistake our civilization made. We never accepted that randomness is not a mistake in the equation – it is part of the equation" (94).

In the novel, the planet is expected to serve humankind's needs and pleasure only. All planets mentioned, including White Planet, Orbus and Planet Blue, are regarded as a background or a setting for the survival, needs and desires of humans who do not interact with it in ecologic aspects. They are all considered to be picturesque objects and landscapes of human luxury and enjoyment. All these planets in the novel have fallen prey to the authoritarianism of the human gaze and commodification of the male gaze. Pink's remark that "[w]omen are just planets that attract wrong species […] They use us up, wear us out, then cast us off for a younger model so that they can do it all again" echoes throughout the novel when people of the Central Power seek for a new planet to ruin again (69).

Within the chapter of Easter Island, Winterson puts forth another aspect of exploitation and destruction of nature, which is done in the name of religion in the eighteenth century. In this chapter, Billy is portrayed as a young sailor aboard Captain

Cook's voyage of the *Resolution* in 1772. He is left behind during their visit to Easter Island, and soon meets Spikkers, who is a half-native and half-European man with whom Billy falls for. Spikkers tells Billy that it is not an outer colonising power but the inhabitants of the island that have destroyed their own home island. Billy consequently infers that "[m]ankind [...] wherever found, Civilized or Savage, cannot keep to any purpose for much length of time, except the purpose of destroying himself" (132). Merchant's view is illustrated in the novel with the religion-based battle between the Ariki Mau, who orders protection of the last tree as sacred, and the Bird Man, who orders felling of the tree, in Easter Island, which ends with the irreversible destruction of all the fauna and flora of the island when the last tree is cut off. Presenting another dimension of the destruction of nature, Winterson stresses the negative transformation of an island, a natural place, from an abundant land rich in natural resources to a barren and infertile place because of the religious struggles between two rival groups. Billy questions "[w]hy would a man destroy the very thing he most needs?", and deduces that exploitation and destruction of nature is a universal phenomenon to the whole humankind, either savage or civilised and white or coloured (Winterson, 2007: 123).

The Easter Island chapter is 'the book within the book' part as well. Billy himself writes the book *The Stone Gods* in the novel in the hope of conveying a message to people in other parts of the world and to people in the future. Billy sees that building of the stone idols, "staring out to sea with their massy stone faces", standing "many feet high, dark and heavy and impassive and seat[ing] upon great plinths of wood and stone", has done nothing good or useful but has led to the overcutting of the trees in the name of sacredness and has caused a religious crisis among human members of the island community (124). Billy recognizes how struggles for authority and monolithic ideologies strip societies, things and events of their meanings. He, accordingly, utters:

> That one thing should stand for another is no harm, until the thing itself loses any meaning of its own. The island trees and all of this good land were sacrificed to a meaning that has now become meaningless. To build the Stone Gods, the island has been destroyed, and now the Stone Gods are themselves destroyed. (136).

Such religious and ideological struggles in the past in Easter Island extend their influences all over Orbus in the present, leading into a planetary catastrophe and causing a kind of third world war:

> The Pope went mad and appeared in a bonnet to tell the world that the Antichrist was going to return as a peace-loving eco-warrior, ushering in a new kind of Paganism, nature versus the spirit. Catholics were instructed to abandon Green politics and prepare for Holy War.
> In America a different kind of religious extremism, committed to Armageddon, liked the idea of the Antichrist appearing as a planet-saving Democrat, and spent as much time and money as they could wasting as much time and money as they could in the name of conservatism.
> And so, while we were all arguing about whether it was Christian or Pagan, Democratic or Conservative to save the planet, and whether technology would solve all our problems, and whether we should fly less, drive less, eat less, weigh less, consume less, dump less, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere rose to 550 parts per million, the icecaps melted, and Iran launched a nuclear attack on the USA.
> The policy wonks had miscalculated. We got blown up.
> The rest, as they say, is history. But this isn't history, this is Post-3 War. (157-158)

Such actions as intervention in and exploitation of nature are not limited to the male characters only, they are also done by some female characters. Pink McMurphy is one of the most noticeable characters who support the male system and is pleased to lead high-tech and artificial life by accepting genetic fixing of aging standardized by men and by supporting exploitation of the planets and mastery over nature for more luxurious life. She states to Spike during their canoe journey on a lake in Planet Blue: "Y'know, Nature's unpredictable – that's why we had to tame her. Maybe we went too far, but in principle we made the right decision. I want to be able to go out for a drink without getting hassled by some gawpeyed museum-quality cod" (88). That is why Winterson sees all humans, both men and women, responsible for the irreversible negative transformation of Orbus from a natural and lively planet to a mechanical and dying one.

Nevertheless, the ecological connection of women to nature is a recurrent theme in the novel. To cite an example, Billie, though a scientist working for the Central Power, does not admit the high-tech lifestyle and she believes she does not fit into such artificial authoritarian community of Tech City. There are more robots and less human beings in her society. Thus, she stresses that she needs a human being to whom she can speak and tell her problems. She longs for a natural way of lifestyle, which is evidently revealed in her desire to keep her farm, which she calls home, a rather rare natural land of her own away from technocratic human intervention:

> And in the middle of this hi-tech, hi-stress, hi-mess life, F is for Farm. My farm. Twenty hectares of pastureland and arable, with a stream running through the middle like a memory. Step into that water and you remember everything, and what you don't remember, you invent.
> My farm is the last of its line – like an ancient ancestor everyone forgot. It's a bio-dome world, secret and sealed: a message in a bottle from another time […] The distance the eye follows to whatever moves and dives, the life that fills every bit of uncultivated hedge and verge. The burrows, tunnels, nests, tree-hollows, wasp-balls, drilled-out holes of the water voles, otter sticks, toad stones, mice riddling the drystone walls, badger sets, molehills, fox dens, rabbit warrens, stoats brown in summer, ermine in winter, clean as bullets through the bank. (13-14)

Feeling responsible for the environment, Billie tries to live in her small natural preserve so as to contribute to the ecological balance of her surroundings. The farm reveals how a high-tech society disconnects its human communities from nonhuman communities in the natural environment. The farm, referring to Bakhtin's creative and cyclical chronotopic image of the "pre-class, agricultural stage" of the human community, offers a sort of pastoral escapism for Billie from stereotypification, officialdom and mechanisation, and suggests in the middle of the high-tech monolithic community a carnival place where stream, soil, stones, plants, animals and insects diversely and dialogically exist together and where she has the freedom to imagine and create according to her ecosophical principles (Bakhtin, 1981: 206). This chronotope tends towards future in the way that human beings "sow for the future, gather in the harvest for the future, mate and copulate for the sake of the future" (207). Connected with the earth and nature, consumption and production are integrated in this chronotope. In other words, "the agricultural life of humankind and the life of nature (of the earth) are measured by one and the same scale, by the same events; they have the same intervals, inseparable from each other, present as one (indivisible) act of labor and consciousness" (208). It is only through agricultural activities that human beings can perceive, come to know and participate in the world of nature. The life of nature and the life of the human race are intermingled in this chronotope, which thus indicates that agriculture-labour element liberates human beings from being mere consumers yet rather encourages them to consume what they produce through their own labour (226). Billie's traditional modesty of living in the bosom of natural environment contrasts with the social regulations and disconnectedness of everyday private life in Tech City. Besides, this natural carnivalesque place in which she can take shelter reminds her of her ecological wider Self.

As another example for the interest of women in nature, women in Easter Island endeavour to prevent the local chiefs from cutting down the last tree. However, men on the island shut their eyes and ears to women, and take the last tree down. In the novel, a team of women who are Alaska, Nebraska and six nuns, one of whose name is Sister Mary McMurphy, are represented as women activists opposing the colonial and anthropocentric ideology of the Central Power. These women characters, who work to provide alternative solutions against the high-tech and artificial lifestyle, signify deep ecological solutions to the ecological crises by embracing differences of gender and species, by doing away with the binaries of human/nonhuman and nature/culture, and by getting rid of the hierarchical ranks so as to create more organic, heterogeneous, complex, egalitarian and diverse societies. These women activists, along with Spike, believe in the cause-effect relationship in nature and human history because the universe is in a continuous process of becoming, which refers to deep ecological principle of the interconnectedness. As Spike states to Billie, "this is a quantum Universe and, as such, what happens is neither random nor determined. There are potentialities and any third factor – humans are such a factor – will affect the outcome." (Winterson, 2007: 215). Spike also adds that human beings' free will is their capacity to affect the outcome either creatively or destructively. Billie in Wreck City also emphasises this interconnectedness of all entities in the universe by expressing that "Determinism versus Freewill is a false study – unhelpful, a time-waster. Life has never been All or Nothing – it's All and Nothing. Forget the binaries" (153). What she means is that the world is complete and whole as long as all entities that range from human and nonhuman beings, organic and inorganic beings to every little single natural element coexist harmoniously, each having their own intrinsic value that is described as "nonhierarchical ontological ecological egalitarianism" in Naess' words (Sessions, 1995: 193). However, humans' tendency towards putting themselves at the centre of the universe and giving themselves more privileges have made them ignore the needs of other entities. As Spike utters, "[t]here are many kinds of life" but "[h]umans always assumed that theirs was the only kind that mattered" and that is how they have destroyed their planet (Winterson, 2007: 80).

Winterson's ecocentric novel also finds its reflection in sociologist Ulrich Beck's posthumous book *The Metamorphosis of the World* (2016) when he wrote:

> The global risk of climate change is a kind of compulsive, collective memory – in the sense that past decisions and mistakes are contained in what we find ourselves exposed to, and that even the highest degree of institutional reification is nothing but a reification that can be revoked, a borrowed mode of action which can, and must, be changed if it leads to self-jeopardization. Climate change is the embodiment of the mistakes of a whole epoch of ongoing industrialization [...] (36)

In their adventures of exploitation, human beings have underestimated the value of ecosphere. People in Orbus are obsessed with physical rather than intellectual perfection and with bodily pleasures through aesthetic surgeries, genetical fixing and genetic reversal. It reveals a major irony in the attitudes of human beings in that they relentlessly consume the resources of all the planets they have inhabited before and will continue to do the same in Planet Blue despite the fact that they endeavour to keep their beauty and physical strength stable. But what is the good of doing so when they will have no other planet left to live in? Handsome explains that humans moved to Orbus after they destroyed White Planet, and now they are about to move to Planet Blue as they are done with Orbus in the same way:

> Well, I don't know what you call it, but a planet that has collapsing ice-caps, encroaching desert, no virgin forest and no eco-species left reads like gutted to me. The place is just throwing up and, I tell you, it's not the first time. My theory is that life on Orbus began as escaping life from the white planet – and the white planet began as escaping life from . . . who knows where? (Winterson, 2007: 68).

Although she ignores "the cinematic possibilities of global disaster on a galactic scale", Billie deduces from Handsome's utterances that "it's so depressing if [humans] keep making the same mistakes again and again" (68). However, Billie understands what Handsome means when she sees Planet Blue for the first time:

> Back at the Ship, the mood was high. The beauty and strangeness of Planet Blue intoxicated everyone. We were happy. This was unbelievable luck. It felt like forgiveness. It felt like mercy. We had spoiled and ruined what we had been given, and now it had been given again. This was the fairy tale, the happy ending. The buried treasure was really there. (89)

Winterson emphasises throughout her novel that human beings do not hesitate to destroy the very planet in which they inhabit, which is also underlined by Val Plumwood: "It seems increasingly possible that many of those now living will face the

ultimate challenge of human viability, reversing our species' drive towards destroying our planetary habitat" (2010: 32). In the novel, human beings, regardless of ecosystems, repeat the same mistakes again and again no matter how many different planets they move to and no matter what the time and place is. Treating it as a living being and believing that it has its own value, subjectivity and agency, Billie apologises to Planet Blue for the inevitability of humankind to destroy the unspoiled planet in the same way they have ruined White Planet and Orbus:

> Out of the window, where it's going dark, I can see the laser-projection of Planet Blue. She needs us like a bed needs bedbugs. 'I'm sorry,' I say, to the planet that can't hear me. And I wish she could sail through space, unfurling her white clouds to solar winds, and find a new orbit, empty of direction, where we cannot go, and where we will never find her, and where the sea, clean as a beginning, will wash away any trace of humankind. (Winterson, 2007: 26-27)

While Handsome sees Planet Blue a new-found land to conquer and possess, Billie apologises to the pristine planet for humans' repeated mistakes and insatiable desires, which is another example for transgradience that reflects subjective feelings and impressions produced by the image of Planet Blue. However, it is obvious that people's tendencies will not change in spite of all the calamities. Dreams and wishes to be realized in the new planet are degraded ranging from fucking parrots, centred shopping experiences, celebrity-chasing/-meeting/on-line connections to having one's own parking space and getting a dating service. In the novel, Winterson manifests human beings' incapability to learn from their mistakes and their failure to compromise feelings with rationality, all of which have ended up with the destruction of nature, planet and their own kind. Billie recognises that "[h]uman beings are the most aggressive species on the planet. They will readily kill each other for territory and resources, but they will also kill each other for worshipping the wrong sky-god, or for failing to worship any god at all" (162). Winterson believes that emotionalism and rationality should be taken into consideration together in order to achieve balance and maintain sustainability of the planet. As Canas pointed out, "[t]o achieve equilibrium in social and ecological relations necessitates both intuition and rationality, altruism and self-affirmation, a dynamic interaction is needed between the two elements which come together in a unity" (1996: 27). As a result of humans' mistakes, the destruction of White Planet leads humankind to Orbus and that of Orbus to Planet Blue, which is a

vicious circle of anthropocentric mistakes, full of "emptiness of another chance", that break the interconnected chains of human/nonhuman and animate/inanimate entities in the universe (Winterson, 2007: 56).

After a nuclear war between different governmental institutions, which is called the Post-3 War, the whole planet is contaminated and the region of the Central Power is split into Tech City and Wreck City. While Tech City, unaffected by the atomic bomb, becomes a high-tech society in which human and nonhuman bodies are technologically created and reconstructed, Wreck City becomes a radioactive community in which human and nonhuman bodies are subject to nuclear waste and toxicity. These toxic bodies are regarded as grotesque and outcast bodies by people in Tech City. The Post-3 War not only affects nonhuman but also human beings in the war environment. As a result of the nuclear war, Wreck City, in which "[p]eople live in the shells of houses and offices, and they build their own places out of the ruins", emerges (179). Wreck City is portrayed in opposition to Tech City and can be described as the grey area because it is "a No Zone – no insurance, no assistance, no welfare, no police. It's not forbidden to go there, but if you do, and if you get damaged or murdered or robbed or raped, it's at your own risk. There will be no investigation, no compensation. You're on your own" (179). Both Tech City and Wreck City are manifestations of anthropogenic intervention in and destruction of nature. However, it is Wreck City that offers a carnivalesque escape for human members.

In the absence of hegemonic order and of paternal and corporate control, people in Wreck City create a carnivalesque and multicultural new community. The city provides liberation from Tech City values, hierarchies and patriarchal restrictions of the Central Power. It is a carnival place housing people who escape the totalitarian regime of the Central Power and the monolithic ideology of the MORE Company. Wreck City can be described as a carnivalesque space because it is a place "where you want to live when you don't want to live anywhere else. Where you live when you can't live anywhere else" (179). Not only human beings but also animals come to Wreck City. Some animals like monkeys "came from the Zoo – after the bombing. There were animals all over the place. Some were shot, some escaped. The ones who escaped came here, like everything else that didn't want to go back into a cage", as Friday, a barman who lives as a trans-corporeal subject in Wreck City, states (189). Besides, printed books are also welcomed in such a carnivalesque place, and they come to Wreck City like people and animals "looking for a landing-place" because

> [b]ooks had been lost like everything else in the War, and Post-3 War we hadn't returned to print media. Natural wastage was the economic argument: why go back to something that was on the way out anyway? You can order books from Print on Demand, but most people use Digital Readers now, or don't read at all. The younger kids have never known book culture so they don't miss it. (Winterson, 2007: 193)

The chronotope of the Dead Forest, which shows humans' devastation of nature because of Post-3 War, indicates the deep ecological idea that nature is a living being and it evolves into either deadly force or a creative one depending on human attitudes. Upon Billie's walking into the Dead Forest unknowingly, Friday follows her saying that it is the Dead Forest, part of the Red Zone, that poisons and kills people but "it's changing" because "[s]omething is happening in there […] There's life – not the kind of life [someone would] want to get into bed with, or even the kind of life [someone would] want to find under the bed, but life. Nature isn't fussy" (192). The portrayal that the forest changes suggests Eco-Bakhtinian idea that nature has its own agency, changing from death to revival or the other way round and possessing the power to renew itself. As a "trans-corporeal landscape" (Alaimo, 2010: 48), the Dead Forest, which "looked like nothing from Nature", is a grotesque living being that destabilises the binary between the human and nonhuman because neither the forest and animals belong to nature nor people living in the forest are human (Winterson, 2007: 200). The trans-corporeality of the forest, which is a corpse that is not dead (200), suggests the notion of carnivalesque bodies, which are both dead and alive and both human and more-than-human. They are all radioactively transformed entities:

> Feeding on the leaves and stems were five or six rabbit-like animals – hairless, deformed, one with red weals on its back [...] A boy and a girl. Perhaps. Holding hands, barely dressed, both with rags tied round their bodies. The boy was covered with sores, the girl had no hair [...] He had no teeth. (202)

When Billie wants to help the sick boy and girl, Friday prevents her saying that they cannot help them because those in the Dead Forest are

> toxic radioactive mutants. They won't live long. It's Tech City's big secret, one of them anyway. The incurables and the freaks are all in there. They feed them by helicopter. A lot of women gave birth just after the War finished. No one knew what would happen to the babies – well, now we do. Those are kids from nuclear families. (203)

Referring to Bakhtin's concept of negation in carnivalesque imagery, the Dead Forest is the other side of the medallion that represents the dark side of the shiny Tech City. Although this part of the city, along with its inhabitants, is negated by Tech City people, it still dwells in the world but as transformed in time and space due to nuclear destruction. The image of mutants in the Dead Forest is another means for Winterson to question what it means to be a human being. She juxtaposes the rich and powerful Tech City people with the poor and wretched forest inhabitants when the latter grotesque people walk out the destructed forest to meet the soldiers of the MORE Company. Billie sees them

> coming in through the dark at the far edges of the Playa. Coming in on all fours, coming in on crutches made from rotten forest wood, coming in ragged, torn, ripped, open-wounded, ulcerated, bleeding, toothless, blind, speechless, stunted, mutant, alive – the definition of human. Souls? (232)

In what follows, Winterson vividly portrays the dehumanization of radioactive mutants and trans-corporeal entities inhabiting the forest:

> They lived in the Dead Forest. They were the bomb-damage, the enemy collateral, the ground-kill, blood-poisoned, lung-punctured, lymph-swollen, skin like dirty tissue paper, yellow eyes, weal-bodied, frog-mottled, pustules oozing thick stuff, mucus faces, bald, scarred, scared, alive, human […] They were vessels of a kind, carriers of disease and degeneration, a new generation of humans made out of the hatred of others. (232-233)

By describing people in the Dead Forest as 'the new generation of humans', Winterson indicates how unstable and fluid the meaning of being a human is. What Winterson argues is that, irrespective of what they look like or who they are, these radioactive mutants are 'human' indeed. Those in the destroyed forest are actually the inherent parts of the people in Tech City, with which they have done away during their regrettable wars for power and mastery. At this point in the novel, the 'powerful' Tech City people come face to face with their otherised versions "across time, across place, across species, across bodies, across scale" (Alaimo, 2010: 156).

Winterson reflects her ecological stance in her narration style as well. The novel's chronology reflects the narrator's cycling motion. Billie Crusoe directs her way through diverse spatiotemporal pathways, telling the same story from different perspectives to reject the anthropocentric and phallocratic grand narratives and to

provide other characters in the novel and readers in reality with an ethical compass for ecology. Billie/Billy is the narrator in her/his own journey to uncharted worlds, challenging the anthropocentric colonial story of Robinson Crusoe. The novel begins with some reflections from the latter part of the story, then goes back in time to recount the events again, and comes to the point beyond the starting point in the end. In the novel, "[t]ime-space is compressed to show that it is not linear but spiralling, each period interweaving like a Möbius strip" (McCulloch, 2012: 73). That is, the novel coils back and forth through centuries in a sense of repeating worlds. In each part, both Billie and Spike warn each other about the previous crises of their times in this way. Signalling some warning about the future, the end of each section calls for a new cycle, a new beginning and a second chance to make up for mistakes, which refers to the carnival spirit that denies any kind of conclusion since all conclusions constantly give birth to new beginnings: "True stories are the ones that lie open at the border, allowing a crossing, a further frontier. The final frontier is just science fiction – don't believe it. Like the universe, there is no end" (Winterson, 2007: 106). Winterson, through her spiralling narration, carnivalises the linear chronology of traditional fiction so as to dethrone the authoritarian patriarchal structures of master narrative while making her own style. As Kostkowska wrote, "[i]n making the theme and the form mirror each other, she creates an interrelated system that imitates the underlying natural relatedness of all things" (2013: 58).

Winterson makes use of chronological manipulation so as to distract readers from their anticipations and suggests them a non-anthropocentric, non-official and non-hierarchical alternative, which is to trade the surface of human desires for the depth of nature. Winterson's going back and forth between the times and plots notifies readers that the stories and events continue parallel to each other,[23] and connotes that there are also other unrevealed stories that keep on in the same manner. It brings readers to the conclusion that it is one of the principles of ecological philosophy because stories of diverse entities all around humankind constantly begin and proceed, raising the awareness of the presence of nonhuman life forms that have their own stories in which human beings find themselves in one way or another. In this regard, dialogism and

[23] For instance, Spikkers is fatally hurt when he falls from a cliff while trying to find the Egg and give it to the Ariki Mau so that the latter could win the leadership in Easter Island – a leadership that "will end the destruction and the civil war and bring peace and prosperity to the island" (Winterson, 2007: 135). As noted above, Spikkers's broken and dead body is redrawn in future as Spike's dismantled body to save her energy.

polyphony work as ecopoetic devices that disable a single, central and hierarchically organised worldview and promote such carnivalesque attitudes as multicentrism and equal treatment of all human and nonhuman beings. In doing so, Winterson transgresses ontological boundaries, "requiring readers to scrutinize accepted realistic conventions of causality, materiality, motivation" (Zamora and Faris, 1995: 3). Hence, Winterson encourages her readers to give up their preconceived official notions of reality they supposedly know and to receive the realities they may not know with open arms because there are lots of realms of which humans have no knowledge as well as worlds and entities that humans disregard and maltreat: "Every second the Universe divides into possibilities and most of those possibilities never happen. It is not a universe – there is more than one reading. The story won't stop, can't stop, it goes on telling itself, waiting for an intervention that changes what will happen next" (Winterson, 2007: 83).

Winterson's employment of metafiction in the novel accomplishes two goals of environmentalist concern, the first of which is to raise the awareness of the reader about the existence of (an)other world(s) outside Earth while the second of which is to bring out the connection and relationships between two worlds. Winterson's idea of two-world systems, which refers to a well-running ecosystem, reflects Bakhtin's carnivalesque as these two worlds of the real and the fictional do not contend but cooperate, feasting the text with multiple and intertwined stories that recount many worlds, lives and life forms interacting and evolving. Furthermore, the external lack of structural interconnection between chapters incites the reader to look for logical and thematic connections underneath the surface, which provides ecocentric tendency for the reader to recognise ecosystemic relations, which are not apparent all the time, in the real world of human and nonhuman beings. Winterson's ecosophy transforms both the reader from a passive consumer into active participants and nonhuman entities from inanimate things into animate participants, which reveals the active, participatory, interrelated, dialogic, polyphonic and carnivalesque aspects of the real world. Winterson's sudden shifts of tone in her narrative, where seriousness and humour interchange, also reflect carnival of conflicting emotions and feelings that coexist at the same instant, which prompts readers to recognise the opposites as well as the existence of another and to celebrate heterogeneity over homogeneity besides equality over hierarchy.

Towards the end of the novel, Spike's body is disassembled so as to preserve her lifespan. On the one hand, her dismantlement refers to natural and grotesque recycle

rather than death. When Billie asks Spike "[h]ow do you feel about being dismantled? It's a kind of death, isn't it?", she responds that "I think of it as recycling, which is what Nature does all the time. The natural world is abundant and extravagant, but nothing is wasted. The only waste in the Cosmos comes from human beings" (Winterson, 2007: 37). On the other hand, her deconstruction limb by limb stands for bodily emancipation from the constraints of hegemonic order of the MORE Company for the sake of free will: "Unfixing her has freed her" (111). Such freedom allows Billie and Spike to reunite for the last time in their minds before their love story ends. It is, thus, a story which encourages understanding, love and compassion for another rather than fearing and degrading the other.

The novel ends in Wreck City when Billie and Spike have refused to go back to Tech City to serve the Central Power. They both know that they can do nothing to save Orbus and all its human and nonhuman inhabitants: "And my tears are for the planet because I love it and because we're killing it, and my tears are for these wars and all this loss, and for the children who have no childhood" (239). Winterson opposes the anthropocentric and phallocratic regional control and welcomes a symbiotic co-existence with other human and nonhuman beings in officially-negated lands because "[t]he universe has no sides, no end, can't be mapped" (57). Therefore, they decide to stay in Wreck City, which is a carnivalesque space that offers them freedom and escape from the authority of the Central Power. In this way, Billie answers her own question whether humans deserve a second chance or not as 'no' because human beings repeat the same mistakes again and again: "Human beings aren't just in a mess, we are a mess. We have made every mistake, justified ourselves, and made the same mistakes again and again. It's as though we're doomed to repetition" (216). Winterson reveals that humans in Orbus are the major actors of the climate change, nuclear destruction and of the invasion of high technologies in the world because of their irresponsible and inconsiderate behaviour towards nature and all life forms: "[T]his is never going to work. Humans can't do it – either we kill each other or we kill the planet or both. We'd destroy the lot rather than make it work" (240). The novel is an attempt to raise ecological awareness by presenting the destructive reverberations of human mistakes. Winterson's questioning of humans' destructive actions and worldviews gives way to challenging the anthropocentric and authoritarian ideologies. Frequently asking the reader who can be counted as human, nonhuman, or inhuman, Winterson emphasises humans' responsibility, accountability and answerability towards alienated human and

nonhuman entities in natural and built environments. The novel, as Andermahr wrote, "revolves around this central tension between responsibility and freedom, weight and weightlessness, commitment and restless desire" (2009: 29-30).

To conclude, this part of the chapter has examined human and nonhuman bodies in *The Stone Gods* under the carnivalesque lens, which contributes to an understanding of how Bakhtinian ecocritical perception can greatly transform human and nonhuman lives in Earth. Through Billie and Spike, who are carnivalesque characters standing for anarchic freedom from internalised authorities and from temporal and spatial boundaries, Winterson gives voice to the marginalised figures, including pristine planets, climate, trees and cyborg, whose voices are most of the time either ignored or misunderstood, while speaking against the official, patriarchy, hierarchy and authority. The author carnivalises the futuristic and post-technological world – in a planet similar to Earth – in which all boundaries are deconstructed only to be reconstructed biotechnologically, materially and discursively. For Patrick D. Murphy, the novel is part parable, part cautionary tale, part elegy, and part cyborg romance that "looks backward and forward, and addresses the conflict of the tendency to seek adaptation when what is needed is exaptation instead" (2013: 34). Cyborg imagery in the novel suggests a carnivalesque way out of binaries, which is "a dream not of a common language, but of a powerful infidel heteroglossia" (Haraway, 1991: 181). In this sense, Winterson's carnivalesque ecological imagination both deconstructs and reconstructs humans, nonhumans, machines, relationships, identities, categories and space stories in a manner of spiral dance. She portrays "a world without gender, which is perhaps a world without genesis, but maybe also a world without end" in her novel (150). The novel reveals the damages of hyper-technologisation, capitalist consumerism, and gender and species inequalities in human and nonhuman communities. In her cyborg writing, Winterson degrades "hierarchical dualisms of naturalised identities" by creating a carnivalesque world consisting of some retold stories that subvert the authority of Western culture (175). In doing so, Winterson re-establishes dialogue with the nonhuman world and recover intelligence to upset command, control and monopoly.

Criticising the myth of the new world, or the new planet, which is constantly discussed today, Winterson emphasises the tendency of humans to repeat the same mistakes over and over again to greater and greater degrees until they ruin themselves and the world they live in. Humans in the novel are represented as intruders and polluters, overwhelmed by their power struggles and hyper-technological achievements,

nature as a sufferer depicted by destroyed landscapes, and planets as contaminated, deadly and burned-out. Despite high scientific and technological precautions including weathershields, stabilisation of emissions, draining rising sea levels, synthesising food, neutralising acid rain, permanent refrigeration around the ice-caps, disuse of oil, gasoline or petroleum derivatives, humans are still at the mercy of the force of nature in their struggle for survival in the face of climate change because "[t]he bodies that can say nothing have the last word" (Winterson, 2007: 234). To illustrate, people in Orbus have to wear oxygen masks because of a red duststorm which also blocks air-filtering systems. Interweaving the world's colonial past with its eventually colonial future, Winterson portrays how Homo sapiens puts its own kind in danger by remaining too anthropocentric and by being self-destructive throughout history since "[e]verything is imprinted for ever with what it once was" (246). Winterson narrates human history differently, particularly from non-anthropocentric and non-hierarchical perspectives in order to challenge androcentric and hegemonic control in ecosystems of all kinds. In doing so, the author seeks to show her readers to make a difference for a better tomorrow, and to love and respect rather than fear and exploit the other.

Last but not least, Winterson's ecological imagination provides re-imagination of nature and nonhuman world within carnivalesque framework so as to find deep ecological solutions to environmental problems. Bakhtinian ecocritical analysis of the novel offers both nurturing and thought-provoking ideas in the field of ecocritical studies. As Alaimo and Hekman wrote, "thinking through the co-constitutive materiality of human corporeality and nonhuman natures offers possibilities for transforming environmentalism itself" (2008: 9). Therefore, Eco-Bakhtinian study of *The Stone Gods* in this chapter may lead to new routes for restructuring the common conventional views about the material world, subject/object relations and bodily natures.

CONCLUSION

This doctoral thesis has discussed the viability of Bakhtin's concepts of the carnivalesque, dialogism, grotesque, polyphony, heteroglossia and chronotope for an ecocritical agenda, and has studied how they are manifested in writings by women in the novel genre. In this thesis, Linda Hogan's *Solar Storms* and *Power*, and Jeanette Winterson's *Sexing the Cherry* and *The Stone Gods* have been studied in accordance with Bakhtinian critical theory and Arne Naess's deep ecology movement. All these novels have offered interdisciplinary ecocritical investigations. Hogan and Winterson have attempted to create environmental discourse and develop ecological consciousness in readers against the environmental problems and ecological degeneration. Both writers have questioned the norms that determine the positions of humans in the nonhuman environment. Therefore, they have retold real events to provide ecological approach to the representation and solution of anthropogenic environmental destructions. They have dealt with ecological conscience by highlighting the inevitable fact that destruction of the natural world will be the end of both human and nonhuman beings. Both writers have presented the reasons for the destruction of the nonhuman world with reference to political, financial and social transformations as well as scientific and technological developments, along with contemporary and traditional perspectives. The analyses have been done by comparing and contrasting Western and native cultures. Hogan has focused on the indigenous and mythic attitudes of native people to re-connect with nature while Winterson has concentrated on resistance and retribution of nature to the anthropocentric, authoritarian and hierarchical perspective in every aspect of life.

This thesis has dwelled on the effacement of anthropocentric, androcentric, ethnocentric, authoritarian and hierarchical boundaries by examining the interactions between the human and nonhuman. This thesis has dealt with the nonhuman as a subject whose voice has been lost in human history and with the reclamation of its agency through carnivalesque and dialogical means in the selected novels. All these novels under investigation have entered a dialogic relation in this thesis as they all approach the same theme through their own differing discourses that yet intersect in their meanings and aims. Bakhtin's critical theory provides dialogic and pluralistic framework that focuses on diversity and uniqueness. The ecological message of these novels lies in the notion of biodiversity that both humans and nonhumans are individual beings made of the same atoms, inseparably participating in the same physical world.

This thesis has sought mainly to show in which ways Bakhtinian concepts can function to develop internally persuasive narrative and rhetorical strategies for descriptions of environmental philosophies, ecological ontologies and some activist issues, and for raising ecological consciousness in humans. The authors, characters, readers and environmental elements of each novel emerge together in Bakhtinian ecocritical praxis, which allows for a critical practice of interaction and intra-action that reveals the ecocentric view of the human-nonhuman complexity of interrelated agencies. That is why Eco-Bakhtinian practice delineates an epistemological and "ontological performance of the world in its ongoing articulation" (Barad, 2007: 149).

Hogan and Winterson depict in their selected novels "a world fated to perish" in which human beings "are out of contact with each other, egoistically sealed-off from each other, greedily practical" and are alienated from their own labour that produced objects they are used to (Bakhtin, 1981: 234). Eco-Bakhtinian practice not only debunks anthropogenic tendencies and destroys superiority of the human race, it also encourages the forgotten connections to nature that humans benightedly strive to become separate. The goal of the Eco-Bakhtinian practice in this thesis is "to sensitize dominators to the realities of the dominated, that is, to make the dominator-subject see/hear what has been construed as an object" (Donovan, 1996: 183), because, as David Abram reminds, all entities in the universe "have the ability to communicate something of themselves to other beings" (2010: 172). Every animate and inanimate being tells their own stories of "coexistence, interdependence, adaptation and hybridization, extinctions and survivals" (Iovino and Oppermann, 2014: 7). Therefore, nature is more than a mere setting for human events. It tells its own story which happens in parallel to the human one, which thus means that all living beings, human or nonhuman, may suffer or enjoy to similar extents.

Nature is depicted in these novels as a living and an active agent influencing the human fate. That is why to be a human, with body and soul unified, is achieved only by corresponding to nature. That is, human identities are already ecological in the sense that humans are shaped by people, animals, plants, places and things that have influenced their lives. Therefore, the main chronotope of these novels is that characters do not stand at the same point throughout the novels but they change in accordance with the development of their relationship with human and nonhuman 'anothers'. What matters here is that humans must notice these connections and integrate them into their discourse. Just as mind and body cannot be separated, body and land cannot be

separated as well because the "body is made of the same flesh as the world" and "this flesh of [human] body is shared by the world" (Merleau-Ponty, 1968: 248). Both writers depict their characters in various aspects, ranging from their anatomical and physiological feature, through the clownish and skeptical, to the fantastic and the grotesque and to the folkloric feature (Bakhtin, 1981: 171). All these aspects permeate each other to create the ecological principle of the human body in Eco-Bakhtinian terms.

Literature is an activity which adapts humankind better to the world because literary works of imagination together with dreams, fantasies and idealisations constitute a fundamental dimension of reality, bringing the invisible realm into the visible, which makes ecological imagination in works of literature a fundamental dimension of environmental reality. The Eco-Bakhtinian explorations in these novels make the reader question the boundaries between the text and its environment and between the human and nonhuman by imaginatively recovering the relationship between them. Nature metaphors and nonhuman representations of Hogan and Winterson have the potential to produce an imaginative and cognitive transformation in the reader, towards the feeling of empathy and harmony with the nonhuman, while difference is acknowledged and binaries are disabled. As M. Jimmie Killingsworth expressed, "speakers and writers have the power to transform the site of discourse, the community itself" along with "changing language and changing minds" (1992: 110). These selected novels have also revealed that "what is social and literary is at the same time environmental and global" (Kostkowska, 2013: 165). Just as Bakhtin wrote about society, "ecology is to write about society" as well (Morton, 2007: 17). That is why "[a]ny narrative that attempts to destabilize hegemonic patterns of thought and expression is inherently an environmentalist narrative" (Kostkowska, 2013: 164). Both writers invite readers to participate in their works actively by challenging them to find out complex and multiple levels of their texts' meaning. In this sense, Eco-Bakhtinian approach enables humans to put themselves as an/other to achieve empathy and to raise the ecological awareness of an/otherness within the process.

The common characteristic of all the four novels is that they all present a model of one ecosystem consisting of diverse, multiple and equal centres. These novels have offered a hope for a better world by disabling official structures and hierarchical orders, by transforming the monoglossic and anthropocentric perspectives into heteroglossic and ecocentric perspectives. Both Winterson and Hogan have constructed their novels

as a symbiotic field and their main characters as symbiotic bodies. Their symbiotic field refers to the marketplace of Bakhtin's carnivalesque, in which their symbiotic characters, as carnival bodies, come together to resist the hegemonic order and to maintain the deep ecology principle of the unity-in-diversity and of sharing of abundance. In this sense, deep ecology does not oppose human flourishing, it is rather against the human-centeredness and hierarchicalization of "a member of a species or a whole species over another individual or species or over any given ecosystem" (Sessions, 1991: 91). Calling for non-hierarchical and non-authoritarian attitudes towards nature, deep ecology offers decentralisation of human communities as a resistance to the hierarchy and to centralisation of the authoritative culture just as dialogism encourages the reconciliation of opposites by concentrating on the reciprocity of two or more opposing voices so as to efface the borders of binaries.

This thesis has also put forth that nature is actually a grotesque entity in itself in the sense that it both gives birth, providing life, and kills. Holmes Rolston III wrote that "life depends on nature's capacity to kill and to rot, and to make a recycling and pyramidal use of resources", and added that "[n]ature is not first and foremost the bringer of disease and death, but life" (1979: 28). That is why "[w]hen nature slays, she takes only the life she gave as no murderer can; and she gathers even that life back to herself by reproduction and re-enfolding organic resources and genetic materials and produces new life out of it" (28). Bakhtin's grotesque realism can be attuned to ecosystems in the way that all human and nonhuman beings "die into one another's lives and live one another's deaths" in order for ecosystemic energy to flow through ecological cycles (Cheney, 1987: 141).

Eco-Bakhtinian analyses have been provided in two chapters. Linda Hogan's *Solar Storms* and *Power* have been discussed in Euro-American contexts with references to native tradition while Jeanette Winterson's *Sexing the Cherry* and *The Stone Gods* in Western contexts with references to the white culture. *Solar Storms* has put factual information about an ecologically destructive event that serves to a consumptionist and capitalist lifestyle. Presenting the James Bay hydroelectric project in the microcosm of the novel, it has delineated the destruction of native peoples' cultures through devastation of their habitats and that of fauna and flora of their habitats in the mesocosm, and has depicted loss of place and loss of sense of human identity as displaced consumers due to consumerism and technological domination in the macrocosm. The novel has presented that humans must be responsive, or answerable in

Bakhtinian terms, to all entities in nature, which calls for mutual recognition and interaction for both human and nonhuman survival. Eco-Bakhtinian examination of the novel has provided that the entities in nature are not others but anothers, not alien but relational, and they do not constitute a binary but a polarity of existence, perception and voice. It has been emphasised in the novel that destruction of human and nonhuman habitats have created psychological crises in all living beings. In this sense, recovery of ecology lessens this damage and offers a way for healing and revival.

Power, similarly, has dwelled on the renewal of the self, restoration of the nonhuman world, and healing of a broken connection between human and nonhuman beings. The novel has indicated humans' blindness to the presence of the nonhuman world and deafness to what nonhuman beings say, and has offered dialogic solutions to reclaim a forgotten tradition of listening to nature, focusing on the nonhuman agency and answerability to/of the nonhuman. Eco-Bakhtinian analysis of this novel has revealed that humans must develop an eco-conscious worldview that emphasises connection instead of fragmentation, recover their ecological sense, open their minds to alternative and eco-conscious ways of knowing the animals and the realm of nature, and restore what connects them to the land they inhabit as in the old traditional days in indigenous lands. The analysis has also exposed that balance can only be maintained by inclusion instead of exclusion, which can be attained by active participation of all human and nonhuman entities in the world.

Sexing the Cherry has questioned authoritative boundaries and hierarchical thinking by representing a progressive ecological philosophy without explicit reference to environmental issues. The novel has rather offered anti-essentialist and heterogeneous world by its fragmented and unusually-structured text that provides a multifarious space that encourages readers to break with their official and patriarchal plot and with anthropocentric attitudes in order to develop ecologically conscious thinking and multiple narrative voices that stand for eco-diversity instead. Winterson's anti-patriarchal multifarious plots with multiple narrative voices as well as self-contained plot sections have been associated with Bakhtin's ecology of narrative in that they are cyclically interconnected within the novel's white pages as well. It has been inferred that the presence of multiple and grotesque narrative personas in the novel upsets the traditional omniscient narrator of a single patriarchal plot, which, thus, offers an ecological dimension of diverse non-authoritarian narrators of multi-centred non-anthropocentric plots. Eco-Bakhtinian exploration of the novel has shown that while

patriarchal anthropocentrism favours a single and central position to the detriment of feminine and nonhuman others and ascribes a hierarchical value of significance to diverse beings, ecocentrism in the novel encourages the ecological awareness that there is always another existence, another being, another reality and another view that is equally important and valuable, which supports ecological multicentrism, grotesque and dialogic plurality of perspectives and respect for human and nonhuman (an)others.

The Stone Gods has portrayed the destructive effects of hyper-techno-scientific developments, wars and high-tech societies on the nonhuman world and the human psyche. Eco-Bakhtinian study of this novel has revealed that devastating techno-scientific applications, planetary pollution due to wars and financial ambitions result in the destruction of the entire planet, extinction of species, depletion of natural resources and bodily disorders in human and nonhuman communities. It has also indicated that Winterson carnivalises the futuristic and post-technological world, which is a planet similar to Earth, in order to unveil the voices of the marginalised figures, including pristine planets, climate, trees and cyborg, whose voices are most of the time either ignored or misunderstood in authoritarian ideology and hierarchical order. It has been inferred that the author criticises the myth of the new world, or the new planet, because of the tendency of humans to repeat the same mistakes over and over again to greater and greater degrees until they ruin themselves and the world they live in. The ecological imagination in the novel provides re-imagination of nature and nonhuman world within carnivalesque framework so as to find deep ecological solutions to environmental problems.

Both writers have described the destruction of the nonhuman world through different cultural contexts and backgrounds. Both have emphasised that humans' break with the nature and its nonhuman inhabitants will end up with the meaninglessness of their existence, loss of identity, and loss of the sense of belonging as they will lose one of their intrinsic parts and their place in the world. They have also expressed that environmental destruction does not only mean the end of nature but the end of humanity as well. However, they differ from each other in portraying their views in terms of standpoint and writing style. Hogan has inscribed the stories of her oral culture first on the landscape and then on paper. As David Abram wrote, "[e]ach part of the topography evokes a part of some tale that quietly resounds in one's awareness. *The land, in other words, is the primary mnemonic, or memory-trigger, for recalling the ancestral stories*" (2005: 177; emphasis in original). Hogan has depicted the effects of colonisation on

native people, who have been internally colonised and whose land has been exploited by European migrant settlers. She has read signs of environmental destruction and ecological degradation and integrated them into her texts, letting nature speak for itself to humankind. Hogan's ecological philosophy is based on deep ecological concepts of existential symbiosis and the interrelatedness of species. Her selected novels have encouraged the reader to recognise multiple voices and realities that coexist without mastery or repudiation. Therefore, Hogan's anti-patriarchal attitude is at the same time her anti-anthropocentric and ecocentric attitude since patriarchal hierarchical structures dominate both human and nonhuman communities.

Winterson, on the other hand, has argued that nature and culture as well as the human and nonhuman share similar patterns of atomic energy and evolutionary force that are prompted by a continuous power of change, fluidity and experiment, which supports Bakhtin's critical theory with its dynamism, interconnectedness and dialogism. According to her ecocentric philosophy, art, including literature, revivifies the interconnectedness of all life forms. In other words, she has favoured in the selected novels the idea of a dynamic universe in which nothing is static and everything is shifting at every moment. She believes that art has the ability and responsibility to show the intrinsic richness of nature to humankind. Winterson has shown her carnivalesque writing style in these novels as she has employed highly unconventional forms with her chronological manipulation, genre blending, metafictional commentary and grotesque characters as well as with her break from a linear chronology, cause-and-effect logic, a close ending, regularly fitting chapters and a central narrative perspective, which has encouraged ecological values of multiplicity, diversity and coexistence. She has drawn diverse fictional worlds and used metafictional elements which are all interconnected and existing together within a larger whole. In Eco-Bakhtinian sense, Winterson's selected novels have embodied anarchic and carnivalesque space in affirmative and constructive way that calls into question hierarchic boundaries, have re-examined old definitions, have prompted an intrinsic awareness of nonhuman life forms and worlds in the reader, and have offered some possible liberating alternative scenarios that do not include dominance, mastery, hierarchy and exclusion.

In Hogan's selected novels, there is a plurality of voices, brought together by single women following their own individualistic paths of care giving relations such as having children without husbands in many cases, digressively acquiring mates, feeding animals, and becoming pillars of a community. In Winterson's selected novels, there is

a plurality of voices, brought together by someone who is actually not one but many. Those many speakers overthrow the hierarchies and authorities in the novels by speaking more than one language, by making other silenced voices heard and by arousing interest of the reader in the existence of nature and of nonhuman beings.

All the four novels have depicted irreversibly transformed nonhuman world through the image of inner/outer and psychological/physical journeys of the characters towards true self, origin, sense of place, environmental justice and Self-realisation. Questioning the meaning of being a human, these novels have attempted to recover the voice of the nonhuman, which is alienated, marginalised, oppressed and muted. These novels have focused on love and respect for nature and on knowledge of nonhuman beings, on the importance of environmental activism, on the fight against stereotypes, and on the instability of matter, time and space. The novels have attempted to suggest ecophilosophical solutions for the reader about how to retain humaneness in humans' attitudes towards the nonhuman while participating in global and technological societies. The novels also have open-ended conclusions that give readers the feeling of hope for a better future towards an ecologically responsible way of being in the world.

To put final touches to this doctoral thesis, Hogan and Winterson are both border-crossers as they have left the hegemonic authoritarian narrative and employed egalitarian, nonauthoritarian and pluralistic forms that support Bakhtinian view of ecology. It could be argued that their selected novels have world-transforming competency as they have attempted to prevail over dualistic thinking and upset official binaries, which have paved the way for environmental philosophy, eco-consciousness and eco-action. By decentralising and decrowning the master narrative of a single point of view, monologic discourse and dominant patriarchal norms, these selected novels have promoted leaving traditional attitudes and belief systems to offer models of linguistic diversity in literary texts and of ecological diversity in human and nonhuman relations, including multiple points of view, gender reconstruction, subject/object reconstruction, character recreation, chronology, and metafictionality. Study of Bakhtinian critical theory in these novels has supported Naess's deep ecology movement, creating a new path for Eco-Bakhtinian studies in which a greyish nature – neither green nor dark – becomes a kind of carnivalistic zone, which can be called Eco-Bakhtinian space, a term developed throughout this thesis. Including the body, land, place, ecology without nature and the universe at the same time, Eco-Bakhtinian space offers not one but many lives that will blossom in different fields.

REFERENCES

Abram, D. (1988). "Merleau-Ponty and the Voice of the Earth", *Environmental Ethics*, 10, pp. 101-120.

……, (1997). *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-Than-Human World*, Vintage, New York.

……, (2005). "Between the Body and the Breathing Earth: A Reply to Ted Toadvine", *Environmental Ethics*, 27, pp. 171-190.

……, (2010). *Becoming Animal: An Earthly Cosmology*, Pantheon, New York.

Alaimo, S. (1996). "Displacing Darwin and Descartes: The Bodily Transgressions of Fielding Burke, Octavia Butler, and Linda Hogan", *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 3/1, pp. 47-66.

……, (2000). *Undomesticated Ground: Recasting Nature as Feminist Space*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Alaimo, S. and Hekman S. (2008). "Introduction: Emerging Models of Materiality in Feminist Theory", *Material Feminisms*, (eds. S. Alaimo and S. Hekman), Indiana University Press, Bloomington, pp. 1-19.

Alaimo, S. (2010). *Bodily Natures: Science, Environment, and the Material Self*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Allen, P. G. (1986). *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*, Beacon Press, Boston.

……, (1998). *Off the Reservation: Reflections on Boundary-Busting, Border-Crossing Loose Canons*, Beacon Press, Boston.

Andermahr, S. (2009). *Jeanette Winterson*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Antakyalıoğlu, Z. (2012). "Jeanette Winterson's *The Stone Gods*: A Postmodern Warning", *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11/3, pp. 975-983.

Badmington, N. (2011). "Posthumanism", *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Science* (eds. B. Clarke and M. Rossini), Routledge, London and New York, pp. 374-384.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, (Trans. M. Holquist), University of Texas Press, Austin.

……, (1984a). *Rabelais and His World*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

……, (1984b). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

……, (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, (eds. C. Emerson and M. Holquist), University of Texas Press, Austin.

……, (1990). *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, (eds. M. Holquist and V. Liapunov), University of Texas Press, Austin.

……, (1993). Toward a Philosophy of the Act, (eds. V. Liapunov and M. Holquist), University of Texas Press, Austin.

……, (1996). *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, (eds. S. Botcharov and L. Gogotichvili), Russkie Slovari, Moscow.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Duke University Press, Durham.

Barry, P. (2002). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Bartosch, R. (2013). "Facets of EnvironMentality", *EnvironMentality: Ecocriticism and the Event of Postcolonial Fiction*, Rodopi B. V., Amsterdam.

Beaton, R. (2010). "Historical Poetics: Chronotopes in *Leucippe and Clitophon* and *Tom Jones*", *Bakhtin's Theory of the Literary Chronotope: Reflections, Applications, Perspectives* (eds. N. Bemong et al.), Academia Press, Gent, pp. 59-76.

Beck, U. (2016). *The Metamorphosis of the World: How Climate Change Is Transforming Our Concept of the World*, Polity, Cambridge.

Bell, M. M. (1994). "Deep Fecology: Mikhail Bakhtin and the Call of Nature", *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 5/4, pp. 65-84.

Bennett, M. (2001). "From Wide Open Spaces to Metropolitan Places: The Urban Challenge to Ecocriticism", *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 8, pp. 31-52.

Berry, T. (1988). *The Dream of the Earth*, Sierra Club, San Francisco.

……, (1995). "The Viable Human", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 8-18.

Best, S. and Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations*, MacMillan, London.

Bevis, W. (1993). "Native American Novels: Homing In", *Critical Perspectives on Native American Fiction*, (ed. R. Fleck), Three Continents, Washington, pp. 15-45.

Bodian, S. (1995). “Simple in Means, Rich in Ends: An Interview with Arne Naess”, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 26-36.

Bonifazi, C. (1978). *The Soul of the World: An Account of Inwardness of Things*, University Press of America, Washington.

Bookchin, M. (1987). “Social Ecology versus Deep Ecology: A Challenge for the Ecology Movement”, *Green Perspectives: Newsletter of the Green Program Project*, nos. 4-5.

Booth, W. C. (1984). “Introduction”, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, (ed. and trans. C. Emerson), University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp. xiii-xxvii.

Bowen-Mercer, C. (2003). “Dancing the Chronotopes of Power: The Road to Survival in Linda Hogan’s *Power*”, *From the Center of Tradition: Critical Perspectives on Linda Hogan*, (ed. B. J. Cook), University Press of Colorado, Colorado, pp. 157-177.

Brown, R. L. and Herndl, C. G. (1996). “Beyond the Realm of Reason: Understanding the Extreme Environmental Rhetoric of the John Birch Society”, *Green Culture: Environmental Rhetoric in Contemporary America*, (eds. C. G. Herndl and S. C. Brown), University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, pp. 213-35.

Buell, L. (2005). *The Future of Environmental Criticism: Environmental Crisis and Literary Imagination*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Busse, B. (2006). “(Historical) ecolinguistics and literary analysis”, *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies: Transatlantic Conversations on Ecocriticism*, (eds. C. Gersdorf and S. Mayer), Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam, pp. 131-154.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*, Routledge, New York.

Campbell, S. (1996). “The Land and Language of Desire: Where Deep Ecology and Post-Structuralism Meet”, *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, (eds. C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm), University of Georgia Press, Athens, pp. 124-136.

Canas, M. (1996). “In US Life Grows: An Ecofeminist Point of View”, *Women Healing Earth: Third World Women on Ecology, Feminism, and Religion*, (ed. R. R. Ruether), Orbis Books, New York, pp. 24-28.

Canguilhem, G. (1978). *On the Normal and the Pathological*, (trans. C. R. Fawcett), Zone Books, New York.

Card, C. (1985). “Virtues and Moral Luck”, Unpublished Paper, American Philosophical Association Meeting, Chicago.

Cheney, J. (1987). “Eco-feminism and Deep Ecology”, *Environmental Ethics*, 9, pp. 115-145.

Chevalier, J. and Gheerbrant, A. (1996). *The Penguin Dictionary of Symbols*, (trans. J. Buchanan-Brown), Penguin Books, London.

Cook, B. J. (2003). “Introduction”, *From the Center of Tradition: Critical Perspectives on Linda Hogan*, (ed. B. J. Cook), University Press of Colorado, Colorado, pp. 1-10.

Coupe, L. (2000). *The Green Studies Reader*, Routledge, London.

Crossley, N. (1996). *Intersubjectivity: The Fabric of Social Becoming*, Sage, London.

Dentith, S. (1995). *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*, Routledge, New York.

Devall, B. and Sessions, G. (1985). *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*, Peregrine Smith Books, Salt Lake City.

Doan, L. L. (1994). “Jeanette Winterson’s Sexing the Postmodern”, *The Lesbian Postmodern*, (ed. L. L. Doan), Columbia University Press, New York, pp. 137-155.

Dobrin, S. I. and Weisser, C. R. (2001). *Ecocomposition: Theoretical and Pedagogical Approaches*, SUNY Press, Albany.

Donovan, J. (1996). “Ecofeminist Literary Criticism: Reading the Orange”, *Hypatia*, 11/2, pp. 161-185.

Dreese, D. N. (1999). “The Terrestrial and Aquatic Intelligence of Linda Hogan”, *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 11/4, pp. 6-22.

Duerr, H. P. (1985). *Dreamtime: Concerning the Boundary Between Wilderness and Civilization*, (trans. F. Goodman), Blackwell, Oxford.

Dyens, O. (2001). *Metal and Flesh: The Evolution of Man: Technology Takes Over* (trans. E. J. Bibbee and O. Dyens), The MIT Press, Massachusetts.

Elder, J. (1985). *Imagining the Earth: Poetry and the Vision of Nature*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Elick, C. L. (2001). “Animal Carnivals: A Bakhtinian Reading of C. S. Lewis's *The Magician's Nephew* and P. L. Traver's *Mary Poppins*”, *Style*, 35/3, pp. 454-471.

Emerson, C. (1988). “Problems with Bakhtin’s Poetics”, *Slavic and East European Journal*, 32, pp. 503-525.

Fitzpatrick, B. S. (2006). *Contested Terrain: Rewriting Nature and the Body From an Ecofeminist and Native American Perspective*, (Unpublished MA Thesis), University of Arkansas, Arkansas.

Fox, W. (1986). "Approaching deep ecology: A response to Richard Sylvan's critique of deep ecology", Hobart: University of Tasmania Environmental Studies Occasional Paper 20.

……, (1995). "The Deep Ecology-Ecofeminism Debate and Its Parallels", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 269-289.

Gaard, G. (1997). "Toward a Queer Ecofeminism", *Hypatia*, 12/1, pp.114-137.

Gaard, G. and Murphy, P. D. (1998). "Introduction", *Ecofeminist Literary Criticism: Theory, Interpretation, Pedagogy*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, pp. 1-14.

Gardiner, M. (1993). "Ecology and Carnival: Traces of a 'Green' Social Theory in the Writings of M. M. Bakhtin", *Theory and Society*, 22/6, pp. 765-812.

……, (2000). "'A Very Understandable Horror of Dialectics': Bakhtin and Marxist Phenomenology", *Materializing Bakhtin:The Bakhtin Circle and Social Theory*, (eds. C. Brandist and G. Tihanov), Macmillan Press, Oxford, pp. 119-141.

Gardiner, M. and Bell, M. M. (1998). "Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: A Brief Introduction", *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words*, (eds. M. Gardiner and M. M. Bell), Sage Publications, London, pp. 1-12.

Garrard, G. (2004). *Ecocriticism*, Routledge, Oxford.

Gebara, I. (1996). "The Trinity and Human Experience: An Ecofeminist Approach", *Women Healing Earth: Third World Women on Ecology, Feminism, and Religion* (ed. R. R. Ruether), Orbis Books, New York, pp. 13-23.

"Genesis". (1976). *The Holy Bible*, The Gideons International, Nashville.

Girard, R. (1977). *Violence and the Sacred*, (trans. P. Gregory), John Hopkins UP, Baltimore.

Glendinning, C. (1995). "Recovery from Western Civilization", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 37-40.

Glotfelty, C. (1996). "Introduction: Literary Studies in an Age of Environmental Crisis", *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, (eds. C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm), The University of Georgia Press, Athens, pp. xv-xxxvii.

Hamilton, J. D. and Wills-Toker, C. (2006). "Reconceptualizing Dialogue in Environmental Public Participation", *The Policy Studies Journal*, 34/4, pp. 755-775.

Hampshire, S. (1951). *Spinoza*, Faber and Faber, London.

Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs and Woman: The Reinvention of Nature*, Routledge, New York.

……, (1992). "The Promises of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others." *Cultural Studies*, (eds. L. Grossberg, C. Nelson and P. Treichler), Routledge, New York, pp. 295-337.

Hardin, M. (2003). "Standing Naked Before the Storm: Linda Hogan's Power and the Critique of Apocalyptic Narrative", *From the Center of Tradition: Critical Perspectives on Linda Hogan*, (ed. B. J. Cook), University Press of Colorado, Colorado, pp. 135-155.

Harré, R., Brockmeimer, J. and Mühlhäusler, P. (1999). *Greenspeak: A Study of Environmental Discourse*, Sage Publications, Inc., London.

Harrison, S. and Hogan, L. (2011). "Sea Level: An Interview with Linda Hogan", *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 18/1, pp. 161-177.

Harrison, S. (2019). "'We Need New Stories': Trauma, Storytelling, and the Mapping of Environmental Injustice in Linda Hogan's *Solar Storms* and Standing Rock", *American Indian Quarterly*, 43/1, pp. 1-35.

Hayles, N. K. (1995). "Searching for Common Ground", *Reinventing Nature? Responses to Postmodern Deconstruction* (eds. M. E. Soulé and G. Lease), Island Press, Washington, D.C., pp. 47-64.

……, (1995). "Simulated Nature and Natural Simulations: Rethinking the Relation between the Beholder and the World", *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*, (ed. W. Cronon), Norton, New York, pp. 409-545.

Hazen-Hammond, S. (1997). *Timelines of Native American History: Through the Centuries with Mother Earth and Father Sky*, Perigree, New York.

Heidegger, M. (1993). *Basic Writings* (trans. and ed. D. F. Krell), HarperCollins, New York.

Hitchcock, P. (1998). "The Grotesque of the Body Electric", *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words*, (eds. M. Gardiner and M. M. Bell), Sage Publications, London, pp. 78-94.

Hogan, L. (1994). “An Interview with Linda Hogan”, *The Missouri Review*, 17/2, pp. 109-134.

……, (1995). *Dwellings: A Spiritual History of the Living World*, W. W. Norton, New York.

……, (1997). *Solar Storms*, Scribner Paperback Fiction, New York.

……, (1998). “First People”, *Intimate Nature: The Bond Between Women and Animals*, (eds. L. Hogan, D. Metzger and B. Peterson), The Ballantine Publishing Group, New York, pp. 6-19.

……, (1998). *Power*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York.

……, (2001). *The Woman Who Watches Over the World: A Native Memoir*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York.

Hollinger, V. (2009). “Posthumanism and Cyborg Theory”, *The Routledge Companion to Science Fiction*, (eds. M. Bould, A. M. Butler, A. Roberts and S. Vint), Routledge, London and New York, pp. 267-278.

Holquist, M. (1981). “Introduction”, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, University of Texas Press, Austin, pp. xv-xxxiv.

……, (1984). “Prologue”, *Rabelais and His World*, (M. M. Bakhtin), Indiana University Press, Bloomington, pp. xiii-xxiii.

……, (1990). “Introduction: The Architectonics of Answerability”, *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, (eds. M. Holquist and V. Liapunov), University of Texas Press, Austin, pp. ix-xlix.

……, (2002). *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*, Routledge, New York.

Iovino, S. and Oppermann, S. (2014). “Introduction: Stories Come to Matter”, *Material Ecocriticism*, (eds. S. Iovino and S. Oppermann), Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, pp. 1-17.

Jeanneret, M. (1991). *A Feast of Words*, (trans: J. Whitely and E. Hughes), University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Jefferson, A. (1989). “Bodymatters: Self ans Other in Bakhtin, Sartre and Barthes”, Bakhtin and *Cultural Theory*, (eds. K. Hirschkop and D. Shepherd), Manchester University Press, Manchester, pp. 201-228.

Johnson, B. (1998). “Western Voices Interview with Linda Hogan”, *Center of the American West.*

Jung, H. Y. (1998). “Bakhtin’s Dialogical Body Politics”, *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words*, (eds. M. Gardiner and M. M. Bell), Sage Publications, London, pp. 95-111.

Kant, I. (1964). *Metaphysics of Morals*, (trans: H. J. Paton), Harper & Row, New York.

Kayser, W. J. (1957). *The Grotesque in Art and Literature*, (trans. U. Weisstein), Columbia University Press, New York.

Kheel, M. (1991). “Ecofeminism and Deep Ecology: Reflections on Identity and Difference”, *Trumpeter*, 8/2, pp. 62-72.

Killingsworth, M. J. (1992). “Discourse Communities: Local and Global”, *Rhetoric Review*, 11/1, pp. 110–22.

Kostkowska, J. (2013). *Ecocriticism and Women Writers: Environmentalist Poetics of Virginia Woolf, Jeanette Winterson, and Ali Smith*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Krech III, S. (1999). *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History*, W. W. Norton, New York.

LaDuke, W. (1999). *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life*, South End Press, Cambridge.

Langlais, R. (1995). “Living in the World: Mountain Humility, Great Humility”, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 195-203.

Lee, A. (1994). “Bending the Arrow of Time: the Continuing Postmodern Present”, *Historicité et Metafiction dans le Roman Contemporain des Îles Britanniques*, (ed. M. Duperray), Publications de l’Université de Provence, Aix-en-Provence, pp. 217-229.

Leopold, A. (1949). *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Levin, J. (2002). “Beyond Nature? Recent Work in Ecocriticism”, *Contemporary Literature*, 43, pp. 171-86.

Makinen, M. (2005). *The Novels of Jeanette Winterson*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Malotki, E. (1983). *Hopi Time: A Linguistic Analysis of the Temporal Concepts in the Hopi Language*, Mouton Publishers, Berlin, New York, Amsterdam.

Martin, S. (1999). “The Power of Monstrous Women: Fay Weldon’s *The Life and Loves of a She Devil* (1983), Angela Carter’s *Nights at the Circus* (1984) and Jeanette

Winterson's *Sexing the Cherry* (1989)", *Journal of Gender Studies*, 8/2, pp. 193-210.

Marx, K. (1988). *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, (trans. M. Milligan), Prometheus Books, New York.

McCulloch, F. (2012). *Cosmopolitanism in Contemporary British Fiction: Imagined Identities*, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire.

McDowell, M. J. (1996). "The Bakhtinian Road to Ecological Insight", *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, (eds. C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm), The University of Georgia Press, Athens, pp. 371-391.

McLeish, K. (1989). "Larger than Life: Review of *Sexing the Cherry*", *Sunday Times*, p. G7.

Meeker, J. W. (1974). *The Comedy of Survival: Studies in Literary Ecology*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Merchant, C. (2014). *Earthcare: Women and the Environment*, Routledge, London and New York.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of Perception*, (trans. C. Smith), Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

……, (1968). *The Visible and the Invisible World*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston.

Merola, N. (2014). "Materializing a Geotraumatic and Melancholy Anthropocene: Jeanette Winterson's *The Stone Gods*", *The Minnesota Review*, 83, pp. 122-132.

Mies, M. and Shiva, V. (1993). *Ecofeminism*, Zed Books, London.

Milbrath, L. (1984). *Environmentalists: Vanguard for a New Society*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Moore, L. (1995). "Teledildonics: Virtual Lesbians in the Fiction of Jeanette Winterson", *Sexy Bodies: The Strange Carnalities of Feminism*, (eds. E. Grosz and E. Probyn), Routledge, London, pp. 104-127.

Morton, T. (2007). *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge and London.

Murphy, P. D. (1994). "Voicing Another Nature", *A Dialogue of Voices: Feminist Theory and Bakhtin*, (eds. K. Hohne and H. Wussow), University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp. 59-82.

……, (2006). "Grounding anotherness and answerability through allonational ecoliterature formations", *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies: Transatlantic*

Conversations on Ecocriticism, (eds. C. Gersdorf and S. Mayer), Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam, pp. 417-434.

……, (2011). "Dialoguing with Bakhtin over Our Ethical Responsibility to Anothers", *Ecocritical Theory: New European Approaches* (eds. A. Goodbody and K. Rigby), University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville and London, pp. 155-167.

……, (2013). *Transversal Ecocritical Praxis: Theoretical Arguments, Literary Analysis, and Cultural Critique*, Lexington Books, Lanham.

Müller, T. (2010). "Notes toward an Ecological Conception of Bakhtin's 'Chronotope'", *Ecozona*, 1/1, pp. 98-102.

Naess, A. (1975). *Freedom, Emotion, and Self-Subsistance: The Structure of a Central Part of Spinoza's Ethics*, Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.

……, (1979). "Modesty and the conquest of mountains", *The Mountain Spirit*, (ed. M. Tobias), Overlook Press, New York, pp. 13-16.

……, (1984). "The Arrogance of Antihumanism?", *Ecophilosophy Newsletter* VI, p. 8.

……, (1989). *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*, (trans. D. Rothenberg), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

……, (1995). "The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 64-84.

……, (1995). "The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movements: A Summary", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 151-155.

……, (1995). "The Deep Ecology: 'Eight Points' Revisited", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 213-221.

……, (1995). "Equality, Sameness, and Rights", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 222-224.

……, (1995). "Self-Realization: An Ecological Approach to Being in the World", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 225-239.

……, (1995). "The Place of Joy in a World of Fact", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 249-258.

Norris, T. (2011). "Martin Heidegger, D. H. Lawrence, and Poetic Attention to Being", *Ecocritical Theory: New European Approaches* (eds. A. Goodbody and K. Rigby), University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville and London, pp. 113-125.

Onega, S. (2006). *Jeanette Winterson*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Oppermann, S. (2003). "Toward and Ecocentric Postmodern Theory: Fusing Deep Ecology and Quantum Mechanics", *The Trumpeter*, 19/1, pp. 7-35.

"osteomyelitis". (2014). *Collins English Dictionary – Complete and Unabridged*, 12th Edition, HarperCollins, Glasgow, n.p.

Palmer, P. (1993). *Contemporary Lesbian Writing: Dreams, Desire, Difference*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

Payne, T. L. (2006). "'We are dirt: we are earth': Ursula Le Guin and the problem of extraterrestrialism", *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies: Transatlantic Conversations on Ecocriticism*, (eds. C. Gersdorf and S. Mayer), Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam, pp. 229-248.

Pearce, L. (1994). "Dialogism and Gender: Gendering the Chronotope: Readings of Jeanette Winterson's *Sexing the Cherry* and Toni Morrison's *Beloved*", *Reading Dialogics*, Edward Arnold, London, pp. 173-196.

Peckinpaugh, T. M. (1982). "The specter of environmentalism: the threat of environmental groups", Republican Study Committee, Washington.

Penley, C. and Ross, A. (1991). "Cyborgs at Large: Interview with Donna Haraway", *Technoculture*, (eds. C. Penley and A. Ross), Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 1-20.

Peterson, M. J. and Peterson, T. R. (1996). "Ecology: Scientific, Deep and Feminist", *Environmental Values*, 5, pp. 123-146.

Pier, J. (2005). "Chronotope", *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, (eds. D. Herman et al.), Routledge, London, pp. 64-65.

Plant, J. (1990). "Searching for Common Ground: Ecofeminism and Bioregionalism", *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism* (eds. I. Diamond and G. F. Orenstein), Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, pp. 155-161.

Plumwood, V. (2002). *Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason*. Routledge, London.

……, (2010). "Nature in the Active Voice", *Climate Change and Philosophy: Transformational Possibilities*, (ed. R. Irwin), Continuum, London and New York, pp. 32-47.

Pomorska, K. (1984). "Foreword", *Rabelais and His World*, (M. M. Bakhtin), Indiana University Press, Bloomington, pp. vii-xii.

"Prunus cerasus austera". (n.d.). Plants for a Future.

https://pfaf.org/USER/Plant.aspx?LatinName=Prunus+cerasus+austera (20.12.2019)

"Prunus serotina". (n.d.). Plants for a Future. https://pfaf.org/user/Plant.aspx?LatinName=Prunus+serotina (20.12.2019)

Rainwater, C. (1999). *Dreams of Fiery Stars: The Transformations of Native American Fiction*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Renfrew, A. (2015). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Routledge, New York.

Rolston III, H. (1979). "Can and Ought We to Follow Nature?", *Environmental Ethics*, 1, pp. 7-30.

Rose, D. B. (2002). "Dialogue with Place: Toward an Ecological Body", *JNT: Journal of Narrative Theory*, 32/3, pp. 311-325.

Rosemergy, J. (2000). "Navigating the Interior Journey: the Fiction of Jeanette Winterson", *British Women Writing Fiction* (ed. A. H. P. Werlock), The University of Alabama Press, Alabama, pp. 248-269.

Rothenberg, D. (1989). "Introduction: Ecosophy T – from intuition to system", *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*, (trans. D. Rothenberg), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1-22.

Rueckert, W. (1996). "Literature and Ecology: An Experiment in Ecocriticism", *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, (eds. C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm), The University of Georgia Press, Athens, pp. 105-123.

Russell, L. (2000). "Dog-Woman and She-Devils: The Queering Field of Monstrous Women", *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies*, 5/2, pp. 177-193.

Russo, M. (1995). *The Female Grotesque: Risk, Excess and Modernity*, Routledge, Oxford.

Salleh, A. K. (1984). "Deeper than Deep Ecology: The Eco-feminist Connection", *Environmental Ethics*, 6, pp. 339-345.

……, (2000). "In Defense of Deep Ecology: An Ecofeminist Response to a Liberal Critique", *Beneath the Surface: Critical Essays in the Philosophy of Deep Ecology*, (eds. E. Katz, A. Light and D.Rothenberg), The MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 107-124.

Sandywell, B. (1998). "The Shock of the Old: Mikhail Bakhtin's Contributions to the Theory of Time and Alterity", *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: No Last Words*, (eds. M. Gardiner and M. M. Bell), Sage Publications, London, pp. 196-213.

……, (2000). “Memories of Nature in Bakhtin and Benjamin”, *Materializing Bakhtin; The Bakhtin Circle and Social Theory*, (eds. C. Brandist and G. Tihanov), Macmillan Press, Oxford, pp. 94-118.

Sarles, H. (1985). *Language and Human Nature: Toward a Grammar of Interaction and Discourse*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Schauffler, F. M. (2003). *Turning to Earth: Stories of Ecological Conversion*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.

Schrag, C. O. (1997). *The Self After Postmodernity*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Schweninger, L. (2008). *Listening to the Land: Native American Literary Responses to the Landscape*, University of Georgia Press, Georgia.

Selway, J. (1992). “Tasting the Sweet Fruits of Success”, *Observer*, p. 45.

Sessions, G. (1995). “Preface”, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. ix-xxviii.

……, (1995). “Introduction – Arne Naess on Deep Ecology and Ecosophy”, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 187-194.

Sessions, R. (1991). “Deep Ecology versus Ecofeminism: Healthy Differences or Incompatible Philosophies?”, *Hypatia*, 6/1, pp. 90-107.

Shepard, P. (1995). “Ecology and Man – A Viewpoint”, *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 131-140.

Skolimowski, H. (1987). “To Continue the Dialogue with Deep Ecology”, *The Trumpeter*, 4/4, pp. 31-32.

Stearney, L. M. (1994). “Feminism, Ecofeminism, and the Maternal Archetype: Motherhood as a Feminine Universal”, *Communication Quarterly*, 42, pp. 145-159.

Steinby, L. and Klapuri, T. (2013). “The Acting Subject of Bakhtin”, *Bakhtin and His Others: (Inter)subjectivity, Chronotope, Dialogism*, (eds. L. Steinby and T. Klapuri), Anthem Press, London, pp. xi-xxiv.

Steinby, L. (2013). “Bakhtin’s Concept of the Chronotope: The Viewpoint of an Acting Subject”, *Bakhtin and His Others: (Inter)subjectivity, Chronotope, Dİalogism*, (eds. L. Steinby and T. Klapuri), Anthem Press, London, pp. 105-126.

Stone, J. (2008). “Polyphony and the Atomic Age: Bakhtin’s Assimilation of an Einsteinian Universe”, *PMLA*, 123/2, pp. 405-421.

Sylvan, R. (1985). *A Critique of Deep Ecology*, Australian National University, Canberra.

Turner, J. (1995). "In Wildness Is the Preservation of the World", *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, (ed. G. Sessions), Shambala, Boston, pp. 331-338.

"United States v. James E Billie", United States District Court, S.D. Florida (August 24, 1987). No. 87-8038-Cr-Paine, 667 F. Supp. 1485, *The Environmental Law Reporter*, ELR 20209.

Vizenor, G. (1989). "Trickster Discourse: Comic Holotropes and Language Games", *Narrative Chance: Postmodern Discourse on Native American Indian Literatures*, (ed. G. Vizenor), University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, pp. 187-212.

Warhus, M. (1997). *Another America: Native American Maps and the History of Our Land*, St. Martin's Press, New York.

Westling, L. (2006). "Literature, the Environment, and the Question of the Posthuman", *Nature in Literary and Cultural Studies: Transatlantic Conversations on Ecocriticism*, (eds. C. Gersdorf and S. Mayer), Rodopi B. V., Amsterdam, pp. 25-48.

……, (2011). "Merleau-Ponty's Ecophenomenology", *Ecocritical Theory: New European Approaches*, (eds. A. Goodbody and K. Rigby), University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville and London, pp. 126-138.

Winterson, J. (1990). *Sexing the Cherry*, Vintage, London.

……, (2007). *The Stone Gods*, Penguin Books, London.

Womack, C. S. (2008). "A Single Decade: Length Native Literary Criticism between 1986 and 1997", *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*, (eds. C. S. Womack, D. H. Justice and C. B. Teuton), University of Oklahoma Press, Noman, pp. 3-104.

Zamora, L. P. and Faris W. B. (1995). "Introduction: Daiquiri Birds and Flaubertian Parrot(ie)s", *Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community*, (eds. L. P. Zamora and W. B. Farris), Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 1-11.

Zimmerman, M. E. (1987). "Feminism, Deep Ecology, and Environmental Ethics", *Environmental Ethics*, 9, pp. 21-44.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name and Surname : Ayşe ŞENSOY
Place of Birth : Nevşehir
Date of Birth : November 15, 1988
E-mail : ayse.ciftcibasi@gmail.com

EDUCATION

High School : 2000 Evler High School (2006)
BA : Pamukkale University
Faculty of Science and Letters
Department of English Language and Literature
(2010)
MA : Erciyes University
Institute of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature
(2012)
Foreign Language and Level : French, D (ÜDS)

WORK PLACE AND POSITION : Adıyaman University
Faculty of Science and Letters
Department of English Language and Literature
Research Assistant

RESEARCH INTERESTS : Environmental Humanities, Bakhtinian Studies, Cultural Studies, Science-Fiction, Fantastic Fiction