T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI PROGRAMI

SEMIOTICS OF SPACE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF YURI LOTMAN'S SPATIAL THEORY BASED ON THREE NOVELS FROM DIFFERENT PERIODS; *NORTH AND SOUTH*, *BRAVE NEW WORLD*, AND *ORANGES ARE NOT THE ONLY FRUIT*

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

SENA TEBER

KOCAELİ, 2017

T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI PROGRAMI

SEMIOTICS OF SPACE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF YURI LOTMAN'S SPATIAL THEORY BASED ON THREE NOVELS FROM DIFFERENT PERIODS; *NORTH AND SOUTH*, *BRAVE NEW WORLD*, AND *ORANGES ARE NOT THE ONLY FRUIT*

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

SENA TEBER

DANIŞMAN: PROF. DR. METİN TOPRAK

KOCAELİ, 2017

T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI PROGRAMI

SEMIOTICS OF SPACE: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF YURI LOTMAN'S SPATIAL THEORY BASED ON THREE NOVELS FROM DIFFERENT PERIODS; *NORTH AND SOUTH, BRAVE NEW WORLD,* AND *ORANGES ARE NOT THE ONLY FRUIT*

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Tezi Hazırlayan : Sena TEBER
Tezin Kabul Edildiği Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Karar ve No: 12.07.2017 /17

Jüri Başkanı : Prof. Dr. Metin TOPRAK

Jüri Üyesi : Doç. Dr. Türkay BULUT

Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Berna KÖSEOĞLU

KOCAELİ, 2017

To my beloved mother

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET ..... **ii**
ABSTRACT ..... **iii**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ..... **iv**
1. INTRODUCTION **1**
2. STRUCTURALISM **6**
2.1. A Brief Introduction To Structuralism 7
2.2. Study Of Signs 11
3. THE NOTION OF SPACE **13**
3.1. Definition Of Space 13
3.2. Importance Of Space In Our Lives 14
3.3. The Role Of Space In Literature 17
3.3.1. The Change In The Use Of Space In Literary Narrations Through Time 20
4. SPATIAL CONCEPTS IN LITERARY WORKS THROUGH THE PERSPECTIVE OF YURI LOTMAN **24**
4.1. Space As A Sign 24
4.2. Semiosphere 28
4.2.1. The Use Of Boundary Formed Through Binary Oppositions 31
4.3. Spatial Dimensions In A Literary Text 35
4.4. Types Of Literary Texts 40
5. SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF THREE NOVELS BASED ON YURI LOTMAN'S VIEWS OF SPACE IN LITERATURE **45**
5.1. *North And South* 45
5.1.1. Historical Context 45
5.1.2. Spatial Analysis 52
5.1.3. *North And South* As A Revolutionary Novel 77
5.2. *Brave New World* 87
5.2.1. A Short Introduction 87
5.2.2. Spatial Analysis 90
5.2.3. *Brave New World* As A Confirmative Novel 119
5.3. *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* 130
5.3.1. Gender Roles And The Perception Of Homosexuality 130
5.3.2. Autobiographical Aspect Of The Novel 136
5.3.3. Spatial Analysis 141
5.3.4. *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit*: Rethinking Yuri Lotman's Spatial Theory 153
6. CONCLUSION **172**
WORKS CITED **181**
ÖZGEÇMİŞ **187**

ÖZET

Bu tezin amacı, yapısalcılık kuramının önemli temsilcilerinden biri olan Yuri Lotman'ın teorisini baz alarak edebi metinlerde mekan kavramının nasıl işlendiğine dair daha kapsamlı ve teknik bilgi sağlamaktır. Lotman mekansal tasviri üç şekilde inceler; *topolojik*, *topografik* ve *semantik*. Bir yapısalcı olarak Lotman, tıpkı dil gibi mekansal betimlemelerin de çözümlenmeye ihtiyaç duyulan kendine özgü bir dili olduğunu savunur. Bir başka deyişle; Lotman'a göre, her türlü mekansal tasvir; ki bu matematiksel, coğrafi ya da kültürel olabilir, anlatımda direk olarak bahsedilmeyen alt anlamlar taşır. Lotman edebi eserlerdeki en önemli göstergenin fiziksel betimlemelerin altında derin anlamların gizlendiği mekan olduğuna inanır. Bu yüzden de mekânsal tasvirlerle anlatılmak istenen gizli anlamları kavrayabilmek amacıyla işaret bilimi olan *göstergebilimini* edebiyata uyarlar.

Buna ek olarak, Lotman'ın sanatsal metinlerdeki mekansal tasvirler üzerine ortaya attığı görüşler edebi metin analizinde "mekansal dönüşüm"e yol açtı. Sebebi de Lotman'ın, insanlara güvenilir bir alan sağladığı için kültürü mekânsal bir yapı olarak ele almasıdır. Lotman kültürün nasıl insanlar için sınırları belirlenmiş ve düzenli bir hayat sunduğunu açıklarken "semiosphere" kelimesini kullanır. Ayrıca mekanın gözle görülmeyen fakat net sınırlar sonucunda oluştuğunun üzerinde durur. Bu bağlamda, Lotman metin türleri üzerine de kafa yorar ve eserleri *tutucu*, *devrimci* ve *onaylayıcı* olarak sınıflandırır. Bu bilgiler ışığında, bu çalışmada Lotman'ın mekan üzerine söylemleri farklı döneme ait üç eser derinlemesine analiz edilerek detaylandırılıp açıklanır. Çalışmanın sonucunda Lotman'ın yapısalcılığa dayandırdığı mekanın göstergebilimselliği hakkındaki yorumlarının bazı post-yapısalcı görüşler barındırdığı kanısına varılır.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Yuri Lotman, yapısalcılık, mekan, semiosphere, post-yapısalcılık, göstergebilim*

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to provide a broader and more technical understanding of the employment of space in literary texts based on the theory of one of the notable structuralists, Yuri Lotman. He approaches the depiction of space in three different ways; *topological*, *topographical* and *semantical*. Due to being a structuralist, Lotman claims that just like language which is formed of signs, spatial representations have a certain kind of language of their own which needs to be decoded. In other words, according to Lotman, all types of spatial portrayals, which can be mathematical, geographical or cultural, carry some further information or sub meaning that is not directly mentioned in the narration. Lotman firmly believes in the idea that in literary texts, the most important sign is space carrying deeper meanings underlying the physical descriptions. That is why he adopts *semiotics*, which is the study of signs, to literature with the intention to grasp the hidden meanings reflected through spatial representations.

Moreover, Lotman's views on spatial representations in artistic texts lead to a 'spatial turn' in literary analysis as he marks culture as a spatial construction in terms of forming a safe zone for people. He uses the term 'semiosphere' while explaining how culture makes a bounded and ordered life possible for the ones belonging to that culture. He emphasizes the constructedness of space thanks to invisible but definite boundaries. In this respect, Lotman also contemplates on the types of texts which can be categorized as *conservative*, *revolutionary* and *confirmative*. Based on these notions, through a comprehensive analysis of three novels from different periods, Lotman's comments on space as a semiotic entity are elaborated and explained in this study. At the end of the analysis, it is concluded that Lotman's thoughts of semiotics of space based on structuralist point of view bear some post-structuralist remarks.

Keyword: *Yuri Lotman, structuralism, space, semiosphere, post-structuralism, semiotics*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Metin TOPRAK for his helpful guidance, patience, insightfulness and motivation throughout the course of this study. I feel grateful for him, who gave valuable feedbacks for the thesis in short notices. His profound knowledge in the field of Literary Theories broadened my perspective about life itself and helped me learn how to approach literary texts critically. Therefore, I consider myself a very lucky person for being a student of him and leading my thesis under his supervision.

I feel also blessed to have such genial and remarkable lecturers at Kocaeli University, in the Department of English Language and Literature. They contributed a lot to my academic development with their extensive knowledge, support, and sincerity.

My warmest thanks are for my family and friends who always stand by me in every possible way. I am especially indebted to my aunt Leyla ŞENOL who could see the enthusiasm in me towards English, reading, writing and literature. Therefore, she directed me to study Foreign Language at high school and English Language and Literature at university. She is a great mentor for me.

Finally, my husband Mert Tayfun TEBER deserves my endless indebtedness and love. Thanks to his understanding, encouragement, and support, the tiring periods while studying for master degree became much easier and less painful. He is the best partner I could have.

1. INTRODUCTION

There have been many researches about the use of space in literature and generally the method of structuralism has been applied in order to analyse how space is employed in a literary work. However, the aim of this study is to develop a broader and more theoretical understanding about the employment of space in literary texts based on the theory of Yuri Lotman who is a structuralist thinker as well as try to detect whether his theory is still applicable in our age.

The practice of structuralism will be used since it enables one to analyse a text technically which is helpful for uncovering the deeper meanings and structures lying under the narration. Structuralism stands out as one of the most technical, scientific and important methods as its main interest is language which is the main ingredient of life. We think and make sense of the world through language; therefore, we can see what language teaches us. Our reality is formed through language; in other words, language forms our truths. This is a subjective reality meaning this reality is same for every person due to the fact that the borders of our perception are also defined by language. That is why, every individual using the same language bears the same perception. In a way, it can be asserted that our language is our world. Hence, structuralism deals with the most important aspect of life, language, which is a powerful means that shapes our identity. It tries to understand how language is formed and performed. Since structuralism is concerned with life itself, it can be applied to every kind of field dealing with life such as sociology, anthropology, politics, linguistics and literature.

Pioneered by Ferdinand Saussure; Vladimir Propp, Roland Barthes, and Levi Strauss can be listed as the most well-known structuralists. Saussure is the first to ask and analyse how language operates. He is interested in how meaning is generated through the use of signs. He comes up with the concepts of *signifier* which is the physical representation of a word and the *signified* which is the abstract concept a word holds. Saussure believes that the relationship between the *signifier* and the *signified* is random and same for every person.

The main theory of structuralism is that there needs to be a frame or structure for everything so that individuals can generate the same meaning from it. At this point, cultural norms and beliefs come to the fore by providing individuals an ordered and structured life. Every individual living in the same community is aware of the boundaries of that society based on its culture. In this respect, there appeared the need for semioticians so as to decode the hidden meanings behind the culturally accepted signs.

Basically, structuralists endeavour to give a meaning to life by examining the system of language. In that sense, since literature is a way of reflecting life, most of the structuralists make researches on literary texts. Yuri Lotman is one of those structuralists. Even though his name is not so popular compared to the others, Lotman has actually contributed a lot to the structural analysis of artistic works. However, what is unique about Lotman is the fact that he uses structuralist method to investigate the use of spatial language. In other words, Lotman considers space as a sign and uses semiotic analysis to uncover the meanings spatial representations carry in literature.

Being a structuralist, Yuri Lotman has been mostly influenced by Ferdinand Saussure. The only difference is that Saussure uses semiotics in language to unlock what signs refer to while Lotman applies it to artistic texts. This is a turning point for literary analysis since with the development of semiotics as a literary device, texts can be analysed structurally and systematically instead of thematically. In a way, structuralism provides an individual with a scientific approach.

As all the structuralists claim, meanings are formed through signs and codes. Based on this assumption, Lotman considers space as the most significant sign; therefore, he firmly believes that meanings cannot be constructed without spatial representations in literary texts. Besides, Lotman agrees on the fact that spatial portrayals are formed based on culturally accepted norms. Accordingly, the spaces in artistic texts depend on cultural codes. What Lotman claims is that spatial representations have a certain kind of language reflecting socially

accepted principles, beliefs, and concepts. Hence, the reader can use spaces to decode these messages which help them to understand about the lives of the characters such as their social status, religious beliefs, life styles etc.

Lotman gives great importance to space because he asserts that especially novels cannot be written without spatial representations. However, he makes it clear that spaces do not only serve as settings for the characters but also reveal a lot about the period the story is written, the conditions and culture which characters are living in, and worldviews of the characters. Namely, Lotman asserts that authors use spaces to represent cultural codes.

At this point, Lotman introduces us a new term; 'semiosphere' which comes from the word 'biosphere'. While inventing such a concept, Lotman was influenced by Vladimir Vernadsky who is a biochemist and geochemist. Vernadsky explains 'biosphere' as the physical space where human beings live and which defines what we are. It is related to the scientific condition of the Earth. Applying the notion of 'biosphere' to the concept of space in literature is one of the most brilliant ideas ever thought. Lotman considers 'semiosphere' as an important element of communication since he defines 'semiosphere' as the space where we interact with each other. Therefore, while 'biosphere' forms the physical space around us, 'semiosphere' constitutes the social space originated by culture.

Moreover, Vladimir Vernadsky claims that 'biosphere' is consisted of a distinct boundary that separates the living systems in the outer layer of Earth. In that sense, Lotman adapted this idea to 'semiosphere' as well. He divides the cultural space into two parts; *internal* and *external* which characterize the 'semiosphere'. This concept reminds us the understanding of binary opposition in structuralism; in order for us to understand a word such as 'empty', we need to know its opposition which is 'full'. Basically, what Lotman suggests is that every culture needs its opposite to define itself as a result of the need to separate itself and make its distinction from others. However, Yuri Lotman adds to this

notion of boundary and puts forth that this boundary has semiotic value depending on the socially accepted norms. This means, every culture has its own borders or boundaries that create its semiosphere. When adapted to literature, the concept of binary oppositions help authors to make the clear distinction between groups of people socially, economically, psychologically, gender based etc.

Furthermore, Lotman alleges that the textual boundary is formed of spatial representations. This reasoning that Lotman has come up with is quite important in literary analysis as it is the core of the narration. He has brought a totally new perspective to the use of space in artistic texts. According to Lotman, the characters portrayed in a text belong to either side of the boundary which is formed of culturally accepted formulas. These formulas give meanings to each part which provides the reader with detailed information about the characters and make sense of the events in the text. That is why, this boundary is crucial to form the structure and organization of the divided parts because it creates the borders of the two spatial parts.

Moreover, Lotman divides the spatial dimensions in a literary text into three; *Topological*, *Topographical* and *Semantical*. *Topological Dimension* refers to the mathematical representation of spaces such as big-small, up-down, left-right. *Topographical Dimension* describes the geographical aspect of the spaces such as rivers, rooms, worlds, mountains etc. Finally, *Semantical Dimension* reflects the cultural meanings attributed to the spaces. By using these explanations, Lotman implies that spatial representations are not barely physical formations since they have deeper meanings under the surface portrayals.

Lotman extends the literary analysis based on spatial dimensions and comments on the plot development as well. From Lotman's point of view, there are three types of text; *Conservative*, *Confirmative* and *Revolutionary*. Regarding this classification, Lotman has again adjusted Vladimir Vernadsky's thoughts on 'biosphere'. Vernadsky suggests that in terms of 'biosphere' there can be no transitions between the outer and inner parts. Similarly, Lotman claims that all the artistic texts are

originally *Conservative* which means one cannot see a hero crossing the boundary formed in the text. However, for Lotman what makes a text successful is the act of crossing that sharp boundary. Therefore, Lotman calls the text in which the protagonist breaks the boundary and adapts to the new spatial formation as *Revolutionary*. However, if the hero crosses that boundary but cannot adapt to the change, this text is called *Confirmative*. In these texts, the character is defined as mobile character due to the movement they perform while in *Conservative* ones they are considered as immobile characters as a result of not being able to change locations. Besides, Lotman takes this movement quite serious due to the fact that the change in spatial representations has a semantic meaning for him. Namely, Lotman says artistic texts have their own kind of language which is formed of spatial representations. Therefore, one needs to analyse the structure of spaces in order to decode the deeper meanings.

Nevertheless, in order to prove his theory, Lotman has written many books. *The Structure Of The Artistic Text* is one of his grand works in which he handles various works of poetry and prose such as *War and Peace, The Stone Guest, Divine Comedy, Don Juan, Anna Karenina,* "Prayer", *A Hero Of Our Times, The Song Of Igor's Host, A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy* etc. Generally, the texts Lotman examines mostly belong to the period between early 16th century and early 20th century. Wherefore, in this thesis, three different novels from different periods will be analysed in order to apply Lotman's ideas about spatial representations and to find out if his thoughts are still applicable even after the first half of the 20th century.

In this respect, firstly a 19th century novel *North and South*, secondly *Brave New World* from the first half of 20th century and finally *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* from the second half of the 20th century will be analysed so as to draw a conclusion in terms of the structuralist method of investigating spaces by Lotman.

2. STRUCTURALISM

One of the most "predominant means of communication" (Hawkes 1977, 101) is language which is a self-operating system. This means language operates on its own without the need of an external force. However, in order for language to be a system, every part in language has to be in harmony with the whole, which is called *coherence* as well as the parts have to be in harmony with themselves, which is considered as *unity*. Without these two notions, language cannot be regarded as a proper system.

Language is regarded as a general area where social connection serves its purpose at utmost level since through language people share their knowledge, feelings, experiences, concerns and beliefs with each other. Due to the fact that it is a common communication tool, language defines the shared emotions, thoughts and expression style of a specific culture. That is why, it has the function of directing people's thoughts and behaviour as well as shaping their world view. In a way, language produces meanings, provides a base for thinking and sets its limits, provides insight for a culture's values. In this respect, language can be considered as a set of symbols producing and protecting a culture. Therefore, language defines the identity of a person; hence, it is an essential part of culture.

Due to its extraordinary nature, some thinkers have asked what language is with the intention to find out how it arises and how it is conveyed. In this respect, the field of study which is labelled as structuralism becomes distinguished with its analyses on how language works. As the name suggests, structuralism "is fundamentally a way of thinking about the world which is predominantly concerned with the perception and description of structures" (Hawkes 1977, 6). In this respect, every self-operating system can be the subject of structuralism.

2.1. A Brief Introduction To Structuralism

Being an influential structuralist and linguist, Ferdinand Saussure "believed that in language . . . meaning is generated through a system of signs" (Taghizadeh 2013, 287). In other words, how we produce meanings depend upon the signs we create every day which reveals the fact that "sign is an indispensable vehicle of cognition" (Kalaga 2016, 139). As a result, it can be asserted that it is impossible for us to think without the thoughts and meanings attributed to signs.

Saussure resembles the sign to "a coin with two sides of signifier and signified" (Taghizadeh 2013, 287). According to the Swiss linguist, signs make the connection between a notion and the written or acoustic version of it. For instance; when the word 'mansion' which is formed of seven letters is uttered, written or drawn, it becomes the *signifier*; however, it also creates a concept or a mental image in our minds which is considered to be the *signified*. In the case of the word *mansion*, signified concept might be wealth, comfort, large family etc. Namely, the signified is the "conceptual content of the sign" (Akpan, Akpan and Obukoadata 2013, 15) and the signifier is the "physical, acoustic, or visual representation" (15). Together, they form a sign. Nevertheless, the word 'mansion' does not have any qualities related to this certain type of accommodation. In this respect, Saussure insists on the fact that this relationship is entirely deprived of any scientific explanation; hence, it is totally "arbitrary since there is no natural relationship between" (Donato 1967, 552) the signifier and the signified.

Nonetheless, the word 'arbitrary' does not mean that the meaning a sign forms completely depends upon the speaker. Saussure claims that the concepts or meanings a sign creates in our minds are same for every person; therefore, "the individual has no power to change a sign in any way once it has become established in linguistic community" (Habib 2005, 635). To put it another way, "the relationship between [the signifier and the signified] is simply the result of convention – of cultural agreement" (Storey 2009, 111). In this respect, one of the most common examples for explaining the cultural aspect of structuralism lies in the

traffic light demonstration. In a traffic light, there are three colours; red, amber, and green. Red means stop, amber means prepare for red or green, green means go. However, there is no logical connection between the actions (signified) and the colours (signifier) which suggests "the traffic would work equally well if red signified 'go' and green signified 'stop'" (Storey 2009, 112). That is to say, there is no certain or logical connection between the act of stopping and the colour of red; however, we know that we have to stop when the light is red just because it is accepted as a general rule in society without any rational or scientific motives. Thus, it can be inferred from this example that "convention and usage consequently determine the accepted signification or perceived (intended) meaning" (Akpan, Akpan and Obukoadata 2013, 15). In other words, social conventions and accepted values and beliefs set the frame for our perception.

The understanding of forming frames or borders is an essential concept of structuralism which helps a specific culture provide a structured life for the people living in that society. As culture is considered as a system, "the fundamental 'task' of culture, . . ., is in structurally organizing the world around man" (Lotman, Uspensky, and Mihaychuk 1978, 213). In a way, it can be claimed that these frames form the boundaries within cultures. Basically, in order for a culture to operate properly, people living in that society need to have certain borders for having common understanding of the world around them.

Nevertheless, this concept of structuredness is not only unique to the system of culture; since, "boundary is a crucial structural element of any system" (Semenenko 2012, 56). In this respect, it has been accepted by the University of Tartu that there would be "no meaning without a frame" (Kalaga 2016, 128) in any kind of art; since, the meaning must be objectified by the people which is only possible when they know the borders of a work of art. Nonetheless, while there can be perceptible or physical borders such as "print, white edges, boundaries of the matter of an artefact such as a painting or a sculpture, the stage in the theatre, the screen in the cinema, the body of an organism" (128), especially in

literature, these borders may be in the form of an "immaterial frame encompassing the semantics of the matter, the meanings that the signifier (or representamen) carries or products" (Kalaga 2016, 128). Namely, in a literary narration, there can be invisible clear-cut borders so as to make the text more structured and enable the reader to get the intended meaning. In this respect, in written works of art, the boundary is formed through the beginning and ending of a literary work which introduce "segmentation to the continuity of life, making it discrete and meaningful" (Sememenko 2012, 86). This is highly important for the reader to understand the text which "makes a text meaningful" (86). Basically, every narration has to have a definite beginning and an ending so that readers can detect the frame of that work which makes understanding easier.

Furthermore, Saussure also tries to ascertain that the meaning of a certain sign originates from its relation to other signs and its difference from them. Habib describes this notion as follows;

> no sign has a meaning in isolation; rather, its signification depends on its difference from other signs and generally on its situation within the entire network of signs. (2005, 633)

This idea suggests that in order to know what 'black' is we need to know the other colours and its difference from these colours. This actually creates the understanding that "the full significance of any entity or experience cannot be perceived unless it is integrated into the *structure* of which it forms a part" (Hawkes 1977, 7). This actually means that we cannot understand a concept, thing, or idea if we try to consider them individually, we need to put them the place they belong in the structure of which they are a part. However, in the comprehension of a notion, what is more essential for structuralists is "to define it negatively, as opposite to something" (Semenenko 2012, 97). For instance, instead of describing what 'freedom' means, it becomes easier to define and understand it as something opposite to 'slavery'; or, we can understand what 'safe' is by contrasting it with the term 'dangerous'. Namely, we have to compare two contradictory concepts so as to grasp what a thing is

through what it is not. This is the best way of comprehension for structuralists.

With these thoughts in mind, Saussure makes the difference between *langue* which is "a system, an institution, a set of interpersonal rules and norms" (Taghizadeh 20013, 287) and *parole* which "refers to the individual utterance, the individual use of language" (Storey 2009, 113). To understand this differentiation, Saussure's most popular metaphor can be taken into consideration which is his comparison of language which he considers as *langue* to the game of chess. According to him, *langue* is the rules of the game while *parole* is the way peculiar to the player who is playing the game; in other words, *parole* refers to the actual game of chess. Even though every player has his own style, they have to play the game according to the rules of it. It is clear that "without the body of rules, there could be no actual game" (Storey 2009, 113). It is claimed by Saussure that this idea is same for language. This justifies that *parole* cannot exist on its own since it is limited to the concept and rules of the *langue*. Namely, *parole* does not depend on personal choices or preferences. Taghizadeh describes this understanding as follows;

> Langue is the structure of system of language which is in the mind of the people and in which all members of a language community share. But parole is the actual speech utterances of an individual language user. A member of a language community can generate countless examples of utterances, but all of these utterances are governed by the system of that language, by its langue. (2013, 287)

Basically, what Saussure puts forward is that language is a system made of signs and all these signs signify certain concepts in people's minds. He demonstrates that a sign has two parts; the *signifier* and the *signified* whose relationship has no rational explanation which means this relationship is totally random based on the rules of the related language, the community and the culture. Therefore, there is no way for a person to think of something different other than the generally accepted one based on a concept.

2.2. Study Of Signs

The study of signs is called semiotics which originates from the Greek word "semeion" whose meaning is "sign". This field of study is based on creation, interpretation and clarification of signs which are used to convey messages. Semiotics in general is interested in the function of the signs in a sign system where signs operate with their interpreters and the messages they transmit. In that sense, the system where there is

> a set of interpreters together with the signs and the messages interpreted by them, as well as the further circumstances relevant to the interpretation is called a 'sign system'. (Posner 2004, 1)

In other words, semiotics deals with how we give meaning to signs and codes. Therefore, semiotics is an important field of study due to the fact that everything we do, see, read, say or think includes a sign. This reveals the fact that we cannot spend a moment without associating a thing, or a word to a certain idea. In that sense, semiotics appears to be related to any discipline which includes cultural, social, and traditional codes such as architecture, fashion, painting, movies and literature.

Nevertheless, according to structuralism, the meanings we decode from the signs are not our own interpretations. Rather, they are culturally constructed forming the "sociocultural environment which provides the meaning and resources for human beings to act and stabilize the world they experience through the semiotic mediation of sign-systems" (Valsiner qtd in Rosa and Pievi 2013, 2). In a way, signs are abstract representations of a given culture. Hence, the procedure of figuring out the meanings of socially developed signs is called "cultural semiotics" (Posner 2004, 1). For instance, when we imagine the colour *white,* we may think of peace or purity; however, in Asian culture *white* reflects a totally different concept; death and bad luck. In that sense, the meaning of *white* is not based on our own perception but all the other people who live in our culture. To put it another way, a certain sign may reflect different concepts in different cultures. Basically, it is a mutually agreed understanding of a sign which suggests that "given messages will be easily produced and received in certain cultures, whereas in other

cultures they appear inexpressible and fail to be communicated" (Posner 2004, 22). In this respect, it can be claimed that the messages a sign or code conduct depend on predetermined cultural concepts which are same for every person exposed to that culture. This is the understanding of structuralism about signs which help people communicate with one another. In short, "each culture is a comprehensive sign system characterized by certain long-term constellations of properties" (22); wherefore, it is clear that based on structuralism and semiotics, culture defines the meaning of a sign or a code.

3. THE NOTION OF SPACE

The word ‘space’ is such a term that it is not easy to make a clear description of it due to its both abstract and concrete nature. It is a well-known fact that world exists in space and the metaphorical world of people is built upon various types of spaces. Therefore, the meaning and function of ‘space’ have been questioned to be identified by many thinkers.

3.1. Definition Of Space

The general perception about the term space is that it is “a boundless, all-encompassing expanse [which is] identical with the void postulated by the atomist philosophers” (Skulj 2004, 22). This is the understanding which governed the primeval days. However, in modern times space is referred by most of the people as the physical environment which encompasses us and where we feel safe which is why “the term space is used to . . . mean specifically the spatial aspects of the reconstructed world” (Zoran 1984, 309). Therefore, the first idea that comes to mind in terms of the phrase ‘space’ is related to architecture. This aspect of space is the Newtonian definition of space which is “something absolute, a completely separate and self-sufficient entity, independent of matter and substance, and in no way determined by objects or things” (Löve 1994, 29). This is called ‘empty’ space. However, in addition to what everybody believes, the notion of space is less about forming physical places but more about shaping our behaviour giving it a social, cultural, intellectual and philosophical aspect. This notion of space is based on the definition of Leibniz who “views space as something relative, that derives its identity only from the objects with which it is filled” (29); and, this is referred as ‘filled’ space. Namely, it can be asserted that the notion of space may bear various implications.

3.2. Importance Of Space In Our Lives

At the beginning, we, as human beings, were vulnerable and weak creatures who were trying to find our way in nature. As time went by, we had to learn how to defend our lives or things we own and how to use our faculties in order to protect ourselves and our families from the unfriendly environment. As a result of the urge to survive, we came up with the idea of building shelters for both protection and privacy because spaces offer sense of safety. Thanks to the living spaces that we created as a "means of standing up against the forces of the environment" (Majlingová 2011, 20), we were able to maintain our lives. It can be suggested that at the beginning "human beings [were] immersed in real space, the space which nature [gave] them" (Lotman 1990, 132). This created a clear separation between nature and human beings which enabled us to create a convenient area where we could provide any kind of needs.

The idea of our distancing ourselves from nature can be regarded as "the symbol of civilization triumphing over brute nature" (Majlingová 2011, 20) owing to the fact that we could continue our existence as cultural beings through establishing our own spaces by determining the borders of our personal places. Basically, since it was nearly impossible to stay alive in nature's hostile environment, we decided to form liveable spaces. In a way, we resisted nature by forging our own living conditions, rules, and habits which clearly proves the fact that nature plays an important role in shaping our cultural identity.

With the passing of time, we developed our identities, norms and values; hence, this change reflected itself in the spaces we were living in because we started to "divide up [our] world, assign values to its parts, and measure them" (Tuan 1977, 34). Wherefore, spaces became an indispensable part of our lives as our impression of space is related to our sense of self. This reveals the fact that a space which an individual belongs to carries traces of their identity. Hereby, it can be deduced that the concept of space "is a human invention, constricted by ritual markings that invest it and attach to it functions and values" (Garcia

2015, 20). Since space has vital importance for people, it is inevitable that people not only internalise the spaces they are living in but also become integrated with that space. In fact, the person who internalises the space in a way ensures a safe zone for them by establishing their life on it. Moreover, they try to protect this safe space at all costs. To this respect, it has to be acknowledged that space serves a great function in providing people with an existence, safety, identity and personality revealing the issue that "space is an abstract term for a complex set of ideas" (Tuan 1977, 34). Besides, not only humans but also objects need a space in order to exist. This leads to the idea that space builds the relationships between individuals, between objects and it even forms the interaction between objects and individuals. In this respect, it can be suggested that the space is characterized with the things and people remaining in it; in other words, space "is the container of elements whose interrelation is determined by their position in" (Löve 1994, 29) it. Thus, it can be asserted that "our understanding of geographical space is one of the ways the human mind models space" (Lotman 1990, 171); however, the concept of 'space' is more than being just a physical term.

People are always in connection with the spaces that they are attached to. All the messages a space has directly affect human beings' social behaviours. Thus, space is a fundamental part of our life for being "the decisive factor that shapes our view of society and our environment" (Volkmann 4). It can be inferred that in order for us to understand a space, we need to interpret its connection to the people and objects in it because the relationship between these three substances determines the meaning.

However, it would not be right to claim that the interaction between the space and human beings is one sided. In other words, while our ideas, behaviours, actions and desires form the spaces we belong to, spaces also lead to changes in our attitudes, behaviours and psychology. As Lotman summarizes, "on the one hand, the [spatial] image is created by man, and on the other, it actively forms the person immersed in it" (1990, 204). Basically, what is meant is that while space gains meaning through the

existence of human beings, people attain the sense of their selves through the space they inhabit since that space provides an identity for the people with its texture. This issue increases space's effect on perception. Therefore, from the space an individual is connected to, we can make many assumptions such as his social status, life style, and view of life based on the fact that space "is both human product and consumption" (Narain 2014, 21). Namely, a person's life proceeds entirely with the notion of space.

What is more, the reason why people want to relate or devote themselves to a space is both because of the need for the sense of belonging somewhere and the desire to be eternal like the space; thus, "humanity . . . always creates around itself an organized spatial sphere" (Lotman 1990, 203). Therefore, a person sees themselves in that space and feeds from that space. In this respect, space and human beings are in an everlasting cycle, they need each other to exist. Everything related to human beings comes into existence thanks to the notion of space. All the activities we do such as thinking, sleeping, eating, or speaking are related to the space we are living in. Considering all the aspects associated with the notion of space;

> Henri Lefebvre developed a triadic model of 'perceived space' as the product of the senses, 'conceived space' as the product of the mind and 'lived space' as the product of social relations and interactions. (Klooster and Heirman 2013, 6)

According to what Lefebvre puts forward, the concept of space has many roles in our lives. It not only refers to our senses as a physical area but also serves as an entity for us to build our perception of the world, people and the environment around us emphasising the fact that space "is an organized world of meaning" (Tuan 1977, 34). That is why, since the very beginning, spaces have always been an essential element in our lives.

3.3. The Role Of Space In Literature

Even though how human mind works is still a mystery, many philosophers have been concerned with how human mind can have knowledge of the world outside it for centuries. Kant is one of the most influential thinkers in terms of generating ideas about how human mind operates. What Kant claims is that human mind is not capable of making sense of the world around it without spatial representations. In one of his books he describes space as follows; "space . . . originates from the mind's nature in accord with a stable law as a scheme, as it were, for coordinating everything sensed externally" (Janiak, "Kant's Views on Space and Time"). Kant suggests that our reason sets the frame for our perceptions which are shaped by the spaces we create and live in. Therefore, it can be asserted that how we perceive the world is in "harmony with our cognitive powers" (Habib 2005, 368); therefore, the way we form our thoughts depend upon spatial representations. As mentioned above, while setting up spaces to live on, we tend to attribute meanings and values to these spaces which makes it impossible for us to understand something without associating it to a spatial representation. This shows that for Kant "the pure form of human sensible intuition is spatiotemporal, i.e., human cognition is transcendentally ordered in space and time" (Mohr, Abildtoft, Stokholm, Sandvik & Munck-Westh 2009, 29). This means we cannot comprehend things, ideas, concepts, or environments without spatial representations in accordance with time.

Moreover, art is one of the ways to "re-create a general picture of the world" (Semenenko 2012, 35) with every aspect and it has its certain kind of language due to the fact that "every system whose end is to establish communication between two or more individuals may be defined as language" (Lotman 1977, 7). Besides, since life is shaped by spaces, art is also based on spatial representations due to being an image of life. Therefore, it can be suggested that the idea of 'space' has always been integrated with art which "is often synonymous with culture itself" (Semenenko 2012 34). In this respect, the importance of the concept of

‘space’ inspires many works of art and the most common field of art which makes use of spatial images is literature.

In literature, “fictional worlds consist of three core elements: protagonists, actions and space(s) the plot unfolds in” (Kayser qtd. in Reuscel and Hurni 2011, 293). Without these three components, no literary work can be created. Namely, it can be claimed that; “spatial setting is . . . a fundamental component of narration and therefore has always been a subject of narratological studies” (Perenič 2012, 266). Within the components mentioned above, the most essential one is the concept of ‘space’ owing to the fact that spaces provide basis for both the characters and the actions; hence, the plot structure depends highly upon the space. Basically, spatial aspect of literary narration carries the burden of making sense of the literary world in which the characters perform, meanings behind the scenes come into existence and actions take place.

Apart from being the place where the action takes place and where the character lives or moves, spaces may have real or fictive characteristics and names. Accordingly, on the one hand, the notion of space is a limited place which has certain borders with a physical starting point surrounding human beings. On the other hand, the concept of space is an abstract idea which goes beyond its borders “extended by an idea of limitlessness” (Volkmann 5). In the past, human beings defined ‘space’ within his environment. However, today we use the term ‘space’ not only for physical places or structures but also for faraway, imaginary or abstract settings such as utopias or dystopias which “are no real spaces” (5). In this respect, either physical or abstract, construction of spaces reveals the purpose of the author, which can be both describing the setting where the action takes place and reflecting the characters’ dreams, expectations, or longings.

In some cases, a depiction of a certain kind of space may have assisting and restricting function in terms of the character. For example, when an elevator might enable the character to reach his purpose, an ocean might prevent him from that. Wherefore, we should take this fact for granted that “novelists succeed in connecting us emotionally with the

domains they describe precisely because literary settings convey something more than" (James 2008, 1) visible and substantial places. They undertake the duty to express deeper meanings lying under the physical depictions.

Furthermore, spaces may act as a directive personality for the character helping and supporting him due to the fact that "space forms the framework that, together with time, structures the plot and determines who characters are and how they behave" (Mucignat 2013, 5). Basically, spaces are not only representations of locations of the events and the characters but also reflect the cultural codes, values and norms of the place and social life, social status, and world view of the people living there. What is suggested is that portrayal of spaces "give[s] a more solid, visible appearance to the fictional world" (11). Based on this view, Hess-Lüttich suggests that "spatial setting is –in addition to temporal setting, narrator, literary characters, and literary events- a fundamental component of narration" (2012, 5).

Taking all the information about the use of 'space' in literature into consideration, it is noticeable that "since it is impossible to tell a story without one or more settings, the spatial dimension is essential to fiction" (Ruschel and Hurni 2011, 293). However, spaces depicted in the story have various functions. First of all, they serve as a decoration or design for the action to happen. In addition, spaces have great importance for the characters to realize their own existence and express the way they perceive the world and their environment. In this respect, it can be inferred that spatial "descriptions go from being mainly decorative . . . to playing an active role in the production of the plot" (Mucignat 2013, 5). Moreover, spaces are useful for the reader to define the psychological, economic, and social conditions of the characters and the time when the story is set. In that sense, every type of space depicted in a literary text has a function "as a component of the narrative creation of meaning" (9). For example, open spaces such as parks, mountains, or cities are applied where the main focus is on the action. However, when the author wants to direct the readers' attention to the psychology of the character, he may

prefer using closed spaces such as hospitals or rooms where the character is able to express himself. We can infer that the content of the novel may be shaped by the structure of the space because in action-packed stories, broad spaces help the storyline develop while in psychological novels spaces become more restrained so as to concentrate more on the psychological or spiritual journey of the character. It is apparent that "just as a character affects the course of a narrative, so too can space play a role in the evolution of the events within the story" (Garcia 2015, 18). Since there is no novel without the depiction of space and since the notion of space has a serious contribution to the plot development and the meaning authors try to generate, "we might indeed expect the writer initially to assume the role of a tour guide, acquainting us with the quintessence of his or her chosen locale" (James 2008, 1). Therefore, no matter what the author wishes to demonstrate, with the help of the spatial images, it becomes easier for him to direct the course of the narrative.

3.3.1. The Change In The Use Of Space In Literary Narrations Through Time

Even though every literary work is formed with the help of the concept of 'space', the implementation of spaces has gone through changes over time. In ancient times, even before the invention of writing, the most useful way to entertain people, describe lifestyles of the local communities, intensify people's faith and give moral lessons was based on storytelling. These stories can be categorized under the title of 'folktale'. During the preliterate age, folktales were part of an oral tradition which were "carried from tribe to tribe, even from continent to continent" (Boas 1916, 335). However, in the 19th century, thanks to Brothers Grimm, these tales were collected and written down.

The English word *'folk'* stems from the German word *'volk'* meaning 'people'. Hence, it can easily be inferred that folktales are stories which are about daily life and daily issues of humanity; in other words, they are the "tales dealing with the social life of the people" (Boas 1916, 343). These stories may involve animals, supernatural elements such as magic

and unnatural forces. Some examples for the unnatural elements portrayed in folktales can be “revival of the dead, disappearance of wounds, magical treasures, and plentiful food obtained without labour” (Boas 1916, 342). Furthermore, there might be heroes who possess non-human powers, and witches, ghosts, giants whom the hero struggles with. Namely, the main content of the story generally includes mythical details and the characters are endowed with uncommon abilities and qualities which help them achieve the good deed at the end. Nevertheless, all the characters have their own thoughts and attitudes similar to human behaviour. In addition, they have real emotions, flaws and failings. Therefore, people are able to relate themselves with the characters in the story and imagine what they would do in such situations. In this respect, folktales are considered to be a nice way to present practical information and life lessons. In a way, these tales tend to give the audience some clues about how to behave in an exaggerated way. Thus, folk tales are not only important for the people but also for the society.

The popular folktale types are epics, myths and fairy tales. In these stories the most essential things are the incidents; that is why, the notion of ‘space’ does not occupy an important place in the characters’ lives. Hence, most folktale settings take the audience away from the real world and carry them to far away, vague and unknown times and places where animals could talk and where you can encounter with demons, angels or monsters. The general beginning of these types of stories might be “Once upon a time in a faraway land” or “Long ago in a deserted place”. This is the way how epics, fairy tales and myths set the setting in order to convey their messages. They set the spaces as a stage for the actions and the characters. This reveals the fact that these spaces do not have the significance to support the events happening in the story. Wood summarizes this issue as follows;

> The folk-tale often depends its power to capture the memory upon some pat saying or unexpected situation, which gives the proper snap to the whole story. Often this sentence or situation is all there is to the story, the rest of the tale being merely background for this one element. (1909, 35)

To put it another way, in these literary works, spaces do not function as real entities but only a place for the characters to perform their roles because the only significant part are the actions taking place and the deeds the protagonists accomplish; in other words the moral of the story.

Basically, the representation of spaces in epics, fairy tales and myths is mostly imaginary which is related to the spirit of the age. In ancient period when depictions were merely about unreal places, the notion of space appeared as a setting where the action occurred; hence, it did not have any physical presence and importance for the plot structure. In other words, due to the abstract nature of the space depicted in the tale, "the cultural border may not be visually discernible" (Jaago 2012, 17). Therefore, the concept of space may not have any connection with reality and physical world. In that sense, in such kind of literary genres which are "built upon some simple event that is characteristic of the social life of the people and that stirs the emotion of the hearers" (Boas 1916, 337), spaces operate as aimless grounds.

Nonetheless, with the emergence of scientific improvements and giving importance to reason and logic, the portrayal of spaces underwent a change and became more realistic and concrete. Contrary to imaginary and unknown depictions of spaces, today, many authors "often link their stories to existing, recognisable places" (Reuschel and Hurni 2011, 293). In this respect, one of the most popular artworks that cannot be created without depiction of spaces is novel because in fictional world, space is the most important element for the reader to visualize what is being told. James suggests that "every novel has to be set somewhere" (2008, 1) owing to the fact that thanks to the depiction of spaces, fictional world acquires visibility.

Novel puts human beings at the core of its subject because novel as a literary genre comprehends life, reflects all the emotions one can feel and depicts the story of people. That is to say, novels form their content based on people, the environment they live in, and their dreams; thus, it is not surprising that spaces which human beings shape their lives in are one of the essential elements in the construction of novel. In that sense, it can be

asserted that “spatial descriptions help to materialize the story, making it visible and apprehensible by the reader” (Mucignat 2013, 6). It can be proved by the fact that so far not even one novel has been written without the depiction of a space owing to the fact that spaces support the characters and the incidents. Therefore, it can be suggested that “all fictional worlds surely depend upon some indication of locality” (James 2008, 1). Besides, spaces hold fundamental role in forming the plot structure of the novel. Through the illustration of spaces, the reader can understand the cultural, economic, social and even psychological condition of the era and the characters which are depicted in the narrative because “characters’ decisions and their pivotal consequences are often intensified by the demands and opportunities of where they take place” (1). That is why, spatial models are crucial for the author to establish the relationships between the characters and reflect the atmosphere and mood of the story.

4. SPATIAL CONCEPTS IN A LITERARY WORK THROUGH THE PERSPECTIVE OF YURI LOTMAN

As discussed earlier, through spatial descriptions the fictional world becomes concrete and the writer codifies the world that he would like to show to the readers' subconscious and Yuri Lotman, one of the leading structuralists, is the one who strongly supports this idea which is why he "introduces various terms and concepts and experiments upon their practicability" (Löve 1994, 33). In this respect, Lotman has provided structuralism with new aspects of the notion of space in literature.

4.1. Space As A Sign

Saussure has an influence on not only linguistic studies but also literary studies with his method of analysing any given system through structuralism. Since "literature and language are similarly structured" (Taghizadeh 2013, 228) in terms of being self-operating, every literary text is composed of signs like language itself. In this respect, every kind of narration can be evaluated through semiotic analysis which is the main structuralist approach. At this point, Yuri Lotman, founder of the Tartu Moscow School of Semiotics as well as one of the leading theoreticians, comes to the fore for being the linguist who adopts this semiotic method to literature. Lotman's primary source for his approach is based on Saussure's method; hence, his understanding of *langue* and *parole* "become[s] understood as samples of the theoretical apparatus of any sign system (langue) and of the realization or employment of individual signs in specific contexts (parole)" (Champagne 1978, 205-206). In addition, Lotman's semiotic approach is quite significant since while Saussure is only interested in linguistic studies based on "verbal research, Lotman . . . recognizes semiotics as the study of the artistic text" (206) by virtue of the fact that he has become concerned about the connection between the author, the structure of the text and the reader. In that sense, Lotman "has tried to define the properties of literature seen as an information source, and he has illustrated his theory with many detailed analyses of individual poems, novels and literary styles" (Thompson

1977, 227). Wherefore, he has been recognized as one of the leading figures of structuralism in literary studies.

Since the development of semiotics as a literary device, literary texts have no longer been analysed thematically but structurally. Before that, analysis of texts was based on the meaning created by authors. To put it another way, thanks to semiotics, literary analysis has gained a more structured, systematic and scientific approach as semiotics changed the understanding that meaning is naturally given in a text by the author. As Taghizadeh describes;

> What the writer has created as concept, the structuralist critic deals with as sign, and he reads the text as a cultural production that is manufactured according to various perceptions, routines, and traditions of that culture. Such a critic never ignores the meaning but treats it as mediated by the signs. (2013, 288)

In other words, semiotics focuses on the meaning of the texts through signs which means semioticians try to discover how signs used in the text form the meaning of the whole literary work. In this respect, Lotman treats semiotics as "the study of modelling systems, since modelling is a function of sign systems" (Kull 2015, 255); in so far as, semiotics proves that meanings are actually structures which are formed through many signs and codes. Accordingly, Lotman thinks that;

> literary texts are entities of great complexity which come into being through the utilization of a variety of 'subcodes' (that is, codes invented by man in the course of his historical activity and utilized in literature for literature's own purposes). (Thompson 1977, 230)

Basically, Lotman claims that literary narratives have complex structures since they make use of signs in order to activate the predetermined meanings and concepts in the mind of the reader. Therefore, Yuri Lotman appears to be one of the celebrated semioticians who "talk[s] about the sign-based nature of all texts" (Andrews 2001, 348). In that sense, he regards the concept of space as the primary sign applied in literature. Nevertheless, he prefers to use the term 'symbol' instead of sign and "assigns symbol a function of a specific cultural entity that does not express some definite content but rather refers to a specific semantic

field" (Semenenko 2012, 77). Basically, Lotman asserts that the meanings in literary texts are constructed through the representation of spaces since "it is impossible to tell a story without one or more settings [;therefore,] the spatial dimension is essential to fiction" (Reuschel and Hurni 2011, 293). There can be culturally accepted symbols that refer to certain concepts in a society suggesting that when they appear in a literary text, "they have a very high semantic capacity" (Semenenko 2012, 119). In this respect, Lotman embraces the notion of space as a significant source for information in various literary styles such as poems, novels or epics so as to convey intended messages. Namely, semiotics enables the reader to comprehend the artistic text as a work of literature as well as makes people understand the deeper implications behind the signs represented throughout the narration with the help of "semiotic systems based on social conventions" (Lotman 1990, 179).

Lotman suggests that the minds of human beings are always in search of an order in universe. This is one of the reasons why we create spaces because we want unity and organization in our lives. In that sense, as mentioned before, by creating spaces we also create our culture due to the fact that we attribute meanings to these spaces. Therefore, Lotman sees space as something that shapes human life. He expands his idea of space and suggests that the spaces that artists handle in their works depend on local culture's codes. In other words, a poet's or a writer's cultural codes manifest themselves through the concept of space in their works. It can be inferred that "authors do not simply describe random settings without any connection to other settings or the main characters" (Gerondeau 2014, 22). Namely, space is preferred to be used as a tool both "to provide an important look into the lives of the characters and their connection to the particular setting" (22) and to transfer the cultural codes to people. At this point, semiotics gains importance in order to decode the meanings hidden behind the spaces created in the narration. It can be suggested that the notion of space appears to be a certain kind of language which reflects various socially constructed conventions, concepts, ideas or beliefs which is why "spatial concepts are primarily

seen as a tool for 'decoding' such world pictures" (Löve 1994, 33). To put it another way, without the notion of space, we cannot exist, think, see, understand or speak for existing means existing in a place. Therefore, through the spaces we establish, we aim at proving that we exist. Furthermore, we give meanings to these places and form our own culture which means the places we live carry traces of our identities. Thus, from a space, we can make many assumptions such as the individual's religion, social status, life style or his view of life. Namely, spaces are inseparable part of our lives. In this respect, a Russian literary theoretician Yuri Lotman claims that it is not possible for a literary work to be formed without the notion of space.

Lotman who "initiated the investigation of literary space from a semiotic point of view" (Löve 1994, 33) strongly believes in the idea that every literary work is based on spatial representations. However, in a literary work, the notion of space does not give information only about the location, structure or the image of a space; in other words, "narrative spaces . . . does not only mean that physical spaces or boundaries can separate characters and create different places of interaction" (Gerondeau 2014, 20). It also reflects the culture of the space where it exists and reveals the social, economic, religious, or political status of the people who live there. Basically, the concept of space in a literary work identifies the story line, cultural structure of the work and also world views of the characters in the work. Namely, Lotman supports the idea that "all narratives need to have some type of setting" (22). However, in Lotman's views, in a literary work space does not only symbolize a location where the characters live or work. It symbolizes many cultural meanings as well and writers use cultural codes to convey their messages to the reader since it is easier for them to understand the plot, the characters' personality or feelings through the spatial representations.

To conclude, "Lotman's work posits a metalanguage based on spatial models for the description of culture" (Schölne 2006, 304); thus, he is considered to be an innovative theorist regarding the notion of artistic

space based on his distinct considerations in terms of the concept of space.

4.2. Semiosphere

One of the substantial contributions of Yuri Lotman to the world of literature and literary analysis is his understanding of *semiosphere*. Actually, with this term Lotman refers to the semiotic space "whose internal organization is created and maintained by the multiple sign processes occurring at the different levels of multifaceted and multileveled system of communication" (Kotov and Kull 180). *Semiosphere* originates from the term 'biosphere' which has been uttered by Vladimir Vernadsky, a geologist, biologist and a philosopher. Vernadsky defines biosphere as follows;

> The face of the Earth viewed from celestial space presents a unique appearance, different from all other heavenly bodies. The surface that separates the planet from the cosmic medium is the biosphere, visible principally because of light from the sun, although it also receives an infinite number of other radiations from space, of which only a small fraction are visible to us. (1998, 43)

In a way, "biosphere is where we live and what we are" (Kotov and Kull 189). Accordingly, Lotman has been profoundly affected by Vernadsky's concept of 'biosphere' which Lotman interprets as something that covers the whole living entities and all the sign processes. What amazes Lotman so much about Vernadsky's theory is that; "in his view living matter is not an accidental creation but it is *the* geological force that influences all geological forces on the Earth" (Semenenko 2012, 111). In this respect, Lotman defines *semiosphere* as "a space in which we are 'immersed' whenever we speak or communicate" (qtd in Nöth 2015, 13) which proves the fact that *semiosphere* is an important element for communication to occur. In a way, *semiosphere* makes life meaningful for living organisms. In that sense, Lotman regards *semiosphere* as;

> the result and the condition for the development of culture; . . . namely the totality and the organic whole of living matter and also the condition for the continuation of life. (Lotman 1990, 125)

In fact, this statement of Lotman reflects the matter that he finds *semiosphere* and biosphere similar due to the fact that both of them are necessary for life which proves his understanding that "the laws of construction of the artistic text are very largely the laws of the construction of culture as a whole" (Lotman qtd in Markos 2004, 316). In a way, it can be suggested that 'biosphere' is related to physical life and *semiosphere* is formed by culture "[creating] a social sphere around man which, like the biosphere, makes life possible" (Lotman and Uspensky 1978, 213).

Furthermore, Vernadsky claims that between the outer and inner layer of the Earth, there is a deep and sharp boundary which no living entity can break. This is another view of Vernadsky that has influenced Lotman deeply since this notion of boundary forms the basis of Lotman's theory of boundary in *semiosphere*. This boundary is rather significant for semiotic analysis of culture which "depends on human consciousness" (Zylko 2001, 393) for Lotman. In this respect, Lotman divides the cultural space into 'internal' and 'external' one, which is based on the fact that "the beginning point for semiotic individuation is the binary division of inside versus outside" (Kotov and Kull 182). It is generally an abstract boundary providing exchange of information. In addition, it can be stated that *semiosphere* is characterized by external boundary while the borders, limits and margins are organized by the internal boundary. That is why, the essential function of the boundary is to filter and adapt the external into internal. To put it another way, it can be suggested that "*semiosphere* is a 'bounded' system" (182) and the task of the border is to make the difference between the centre and the periphery. This is important for the structure of the *semiosphere* which "is built on the asymmetrical relationship between the center (the core) and the periphery" (Semenenko 2012, 115). This points out the notion of binary opposition in structuralism which is essential to understand the world around us as within a culture everything exists with their oppositions.

According to Lotman, every culture needs its opposition to live. Namely, there has to be an external one as opposed to your own culture.

If there is not, 'the other' needs to be established. For example; 'our' world is described as safe and ordered while 'their' world is described as chaotic and disorganized and barbarian due to the fact that "the core is occupied with the most organized systems (languages), and the less organized ones are located on the periphery" (Semenenko 2012, 115). As a result, there appears a border between the oppositions which is, for Lotman, always represented spatially.

Moreover, in Lotman's understanding, the boundary has universal value in the semiotic world. In other words, Lotman tends to focus on the universal opposition of culture which is based on the fact that;

> Whatever lies beyond the boundary is generally characterized by a large number of diverse human cultures as uncivilized, animal-like, pagan, chaotic, a space where all that is disallowed within the given semiosphere is permissible beyond the boundary of the semiosphere. (Andrews 2001, 350)

In addition to being spatial, the boundary has also semiotic value which suggests that it is based on interpretation of the socially constructed conventions. In other words, "Lotman admits that, in every culture, a high degree of convention determines the boundaries" (Godzich 1978, 391). Therefore, they have to be recognized as concrete and indispensable distinctions.

Besides, the semiotic borders can have many dimensions. Normally, "the space of semiosphere carries an abstract character" (Semenenko 2012, 114); however, sometimes it can be a real geographical border such as the boundary between Italian and English culture. Sometimes it can be historical such as the border between the past and present condition of a culture. Sometimes it can be based on time like the division between night and day. It can be physical as well separating a kitchen and a living room. However, by looking at these examples, Lotman states that all the boundaries have semiotic and spatial qualities; hence, they form the textual boundaries in a narration. These boundaries may be abstract or symbolic but they are all depicted through spatial representations because the world of mankind depends on spaces; in other words, human beings make sense of the world through spatial representations. In short, what

Lotman means is that the space of *semiosphere* "is real and concrete in the sense that it belongs to the mental sphere" (Semenenko 2012, 114). This emphasizes that the boundary is formed in our minds through language by using spatial concepts. Basically, *semiosphere* is a spatial entity and it is organized by the structure of this space. This structure is formed through binary oppositions and boundaries culturally created in language.

4.2.1. The Use Of Boundary Formed Through Binary Oppositions

As it has been mentioned before, one key concept of structuralism is understanding a thing by contrasting it with its opposite. Structuralists believe in the idea that in order to comprehend what something is we need to know its difference from the others due to the fact that our perception is formed through opposition which is "a universal principle of description and cognition" (Semenenko 2012, 96). For instance, we cannot know the meaning of *mad* without knowing what *sane* is. This also reflects the fact that for structuralists every notion has certain borders within which that notion is shaped and understood. In this respect, structuralism asserts the idea that describing something through its binary opposition is a universally accepted way of perception.

In that sense, Yuri Lotman adapted this idea to literature and claimed that the meaning in a text can be given with the help of binary oppositions. It is alleged by Lotman that binary oppositions are employed by writers in order to create boundaries in their works; hence to make the difference between groups of people socially, psychologically, economically or gender based together with the difference between objects, ideas, actions etc. According to structuralism, these accurate boundaries are highly important for narration; therefore, "an exploration of the literary universe must start with the detection of this dividing line" (Löve 1994, 34). As a structuralist, in the course of narratives, this textual boundary has utmost significance for Lotman as well since he believes that the whole text is based on this boundary. The main idea Lotman puts forward is that all binaries are defined through spatial

representations. To put it another way, according to Lotman;

> the boundary can be defined as the outer limit of a first-person form. This space is 'ours', 'my own', it is 'cultured', 'safe', 'harmoniously organized', and so on. By contrast 'their space' is 'other', 'hostile', 'dangerous', 'chaotic'. (1990, 131)

This separation can be analysed culturally through the division between 'self' and the 'other'; nevertheless, it may also be the border which distinguishes "the living from the dead, settled people from the nomadic ones, the town from the plains; it may be a state frontier, or a social, national, confessional, or any other kind of frontier" (Lotman 1990, 131). The only important point Lotman emphasizes is that all these divisions depend on spatial aspects. Basically, it can be suggested that the boundary between separate spatial representations creates clear-cut borders which means "the boundary divides the entire space of the text into two mutually non-intersecting subspaces. Its basic property is impenetrability" (Nöth 2015, 14). Lotman claims that this boundary is divided by two separate parts and characters belonging to a certain part. This is the basis of a narration for him since borders "tell us where one thing ends and another begins. They draw the line between what belongs to whom and what does not. They tell us who claims what and how far these claims extend" (Gros 2007, 1). As it can be understood from what Gros mentions, binary oppositions clarify the boundary between two different concepts on which the whole text is built.

Furthermore, Lotman suggests that "binary division is interpreted depends on the typology of the culture" (1990, 131). In other words, the qualifications of the division change depending on what kind of place we are in and what cultural codes we have. However, Lotman tries to focus on universally acknowledged cultural binaries "including internal (center vs. periphery) and external boundaries ('us' vs. 'them'), the living vs. the dead, city vs. rural, sacred vs. pagan, etc" (Andrews 2001, 350). In this respect, Lotman's main principle while describing culture is that it is formed by a basic opposition between *inside* and *outside*. In other words, every culture tends to label the ones or things that are not from their own

culture as outsiders; therefore, there appears a clear distinction and a clear-cut border between cultures. However, in order to understand your own culture, you need the existence of the other. In that sense, Lotman claims that "there can be no 'us' if there is no 'them', culture creates not only its own type of internal organization but also its own type of external 'disorganization'" (1990, 142). In this respect, this binary opposition is true for almost every culture.

Another universal opposition that is accepted and perceived in the same way by all the people is the division between *up* and *down* and Lotman explains this culturally universal binary as follows;

> The correlation between average human weight, the force of gravity and the vertical position of the body have resulted in what is universal for all human cultures; the opposition of *up* and *down*. (1990, 132)

In this respect, in most of the cultures, it has been accepted that the term *up* is associated with good things while the word *down* bears all the negative connotations. Accordingly, Danesi gives an example from religion; "heaven is portrayed as a place that is up from the earth, hell as a place that is down from the earth" (2013, 42). This 'up is better' versus 'down is worse' metaphor can be seen in every aspect of our lives; for instance, "in musical composition, higher tones are metaforms that are typically employed to convey a sensation of happiness, lower ones of sadness" (42). Moreover, there appears boundaries other than spatial concepts created by binary oppositions within a specific culture as well such as *rich-poor*, *intellectual- ignorant*, *rural – urban* etc. Therefore, it is obvious that "a culture dominated by binary structures is extremely polarized, with sharp boundaries between the poles" (Semenenko 2012, 98) which is the main idea underlying structuralism since it is based on the idea of having frames and clear-cut borders for any kind of notion. Wherefore it can be claimed that binaries are important for people to understand cultural codes, relationships between people and their conditions in a society.

Nonetheless, the boundaries that shape literal or imaginary spaces does not always have negative and dividing nature; rather, they may have

connecting structure. This view of Lotman is quite post-structuralist due to the fact that it is different from the structuralist view of boundary which believes in the "separatory, and in a sense, negative power" (Kalaga 2016, 137) of boundary. Basically, what Lotman suggests is that in addition to boundary's dividing function, it also unites the divided parts;

> For example, the Roman Empire emphasized its difference, which distinguished it from the 'barbarian' world. In this case the boundary both connected and divided. The boundary connected because it allowed exchange between both spheres of semiosis; it divided because it stressed the Empire's difference from the rest of the world. (Zylko 2001, 398)

In other words, the boundary both makes the distinction between the divided parts and connects them. The boundary which creates the division gives meanings and attributes values to each part. Therefore, boundary is highly important to create the structure and organisation of the divided parts. While the structuralist approach is based on the "separation of the outside from the inside" (Kalaga 2016, 137), Lotman's view of boundary facilitates "construing the boundary as both separating and connecting" (137). For instance, while a boundary creates a separation between a civilized inner space and a chaotic outer one, it may also "secure the identity of the culture by creating an inner space whose boundary protects it from the influences alien to it" (Nöth 2015, 20). In fact, this division of two different cultures is quite natural for Lotman as he believes in the idea that "every culture begins by dividing the world into 'its own' internal space and 'their external space'" (1990, 131). This leads to the construction of the binary oppositions between 'self' and 'the other'. While the concept of 'self' refers to all the positive aspects such as being cultured, safe, and prosperous, 'the other' is associated with all the negative and unknown notions such as chaotic, dangerous, and primitive revealing the idea that "the other culture is a mirror image reversal of one's own culture" (Nöth 2015, 21). Lotman considers culture "as an external representation of mind, as a model of reality expressed in

texts, and as a manifestation of our unique semiotic capacity" (Semenenko 2012, 146).

4.3. Spatial Dimensions In A Literary Text

While expressing his theory of spatial representation of every concept in a literary narration, Lotman talks about three spatial dimensions. In other words, Lotman emphasizes that while creating a work of art, the artist may apply three different ways of spatial portrayal. First one is named as *Topological Dimension.* It is the mathematical explanation of spaces such as big-small, close-far, top-bottom etc. In John Braine's novel *Room at the Top,* the representation of *top* is important as it can be understood from the title. After the protagonist moves to an apartment at the top, his life changes. The boundary is created through the division between *top* and *bottom* in this novel which can be considered as the topological level of the notion of space in order to make the division between rich and poor lifestyle. Therefore, *top* represents better life conditions in the novel. This supports "space as a sign system filled with meaning upon which social reality is constituted" (Hess-Lüttich 2012, 8). Second spatial dimension is the *Topographical Dimension* which is the geographical aspect of spaces such as mountain, river, city, village etc. In a sense, this spatial "perspective perceives literary space as imaginary geography" (8). For example; in Charles Dickens's novel called *A Tale of Two Cities,* London and Paris can be taken as the topographical spatial aspect of the narration. The whole text is based on the division between the living conditions in these two cities. The last one is the *Semantical Dimension* which refers to the cultural meanings we attribute to spaces. In this respect, Virginia Woolf's novel *Orlando* can be given as an example as it depicts a man who turns into a woman. Therefore, in this novel gender can be taken as a cultural representation which portrays the body governed by culturally accepted norms as a spatial organization for an individual. Basically, what is suggested by Yuri Lotman is that;

> Spaces – as signs- have a semantic charge. They can have multiple layers of meanings carved over time. In order to unpack these layers of meaning, the semantic-actant

> dimension draws from studies on spatial imagery from phenomenological, anthropological and symbolic perspectives. (Garcia 2015, 18)

Namely, culture plays an important role shaping the meanings attributed to the spatial representations; therefore, "the semiotization of the world is culture-based . . . with the result that the sign processes occurring in the system are subject to certain stable limitations" (Posner 2004, 22). Accordingly, it can be inferred that spatial representations bear some deeper meanings and values which are special to the people living in the same culture or having same cultural values. Lotman gives an example for his claim in his ground-breaking book *Universe of the Mind* as follows;

> In the medieval thought system earthly life itself was a value category in opposition to heavenly life. So the earth as a geographical concept was also perceived as the place of earthly life (i.e. it was one member of the opposition of 'heaven/earth') and consequently acquired a religious and moral significance which is unknown to modern geography. These ideas were applied to all geography: some lands were righteous and others were sinful. Movement in geographical space meant moving in the vertical scale of religious and moral values, the top of the scale being heaven and the bottom hell. (1990, 171)

Therefore, according to the meanings attributed to the existing spaces, the movement through these spaces may carry the same values and meanings. By considering the example Lotman has given, it can be claimed that since some lands are considered to be holly or righteous, visiting these places may have the same importance with going on a pilgrimage.

If we are to explain Lotman's thought of three different spatial dimensions and the meanings they carry, we can take the topological opposition of 'big-small' as an example. When we look at this opposition's topographical meaning, 'big' and 'small' can be portrayed through the image of a 'city' and 'village' topographically. On the third dimension, 'big' and 'small' semantically have different values and meanings. Therefore, if we think deeper and make cultural assumptions from these two spaces, we can assume that people who live in a city may

be artificial, unhealthy, dependent on others while people who live in a village may be natural, healthy, free, frank and productive due to the fact that cities are generally more developed and industrial places while villages are green and unspoiled places. Thus, it can be seen that Lotman "focuses on the relation between the meaning-production space and a particular message" (Semenenko 2012, 120). The division between rural and urban spaces is physical; yet, this can also be a tool for the author to indicate the differences between these two living spaces since "novels . . . tend to use descriptions of individuals, objects and places as signs that tell us something about what happens in the story" (Mucignat 2013, 5). Other than being a place with crowded population, cities have other connotations such as organized lifestyle, more developed economic, social, industrial and commercial relations etc. Even the struggle for people is different in these two kinds of living. In cities, people struggle with nature and try to destroy and change it in order to survive because nature is something out of their perception for its being incompatible with urban life. Nevertheless, in rural places, the interference of people with nature is limited. On the contrary to urban life, in rural areas people only try to keep nature the way it is to survive. Namely, only with the representation of two different types of spatial concepts, an author may express many ideas that are not spatial at all. Hence, this makes his job easier to direct the flow of the action and the meaning he wants to reflect.

Similarly, the topological opposition of 'above-below' could represent the opposition of 'heaven-hell' in topographical sense along with its semantical meaning which is everything that comes from above is positive, pure, divine, and blessed while everything related to the concept of below has negative attributions; in other words, these two spatial terms can be "opposites of cultural values such as good versus bad or life versus death" (Nöth 2006, 255). This means the topological opposition of high–low may represent the opposition of evil and good. Accordingly, "God dwells in heaven" (Tuan 1977, 37); therefore, it is high above. This is a generally accepted binary opposition and nearly in all cultures, the meanings attributed to these two spatial concepts are same. Rather than

reading "up-down" as a spatial representation only, the reader can contemplate on the meanings behind these portrayals which help the construction of the narration.

Basically, by considering the examples and theories of Lotman, it can be seen that Lotman's treatment of space is related to his concept of *semiosphere* which is considered to be a 'spatial turn' in literature due to the fact that while other linguists, theoreticians or sociologists;

> are mainly concerned with the study of real spaces such as continents, landscapes, cities, rural or urban spaces . . . Lotman's semiosphere is a more abstract and often not geographically localizable mental space. The reader is thus left with the impression that Lotman's semiosphere is a metaphorical space. (Nöth 2015, 24)

What Lotman endeavours to put forward is the fact that when the topographic dimension of space is combined with the topological and semantic aspect of space, they form an "abstract understanding of the role of space in literature" (Löve 1994, 33). This reveals the fact that the notion of space is more than a physical aspect. This is a description of 'spatial turn' in literature thanks to Lotman. To put it another way, Lotman strongly believes in the idea that the spatial representations have cultural meanings behind which actually reveals more information about the narration than the actual notion of space. Wherefore, he claims that the notion of space can form a *semiosphere* for the artistic text based on the fact that all the meanings attributed to spaces have cultural attributions; therefore,

> the production of real and imaginary space and the existence of fundamental structures such as *exterior–interior* and *inside–outside* appear to be culture-independent, and that they precede socio-cultural processes leading to the production of difference….the categories of the relation "top–bottom", "in front–behind" or "inside–outside" stop being objective and instead become invested with the subjective, imaginary values of corporeal space. (Bolfek-Radovani 2012, 76)

It is obvious that regarding the *Semantical Dimension*, the notion of space can generally depend upon imaginary borders between "friends and foes, rich and poor, or the home and the woods in fairy tales" (Nöth 2015, 13). In this respect, "when the semiosphere involves real territorial

features as well, the boundary is spatial in the literal sense" (Lotman 1990, 140) such as the boundary between 'home' and the 'forest'. Formerly, in folktales the division between faraway lands and home was not taken as culturally constructed notions. However, with Lotman's theory of artistic space in literature, faraway lands or dark forests start to be seen as the places of danger or evil while home becomes the place of safety and well-being; for instance, "a dark forest seems to breathe a menacing atmosphere, or, conversely, a charming house projects conviviality and safety" (Klooster and Heirman 2013, 38). As it can be understood, these spaces are created according to the cultural codes of a certain society which is described as the *semiosphere* and "boundary, or border. . ., is both a source and a product of communication" (Kull 2015, 262). Besides, since the idea of *semiosphere* is based on asymmetry like the two hemispheres of human brain, Nöth takes Russian medieval literature as an example in order to clarify this point;

> In Russian medieval literature . . . places and directions are imbued with moral values. Right and East mean righteousness, blessing and holiness, whereas left and West are associated with sin, immorality, and torments. (2015, 13)

This proves the fact that spatial representations carry cultural codes. By considering the examples mentioned above, we can clearly see that we come to such conclusions thanks to our cultural codes only by interpreting the spatial aspects. In this respect, the spatial concept is formed by the boundary which "has both metaphorical and literal connotations" (Nöth 2015, 20). The most popular example given by Lotman for the semiotics of space is *Divine Comedy* by Dante. Lotman considers the spatial structure in *Divine Comedy*, which has a special and most probably religious meaning. Therefore, it can be treated as a semiotic text. Lotman believes in the fact that Dante sees himself as a Creator because he creates a world of his own having his own understanding of 'heaven' and 'hell'. In this respect, "in Dante's belief-system space has a point, and each spatial category has its own meaning" (Lotman 1990, 179) which is conveyed through the division between of

top/bottom. Dante forms Hell from many layers; therefore, "all sins, which Dante arranges in a strict hierarchy, have spatial attachment so that the weight of the sin corresponds to the depth of the sinner's position" (Lotman 1990, 180). In that sense, the movement through these layers have semantic meanings related to the sins depicted on each layer.

In conclusion, Yuri Lotman recognizes space in literature as a "specific usage of signs. Lotman perceives an analogous relationship between the narrative text as an abstract model of reality and the respective "world view" of a given culture" (Hess-Lüttich 2012, 2). Therefore, it will not be wrong to think that spaces have a special language and they help us create non-spatial content and meanings which is based on Lotman's understanding of space as a modelling notion to uncover the actual meaning behind a text "for space may model social, religious, and political (i.e. ideological) or moral aspects of a world-view" (Löve 1994, 35). Namely, spaces have hidden messages and writers use these spaces in their novels to construct their story and transmit what they want to tell the reader.

4.4. Types Of Texts

For being a structuralist Yuri Lotman cannot help himself from forming certain thoughts about literary texts for being a structuralist. In that sense, he divides the literary texts into three; *Revolutionary*, *Confirmative* and *Conservative*. Lotman normally thinks that in a proper text there is no possibility to observe a transition. Lotman has been influenced by Vladimir Vernadsky's concept of *biosphere* while generating this aspect of literary texts again since Vernadsky believes in the fact that "there are no transitions between living and inert matter bodies of biosphere: the boundary between them has been sharp and clear during the entire span of geological history" (Marov 2013, 6). Therefore, according to Lotman all the literary texts are *Conservative*. This kind of text is the one in which the main character, either male or female, cannot move across the "the space assigned to him" (Lotman qtd in Fuchs and Holub 2013, 95). However, if the protagonist attempts to change his

setting by crossing the border formed in the narration through spatial representations and succeeds at the end by becoming a different person or by adapting to the changes he has gone through, this text is considered as *Revolutionary* in the eyes of Lotman. In other words, even though Lotman;

> states that the boundary is impenetrable, movement across the boundary (the struggle of the hero against- or his struggle to restore- the structure of the cosmos) is in fact one of the most typical forms of plot construction. (Lagopoulos and Lagopoulos 2014, 480)

This is the successful text for him because "Lotman regards as true heroes only those characters in the story who possess the capacity to cross the fundamental boundary of the textual universe" (Kotov 2002, 36). For example, it is well-known that in a typical fairy tale, there is a certain boundary between "the safe, closed space of the home and the dangerous, open space of the forest" (Fuchs and Holub 2013, 92); thus, the protagonist is not allowed to cross this border since bad things may happen in the forest. However, if the main character manages to trespass this border and become a different person or at least overcome the difficulty in the forest, "this 'crossing of the basic topological border in the (…) spatial structure' (Lotman 1977, 238) becomes the main element of the plot.

Similarly, if the protagonist fails in his attempt to cross the boundary or fails in adapting the changes he has experienced or if no change happens in him/her even though he manages to transgress the boundary, then this work of art is called *Confirmative*. In that sense, Lotman considers this kind of movement as an example of;

> non-movement that continually cancels itself out and returns to the point of departure, thwarting any change in his character and conforming to characteristic of plotless text. (Fuchs and Holub 2013, 95).

For instance, in *Metamorphosis,* Franz Kafka creates the character Gregor Samsa. After he turns into a bug, Samsa locks himself into his room because of shame. After some time, he decides to leave his room. He crosses the border with his room and the real world; however, he

cannot manage to adapt to the humiliating looks of the people due to his appearance. Therefore, he goes back to his room and dies. In that sense, this novella can be considered as a *Confirmative* one since the main character tries to cross the border that is created for him to live in with his new appearance even though he fails at the end. Based on these notions, Lotman divides the characters;

> into mobile ones who are free to move about plot-space, capable of changing their position in the structure of the artistic world, and of crossing the frontier which is the basic topological feature of that space; and immobile ones who are in fact functions of that space. (1990, 157)

Namely, Lotman suggests that the story in a narration is based upon the transitions between the borders by the characters and these transitions are essential for the plot due to the fact that "disrupting these worlds reveals the behaviour and motivations of characters because it shows how the characters adapt to new and unfamiliar situations" (Gerondeau 2014, 21). Therefore, the characters, who are able to pass between the spaces and become different persons in revolutionary texts, are called *mobile* characters and the ones who cannot move are called *immobile* or *static* characters. In that sense, both Ulysses and Dante "are constantly in movement, . . . they cross the boundaries of forbidden spaces. . . boundaries of which define their place in the Universe" (Lotman 1990, 183). They can be characterized as *mobile* characters and these texts as *revolutionary* texts due to the fact that both of the characters in the texts "are voluntary or forced exiles, driven by passion, crossing the boundaries which separate one area of the cosmos from another" (Lotman 1990, 183). In addition, they succeed in their journey to become a different person.

Considering the thoughts Lotman has come up with, it can be inferred that space has social, cultural, and economic connotations as a place where human beings live. Therefore, while reading a novel, readers may associate the spaces with many meanings according to the codes that social life attributes to that space. Space reveals itself by defining the personality of the characters, reflecting the cultural and economic

structure of the period and the characters. Actually, space has physical, social and psychological effect on the characters. It is obvious that "space is a language [itself]" (Pelaschiar 2003, 79). Basically, writer has the concern to make the world he has created through spaces look realistic. In this respect, space is an element which attracts the reader's attention to real world. Thanks to spaces, fictional world attains visibility. In addition, the reader is able to interpret the story according to his world views. Writer in a way encodes the world that he would like to present to the readers subconscious. Thus, space shows up as a fundamental element on the construction of both the characters and the plot. What Lotman suggests is that;

> Setting is not simply a backdrop, an insignificant component that fades into the background of stories while plot, characterization, and other themes take more prominent roles. Setting is a more complex world, or worlds, with multiple factors contributing to the plot and the themes of the story, which in turn affect the characters. (Gerondeau 2014, 5)

Based on Lotman's assertions, it can be claimed that all the novels are based upon spaces. This means that "setting is crucial in complicating the story and helping to drive the plot forward" (Gerondeau 2014, 21). The main reason is that apart from being a condition for human beings to exist, space is also a tool for people to express themselves. In a way, space has its own language for people to make sense based on their cultural codes. Therefore, space is not only essential for the structure of the novel but also important for the structure to be understood and comprehended by the reader. If we think about our existence, we can come to terms with the fact that being also means being in a place; thus, through the spaces that we establish, we try to show that we exist in a place, we possess that place, and we belong to that place. Namely, we create a new language. In this respect, along with Yuri Lotman, Franco Moretti also suggests that "without a certain specific location, a certain kind of space, a certain kind of story is simply impossible" (qtd in Fernandes 2008, 100). According to these two literary scholars, writers do not have another choice but to build their story on spaces, consciously

or unconsciously, due to the fact that human beings think, speak, live, form their identities and cultures through spaces. Therefore, the reader can make sense of the storyline, the personality of the characters, the conditions which the characters are associated with only through the perception of spaces that they are familiar with. In this respect, in literature, space is one of the essential elements for making up the story. The space being described in the novel not only has an importance as a location but also it acquires many other meanings.

5. SPATIAL ANALYSIS OF THREE NOVELS BASED ON YURI LOTMAN'S VIEWS OF SPACE IN LITERATURE

According to one of the prominent structuralists Yuri Lotman, every literary work is made of spatial representations. What he claims is that every literary text depends upon the concept of space in order to form the themes in the readers' mind. In other words, every notion in a literary work is introduced through spatial portrayals. In this respect, this thesis aims to analyse three novels from different authors belonging to different periods of time based on Lotman's spatial analysis of literary texts by demonstrating the spatial aspects in these novels.

5.1. *North And South*

One of the classical works of English Literature belonging to Victorian period is *North and South* (1854) which was written by Elizabeth Gaskell. With its amazing storytelling, well-structured characters, and realistic depictions of the age, *North and South* is considered to be an irreplaceable work among literary works.

5.1.1. Historical Context

Until the late 1700s, England was a rural country. However, with the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century, Britain faced many industrial, social and economic changes which can be "seen as a vanishing of the old rural England" (Ghalia 2011, 36). With the establishment of factories, mills, machineries, steamship in the 19th century, the feudal nation became a fully urbanized and industrial one. Therefore, England became a manufacturer country. Actually, "the greatest example of Britain's industrial power in the mid-nineteenth century was its railway system" (McDowall 1989, 138), thanks to which not only goods could be transported but also people could travel easily and quickly. Based on these developments, England evolved into a fully industrialized country.

Thanks to these changes, England considered itself to be a superior power in the world because "British factories were producing more than

any other country in the world" (McDowall 1989, 131). In this respect, during the Victorian era, British people claimed that they were living in a modern period due to not only the industrial developments, but also social and economic changes. Basically, Victorian period was an age of transition for England; hence the feeling of change was dominant. Accordingly, in the 19th century, England had the dream of being an empire because England was having so many colonies in faraway lands that she had the nickname as 'the empire on which the sun never sets'. It had extensive borders. Therefore, this colonization encouraged English people to regard themselves as superior to anyone in the world. This situation also created the sense of self-courage within people from peasants to artisans which gave way for England to become an industrial country more easily. British people were proud of their nation; thus, "the national mood of the Victorian people was influenced by prosperity through free trade" (Ghalia 2011, 18-19) due to Industrial Revolution.

Even though Industrial Revolution seemed to lead to drastic improvements within society, it created an unsettled environment due to the huge difference between the north and south of England. All the industrial improvements took place in the northern part leading this side to become a fully urbanized one while the southern part remained agricultural. Since the economy was based on agriculture in the south, it took slower for industrial developments to occur compared to the north. The south was dealing with growing crops; therefore, it had little manufacturing. In the south, plantation owners were the wealthy people belonging to aristocracy. They were responsible for the social, political and economic life in the south. However, in the north the land was not suitable for farming. Thus, with the coming of Industrial Revolution, cities became trade centres.

In 1700s, machines were invented to produce cloth which had been made by human power before. By 1800s, textile companies built mills in the northern cities to house large machines which enabled mass production. Owing to the process of industrialization in the northern part of England, there were "rapid shifts of population into the cities to seek

work in the factories" (Matus 27). With the use of machines in factories and manufacturing, the need for more workers reached a serious level. As a result, due to the fact that economy was based on manufacturing and there were many textile factories, the need for more workers led a lot of people to immigrate from the south to the north. From villages, more people began to immigrate from the south to the north with the hope of finding a job because “there were many new job opportunities available and many people changed their lifestyles to adapt to new social and economic circumstances” (Lemire 2012, 254). Especially, Manchester was the most popular city among these people. Presumably, cotton production made Manchester an important industrial city and the population increased dramatically. Nonetheless, with the dramatic growth of population over the course of the century, new areas of residence were established which can be considered as slums. These were such dirty and neglected places that on normal occasions no middle class person would visit. This suggests the fact that there appeared dramatic social changes in the living conditions of the people. More importantly, "the cities and towns were overcrowded and unhealthy" (McDowall 1989, 140) because there were no laws and regulations to organize these places. As a consequence, the sudden rise in the population in the northern part of England ended up giving way to only misery, wretchedness, and desolation.

Besides, with the rise of the Industrial Revolution, different classes began to be formed such as upper class who were the land owners, middle class who were the capital or factory owners, merchants, shop owners, or traders and working class who were the poor factory workers and their families having no property. Before the industrialization, there were only peasants and middle class people who were described as aristocrats. However, with industrialization, there appeared a peasant-working class who worked in mills. These people were the ones whose lands had been bought by landowners or who did not have any fields or properties. These peasant-workers were formerly living in rural areas but then they started to live in cities. With the Industrial Revolution, they lost

their properties and social positions, left their homes for the purpose of searching for work in industrial cities in the north. Furthermore, industrialization changed middle class as well. There appeared two different middle classes, one of which was formed of people who were educated and called themselves aristocrats, the other of which was formed of people who were uneducated and dealing with trade called themselves bourgeois which can be defined as “the new rich, powerful merchant and manufacturing class” (Ghalia 2011, 18). Hence, there appeared a conflict between these middle classes because one of them would consider themselves sophisticated and gives importance to education and reputation while the other would depend on and give higher value to capital and trade. This division between classes was the result of “transition from Feudalism to Capitalism” (21).

In such an environment, working class people were the ones who suffered the most because not only the working conditions but also living conditions were tough and nearly all the members of a family, even the children, had to work in order to survive. Namely, "crowding, lack of sanitation, and other ills of urban expansion gave rise to concerns" (Matus 27) about the living and working conditions of the working class people. Regrettably, the wages were really low and all the workers had to breathe dust and dirty air while they were working with huge machines. While vast majority of people left their villages to find jobs in cities and had the hopes of having a better life, they were disillusioned when they were faced with hunger, poor working conditions and lack of opportunities to survive. This was the case of the Victorian period when people both had “nothing to eat and drink on the one side” (Kalpaklı 2010, 3) and “enjoy[ed] plenty of drink and food on the other” (3). As a result, in urban areas there were not only aristocrats and bourgeois but also people who were both peasants and workers which belonged to lower class. Needless to say, rich and the poor were not living in the same neighbourhood. Lower class were living in the outskirts of the city in basement floors without any windows. The places they were living in had poor living conditions which could cause every kind of disease.

Therefore, people had to work. They did not have a chance to lose or quit their jobs in order to be able to pay their rents so that they might not lose the places they were living in. However, working conditions were no different than the living standards since "the workers received very little wages and had no job safety measures" (Ghalia 2011, 25). Namely, industrialisation made factory owners richer and workers poorer due to the fact that "while the subordinate class comprised those who produced goods and services, the dominant class lived by expropriating the products of the subordinate class labour" (21). Thus, this revolution was the chief reason of social problems of the time such as increase in population, fast industrialization, urbanization, poor working conditions, long working hours, low wages and class difference. At that time "while many manufacturers, merchants and associated traders enjoyed the considerable riches of this huge shift in the country's economy" (V.U. 2013, 5), some people were suffering which is why there appeared a great difference between the classes and class conflict appeared due to increasing unsettlement within workers due to this unequal distribution of wealth.

In the mid 19th century, capital was important and factory owners were the ones who were exploiting the workers who could not gain the true worth of their work. This led workers to unite and form groups; hence creation of the trade unions which "is an organisation of workers who recommended helping each other in order to achieve common goals in key areas and working conditions" (Ghalia 2011, 33) as well as to defend their rights. At first these unions did not have many members. But in time, when the workers saw that factory owners did not have any enthusiasm to solve any of the workers' problems, they looked for the people who could listen to them and help them. Thus, more people became members of these trade unions. To put it another way, middle class factory owners were indifferent to the problems of the workers and giving low wages so as to compete with other tradesmen; namely, "the rich never gave importance to the labour" (22). Wherefore, workers were aggressive against the factory owners so they became members of trade

unions in order to get their rights and solve their problems. There was a depressing and an unpleasant environment in England at that time since workers “saw themselves as exploited and only a commodity to the powers that existed in England . . . [which] led to early efforts of unification and the creation of working class consciousness” (Ghalia 2011, 25). As a result, middle class people started to be afraid of the possibility that workers might do violent acts and protests. This reflects the fact that in the Victorian period, things were not actually peaceful as it seemed.

While these things were happening in England, authors tried to reflect these issues in their novels which are called 'industrial novels' or 'condition of England novels' which;

> share some common characteristics: the detailed documentation of the suffering of the poor, the reproduction of working class speech through dialect, criticism of the effects of industrialism, the discussion of contemporary reform movements like Chartism and Utilitarianism and some attempt at a solution to social problems. (V.U. 2013, 2)

In this period, authors had the tendency to reflect the changes that were caused by the Industrial Revolution in their novels. They reflected the difficulties England was facing and social problems in their novels. These novels could directly talk about social issues realistically. Writers were really sensitive to these issues and adopted a moral and strong manner against all the injustices, social changes, and inequalities. The purpose of this was to change the mind of the middle class readers. In a way, writers wanted a change in the relationship between classes. They tried to show that the class conflict was a result of individual mistakes of factory owners and workers. Namely, authors tried to make people empathize with each other so that people could see that it is actually not the society but the mentality of the people causing the class conflict.

Elizabeth Gaskell was one of these writers who could successfully represent what was going on in the society realistically due to the fact that she was raised in an industrial city in the north. Gaskell in her novels reflect the social injustices and tries to affect middle class readers by approaching the events morally. Gaskell “portrays characters from

different social classes and provides her novels with themes and motifs from love to social issues such as poverty, poor working conditions" (Algotsson 2014, 4-5). Instead of being insensible to the things happening around her, Gaskell wishes to contribute to the solutions. In this respect, she touches upon the subjects such as; class conflict, changing middle class due to industrialization, the misguidance of trade unions, woman's role in the changing world, problems of the working class. Gaskell also talks about how trade affects society and initiates imperialism and feudalism. In addition, Gaskell portrays the lives of the workers, houses, living conditions, their relations with each other, feelings, hobbies in detailed.

Elizabeth Gaskell married with a priest William Gaskell and lived in Manchester and worked with poor people and travelled. Since her husband was a priest, she entered the houses of poor people and helped them in some ways; hence, she had the opportunity to observe their despair and poor living conditions. In this respect, Gaskell in her most successful industrial novel, *North and South* managed to reflect the poor living conditions of working class people with the representation of Manchester through Milton which is depicted as the city "with its own social difficulties" (Dennis 2009, 54).

It is a well-known fact that Victorian novels were generally written realistically for the middle class people because these novels "became a method of teaching the middle and upper classes about the "real" condition of England" (Brantlinger and Thesing, 2002 336). In this respect, Elizabeth Gaskell wrote her most successful industrial novel *North and South* as a reaction against the economic and social changes in the society. She sympathised with the poor and their poor living conditions; as well as the middle class people in her novel. In other words, Gaskell managed to represent "both sides of the question quite well" (349). In this respect, the title of the book symbolizes the difference between "the industrial north of the country and the metropolitan and rural south" (Knežević 88) after the revolutions. Basically, Gaskell tries to show the people hard lives of the poor people who belong to the

working class by showing the apparent distinction between the middle class and lower class. Gaskell makes the difference clear with her characters Margaret and her family who belong to the south and Mr. Thornton, his family and some workers who belong to the north. Nevertheless, Gaskell never favours one class over the other. On the contrary, the union of the southern and northern part, the working class and middle class is essential for the prosperity of England and she shows this throughout the novel.

5.1.2. Spatial Analysis

The chief purpose of Elizabeth Gaskell in writing *North and South* is showing the social, economic, technological and intellectual difference between the industrial north and rural south of England during the time of Industrial Revolution. As it is mentioned in the previous parts, during this time novels were written realistically. Therefore, Gaskell made use of the spatial representation of north and south in her novel in order to reflect the deeper meanings, mentalities, acts and lifestyles of people in England. When the readers look at the title of the book, they may think that they would read the condition of two parts of England during Industrial Revolution. However, in addition to geographical changes happened in society, Gaskell represents many invisible, hidden and cultural diversities through the division of north and south. It is obvious that using the topological dimension of space discussed by Yuri Lotman not only portrays geographical significance but also has semantic signification.

In this respect, the title is a symbol of doubleness "which indicates contrasts between the way of life in the industrial north of England and the agricultural south" (Ghalia 2011, 51). When contrasting the north and south, we think of the differences in climate, geography, population, cities, and economy. For instance, southern part of England has more suitable weather conditions for agriculture than the north. Therefore, south is a rural region while north is an industrial part. However, in addition to these visible differences, south symbolizes the invisible

values and beliefs of the protagonist, Margaret, and her family represented by the rural city, Helstone. In a way, south is the portrayal of humble, peaceful, intellectual and traditional lifestyle of aristocratic people belonging to middle class. On the contrary, north is the symbol of Mr Thornton and his family represented by the industrial city, Milton. In other words, it represents the developing modern industrial cities during the Industrial Revolution, the problems between workers and factory owners, and the metamorphosis of middle class people into bourgeois by being rich through trade. This spatial representation creates an imaginary boundary in the minds of the reader which means the novel can be an example of "cultural cartography" (Knezevik 2011, 88). Basically, on top of the geographical, social, economic and industrial difference between north and south, these spatial dimensions symbolize lifestyles, point of views, values, interests and beliefs of northern and southern people. In other words, Gaskell portrays the attitude of the people, their emotions and more importantly cultural codes by making a distinction between north and south. Since "the codes at a particular culture's disposal organize their respective world segments in various ways" (Posner 2004, 22), Gaskell applies to the spatial metaphors of north and south in order to convey these cultural codes. In that sense, the title clearly reflects the situation of England, the changes it went through, and how the lives of the people were affected from these changes in the 19th century by making some criticisms.

When Industrial Revolution was at its peak, in the north, the people at factories were working at maximum force, factory owners were greedy and ambitious and workers were angry and volatile. On the one side, there were the factory owners who were not educated but could use their mind for commercial success. On the other side, there were the workers who were trying to take care of their families by working at least ten hours a day for minimum wages. Highly disturbed by this cruel situation and insensitivity of middle class people in England, Gaskell believed it was her mission to introduce the lives and suffering of working class people to the middle class who had no idea. Thus, Gaskell had the

purpose to show people what really workers wanted, what their problems were, and why they were unhappy. Through *North and South*, she reflects the unknown facts about working class people's lives. She tried to prove that working class people were not machines which only produced something. The main aim of Gaskell was to show that the stereotypical thoughts of working class people were not always true because working class people were first human beings just like any other person. She tries to reconcile working class with middle class through making them communicate with each other and see each other as human beings rather than as a tool for profit. Besides, in this novel, Elizabeth Gaskell emphasizes the social problems and increasing discomfort within workers due to the Industrial Revolution. She aims at showing how unmerciful to watch your own factory owner living in prosperity while you were struggling to buy bread for your family. In a way, Gaskell is attacking at the economic inequality between classes. Namely, she tries to show that industrialization affects a society not only technologically or economically but also socially. She wants to prove that it can change people's attitude, way of life and mentality.

The protagonist is a middle class woman from a small village called Helstone from the south of England, Margaret Hale. Margaret has lived in London with her aunt, Mrs. Shaw for ten years and has become an intellectual and modern young girl; however, she is in love with the rural life in Helstone where her family lives and she really misses there. In the south, she and her family have such a humble life that they do not own even a horse; "We have no horse, not even for papa. He walks to the very extremity of his parish. The walks are so beautiful, it would be a shame to drive—almost a shame to ride" (Gaskell 1994, I: 10). In fact, they always prefer to walk in order to enjoy the beauty of the environment. Therefore, after the wedding of her cousin, when Margaret is going back to her home with her father, she feels excited;

> Margaret's heartfelt more heavy than she could never have thought it possible in going to her dear home, the place and the life she had longed for years-- at that time of all times for yearning and longing, just before the sharp senses lose their outlines in sleep. (Gaskell 1994, II: 14)

From the passage above, we understand that Margaret cannot wait to return Helstone after so many years. Margaret adores her village and describes it as follows; "Oh, only a hamlet; I don't think I could call it a village at all. There is the church and a few houses near it on the green--cottages, rather--with roses growing all over them" (Gaskell 1994, I: 9). Basically, Helstone is like heaven for Margaret. She depicts the beautiful and green environment. From the descriptions of Margaret, we feel that Helstone is a quiet, clean, peaceful and pastoral place.

Nevertheless, after Margaret's father who is a priest, Mr. Hale, has experienced religious doubts and "suddenly feels that he does no longer believe in the doctrine of the church" (Ghalia 2011, 52), they decide to leave Helstone and move to the north; to Milton where he thinks he "can earn bread for [his] family" (Gaskell 1994, IV: 40). That is why, even though Margaret is upset about this decision of her father, Hale family begins their passage to the northern city Milton, which is believed to be the portrayal of Manchester, a northern Mill town. The narrator describes their arrival as follows;

> For several miles before they reached Milton, they saw a deep lead coloured cloud hanging over the horizon in the direction in which it lay. It was all the darker from contrast with the pale gray-blue of the wintry sky; for in Heston there had been the earliest signs of frost. Nearer to the town, the air had a faint taste and smell of smoke; perhaps, after all, more a loss of the fragrance of grass and herbage than any positive taste or smell. Quick they were whirled over long, straight, hopeless streets of regularly-built houses, all small and of brick. Here and there a great oblong many-windowed factory stood up, like a hen among her chickens, puffing out black 'unparliamentary' smoke, and sufficiently accounting for the cloud which Margaret had taken to foretell rain. (Gaskell 1994, VII: 66-67)

The geographical difference between Helstone and Milton can be felt right away from this narration. Accordingly, Hunt suggests; "as Margaret and her family approach Milton for the first time, they notice the air becomes thicker" (2010, 74). We understand that Milton is an industrial place with dark, gloomy and dirty atmosphere because of the factories whose smoke fills the air and pollutes it; therefore, "Margaret is

depressed by the dark industrial surroundings and uncomfortable in her reduced circumstances" (V. U. 2013, 5). Besides, the northern people are totally different from the southern people in their manners;

> They came rushing along, with bold, fearless faces, and loud laughs and jests, particularly aimed at all those who appeared to be above them in rank or station. The tones of their unrestrained voices, and their carelessness of all common rules of street politeness, frightened Margaret a little at first. (Gaskell 1994, VIII: 81)

Namely, Milton is a soulless place where factories dominate the area; which is why "Margaret dislikes industry and what it does to people and the environment" (Brantlinger and Thesing 2002, 349). The depiction of Milton clearly is not as lively and peaceful as Helstone. There is nothing cheerful about Milton that is why;

> On first encountering . . . Margaret finds herself disoriented and overwhelmed, both by its geography and by its inhabitants. She perceives the city as a bewildering aggregate of unfamiliar social and economic relationships, manifested as a grey, smoky opacity. (Dennis 2009, 46)

In other words, it can be claimed that when Margaret moves to Milton with her family, "she is at first repulsed by what she sees; and then when she discovers the conditions under which the workers are forced to live, she is outraged" (V. U. 2013, 5). Taking the features attributed to Milton and Helstone into consideration, it can be inferred that these cities become "a complex semiotic mechanism, a culture generator" (Lotman 1990, 194) in addition to their being two different spatial portrayals.

After some time, Mr. Hale meets his private student who is a well-known factory owner Mr. Thornton and his family. As a southern breed man, Mr. Hale is surprised at the living conditions in Milton like his daughter. Therefore, he asks if Mrs. Thornton, Mr. Thornton's mother, is pleased with this noisy and dirty environment where their house is located since "the physical location of the house at the center of the town is excessively populated (and very loud) during the day" (Hunt 2010, 73). The answer Mr. Hale gets is not so surprising because Mrs. Thornton is totally proud of the industrial developments and prouder that her son is controlling these industries;

> I have heard noise that was called music far more deafening. The engine-room is at the street-end of the factory; we hardly hear it, except in summer weather, when all the windows are open; and as for the continual murmur of the work-people, it disturbs me no more than the humming of a hive of bees. If I think of it at all, I connect it with my son, and feel how all belongs to him, and that his is the head that directs it. (Gaskell 1994, XX: 190)

It is clear that Mrs. Thornton is not disturbed by any sound or dirt of the factories or mills so long as they are the owners. In a way, she feels secure and confident since the sound gives the feeling of relief that the mill is working well enough to provide them with money, wealth and abundance. Namely, for Mrs. Thornton, this sound of the mill is a sign of "the fortifying sound of the workers' labor and her son's amassing wealth" (Hunt 2010, 79). Gaskell successfully portrays the boundary between the north and south through the things southern and northern people care for which is an indication of "cultural mapping" (Dennis 2009, 46). In return for Margaret's negative ideas about Mr. Thornton's class, Mrs. Thornton has the same feelings towards Margaret and her values. For Mrs Thornton, the fact that Margaret is not rich is a fault in her. She every time humiliates Margaret and her family just because they do not have the same financial competence with her own family. This attitude of Mrs. Thornton reflects the selfish and capital-conscious manners of the northern people. Basically, since "every culture requires internal organisation, the environment outside that culture is perceived as the 'chaotic external sphere'" (Jaago 2012, 17). Gaskell reflects this condition ably in her novel through the representation of spatial concepts. She creates an imaginary frame for readers to grasp the cultural codings based on the distinction between north and south. This means that the notion of space is not only a geographical entity in the novel since both Milton and Helstone appears to be the topological representations;

> where different national, social and stylistic codes and texts confront each other, . . . place of hybridization, recodings, semiotic translations, all of which makes it into a powerful generator of new information. (Lotman 1990, 194)

Living in the industrial part of England where all the technological, economic and social improvements take place, Mrs. Thornton as being the mother of a very successful tradesman, cannot stand anybody who cannot possess the same level of wealth with them. That is why, in spite of herself, she "has an interior feeling of hate and strangeness towards Margaret and even towards the workers because she feels that they are not what she supposed them to be" (Ghalia 2011, 95). In other words, since they do not have any money and any courage to be powerful, workers and Margaret are considered to be people belonging to a lower rank. Basically, Mrs. Thornton believes that;

> They are penniless and poor and far from her luxurious world. For her, their poverty is due to their weakness, and this is what she rejects strongly. Like her son, she thinks that only strong people who can rise themselves socially and those workers are not from her ranks; so, they are excluded from her ambitious world. In other words, both the workers and poor women like Margaret are othered in her eyes. (Ghalia 2011, 95-96)

This perspective is atypical understanding of people who have mills, factories and people working for them in northern England. People like Mrs. Thornton consider themselves to be fine people of their society which is why she never approves of the idea that her son would want to marry Margaret and "rejects her because she is just a daughter of a clergy man" (Ghalia 2011, 82). Gaskell perfectly described the difference between the attitude of people with the division of spatial representations north and south.

Mrs. Thornton is not comfortable with the image of a rural girl who does not have a title or wealth being a member of her prestigious family. She puts her son Mr. Thornton at the top of everything that Margaret can never obtain; basically, Mrs Thornton;

> views him superior to her in all fields: he is rich while she is poor. He is a well-known manufacturer whereas she is just a village dweller and this may reduce from her son's importance. (Ghalia 2011, 96)

This emphasizes the fact that in order to be taken seriously in the north you have to be a wealthy and distinguished individual. Furthermore,

reputation is everything in the north which can clearly be seen in the wedding preparations of Fanny, Mr Thornton's sister. Even though Mr Thornton economically has bad times due to the strike of the workers, he does not hesitate to spend money on Fanny's wedding; "Mr. Thornton had made too grand a wedding of it, considering he had lost a deal by the strike, and had had to pay so much for the failure of his contracts" (Gaskell 1994, XLVII: 480). Northern people pay attention to the way other people see them, which is portrayed through the way the Thorntons get ready for the wedding ceremony. To put it another way, "how the wedding ceremony is carried out is a sign of the class and one should not avoid spending money for these occasions, regardless of how much one is in debt, as "keeping up appearances" is crucial to preserve one's place in the social-strata" (Kalpaklı 2010, 10).

As it is obvious, Mrs Thornton does not care about anybody who is not wealthy. Therefore, she does not want to be friends with Hale family and does not let her daughter be friends with Margaret. Fanny shares the same ideas with her mother which can be seen in one of her dialogues with Margaret in Margaret's unpretentious house;

> 'I suppose you are not musical,' said Fanny, 'as I see no piano.'
> 'I am fond of hearing good music; I cannot play well myself; and papa and mamma don't care much about it; so we sold our old piano when we came here.'
> 'I wonder how you can exist without one. It almost seems to me a necessary of life.' (Gaskell 1994, XII: 112)

Like her mother, in this scene Fanny wisely insults Margaret for not having a piano which is an indication of one's class and artistic taste. It is obvious that Fanny gives so much importance to materialistic values. She even does not refuse to marry an old man just because he is rich. It means she regards marriage as an act which can provide her a luxurious life. Fanny only cares about the way she dresses or her expensive possessions proving that "Fanny is a brainless girl who admires luxurious life without making any effort to ensure it and . . . who knows nothing about the bitterness of life" (Ghalia 2011, 99). Unlike Margaret, Fanny is an immature, selfish and dependent on money and other people's care. That

is the only reason why Fanny accepts to marry an older but richer man. These women precisely mirror what the industrial northern society cherishes most. From these extracts, it can be assumed that Gaskell does not only makes geographical difference between the two places, north and south but she also implies some ideas related to the southern and northern part of England through this topological opposition.

One day, Mrs. Thornton goes to visit Hale family due to her son's insistence. Mrs. Hale gets "captivated by some real old lace which Mrs. Thornton wore" (Gaskell 1994, XII: 112). Mrs Hale is aware of the fact that such an old lace has not been produced for seventy years and realizes that this has been passed through generations. In other words, this proves that "it must have been an heir-loom, and shows that she had ancestors" (112). Thus, Mrs. Hale thinks that Mrs. Thornton is worth showing hospitality because the lacework is an indicator of Mrs. Thornton's belonging to an aristocratic family just like the Hales. This incident can be considered as an evidence for what Hale family values. Namely, while Hales give importance to aristocracy and being a part of a well-established family, Thorntons only care about money and wealth. From this distinction, it can be inferred that while in the south social relations are based on personal affairs, in the north all these relations depend on "cash nexus" (Gaskell 1994, LI: 515). All these examples make it clear that the place people live in defines their personalities, attitudes, beliefs and things they give importance to.

Moreover, being a southerner Margaret and northerner Mr. Thornton persistently defend the places they come from against each other;

> 'It is no boast of mine,' replied Mr. Thornton; 'it is plain matter-of fact. I won't deny that I am proud of belonging to a town—or perhaps I should rather say a district—the necessities of which give birth to such grandeur of conception. I would rather be a man toiling, suffering—nay, failing and successless—here, than lead a dull prosperous life in the old worn grooves of what you call more aristocratic society down in the South, with their slow days of careless ease. One may be clogged with honey and unable to rise and fly.'
> 'You are mistaken,' said Margaret, roused by the aspersion on her beloved South to a fond vehemence of defence, that brought the colour into her cheeks and the angry tears into

> her eyes. 'You do not know anything about the South. If there is less adventure or less progress—I suppose I must not say less excitement—from the gambling spirit of trade, which seems requisite to force out these wonderful inventions, there is less suffering also. I see men here going about in the streets who look ground down by some pinching sorrow or care—who are not only sufferers but haters. Now, in the South we have our poor, but there is not that terrible expression in their countenances of a sullen sense of injustice which I see here. (Gaskell 1994, X: 94)

This dialogue between Margaret and Mr. Thornton shows that they are both proud of their birth places. Mr. Thornton does not like the slow and peaceful way of living in the south, and Margaret does not like the north and the rich people because she is from a rural land. Margaret is irritated by the developments here. Since she has not been grown up in Milton, she judges everything from her point of view in her southern terms. This is typical for every culture which "separates the culturally shaped reality from the rest of the known world and tends to stigmatize the latter as 'uncultured', as 'uncivilized', or as 'non-culture'" (Posner 2004, 22). She is not used to the smoke of the factories and polluted air. By taking advantage of the binary opposition of north and south, Gaskell actually indicates that "contrasts between the urban and rural, the domestic and public, and the commercial and the personal form a vivid background to the story of industrial unrest and unlikely romance" (Dennis 2009, 45).

In that sense, all the things she witnesses in Milton are new to Margaret. She has conventional and tradition values owing to having being raised in an aristocratic family. Therefore, she has difficulty in understanding the beliefs and values of the Thorntons which depend on capital due to their business, increasing power and wealth.

Moreover, Margaret Hale comes from the south and she is an educated girl who is in love with Helstone. Margaret's father is a priest and grandfather was an aristocrat, Sir John. Her aunt Mrs Shaw lives in London and is married to a general. This shows that Shaw family is cultured and aristocrat as well. There is nobody in her family dealing with trade. Therefore, Margaret thinks trades people do not do anything beneficial which is why she is prejudiced against tradesmen. According

to her, tradesmen are not cultured, educated gentlemen. That is why, when her father, Mr. Hale, informs Margaret about the fact that he is going to give a lesson to a manufacturer, Margaret answers him in a quite intolerant way; 'A private tutor!' . . . looking scornful: 'What in the world do manufacturers want with the classics, or literature, or the accomplishments of a gentleman?' (Gaskell 1994, IV: 42). In the south, people read books a lot and they give importance to education. However, Margaret thinks the northern people do not care about education at all. She cannot understand why a manufacturer needs literature or art. With the narrator's description, it can be understood what education means for a manufacturer;

> Mr. Hale met with several pupils, recommended to him by Mr. Bell, or by the more immediate influence of Mr. Thornton. They were mostly of the age when many boys would be still at school, but, according to the prevalent, and apparently well-founded notions of Milton, to make a lad into a good tradesman he must be caught young, and acclimated to the life of the mill, or office, or warehouse. If he were sent to even the Scotch Universities, he came back unsettled for commercial pursuits; how much more so if he went to Oxford or Cambridge, where he could not be entered till he was eighteen? So most of the manufacturers placed their sons in sucking situations' at fourteen or fifteen years of age, unsparingly cutting away all off-shoots in the direction of literature or high mental cultivation, in hopes of throwing the whole strength and vigour of the plant into commerce. (Gaskell 1994, VIII: 77-78)

It is clear that in Milton, even the children are supposed to work and become successful tradesmen. They basically, do not give any significance to education. They use it as a tool for acquiring wealth. As a mill owner, Mr Thornton expresses his views on education as follows;

> 'That is true,—I had blundered along it at school; I dare say, I was even considered a pretty fair classic in those days, though my Latin and Greek have slipt away from me since. But I ask you, what preparation they were for such a life as I had to lead? None at all. Utterly none at all. On the point of education, any man who can read and write starts fair with me in the amount of really useful knowledge that I had at that time.' (Gaskell 1994, VIII: 98)

Actually, Mr. Thornton's speech summarizes the northern people's ideas about education. What he means is that education does not prepare them

to be successful businessmen. Even Mrs. Thornton values working more than books;

> 'I have no doubt the classics are very desirable for people who have leisure. But, I confess, it was against my judgment that my son renewed his study of them. The time and place in which he lives, seem to me to require all his energy and attention. Classics may do very well for men who loiter away their lives in the country or in colleges; but Milton men ought to have their thoughts and powers absorbed in the work of to-day. At least, that is my opinion.' This last clause she gave out with 'the pride that apes humility. (Gaskell 1994, XV: 132)

She definitely thinks that books have no importance in the lives of northern people due to the fact that the only thing matters in the north is working and being a successful tradesman. Mrs. Thornton explicitly mentions that;

> civilization for her is based on economy and business. She tells Margaret that her son is not obliged to read classics; as a businessman he should be spending his time and energy looking after his business. In Mrs. Thornton's tone, there is a sort of proud. She praises her son and Milton men who should exploit their thoughts in the daily work. (Ghalia 2011, 64)

Therefore, education especially art, is not dignified for gaining a powerful, rich and successful lives in the north. On the contrary, as southerners Mr. Hale and Margaret are fond of reading books. At home, Mr. Hale has a library and he has raised Margaret by "reading aloud to her" (Gaskell 1994, II: 18). They give importance to the things they can learn from books even though this information does not bring them money or wealth. However, unlike southern people, Thorntons do not consider any information or knowledge to be useful unless it brings them money which proves the fact that;

> places and characters belonging to the individual spheres are depicted accordingly and we can usually infer the moral status of the characters from the description of the places they live in. (Majlingovà 2011, 13)

Accordingly, when Margaret tells that they need another servant in the house in Milton, the family's faithful servant Dixon says that since Hale family is an aristocratic family every girl would be honoured to work in

this house. Nevertheless, Milton is a totally different place compared to the place where they have lived so far. Nobody knows Hale family in Milton. Actually, Hale family has experienced this fact too early when they want to change the wallpapers in the house they are going to rent. Unfortunately, they have been declined; yet, with the intervention of Mr. Thornton they get the permission. Through the representation of north and south, reader can sympathize with the living styles of the southern and northern people and their moral standards. If Hale family were in the South, this would not be a problem for them to change some things in the house. Nevertheless, in the south, you need to be wealthy and powerful so that you can make people let you do whatever you like.

In that sense, in the industrial town Milton, the only thing matters is manufacture which is why people in Milton have no lives other than working;

> in Milton everyone was too busy for quiet speech, or any ripened intercourse of thought; what they said was about business, very present and actual; and when the tension of mind relating to their daily affairs was over, they sunk into fallow rest until next morning. (Gaskell 1994, XL; 407)

Since Milton is a manufacturing city, northern people have to work in order to survive. Their lives are based on working so much that people even talk to each other only for work. They do not speak with one other on different and daily subjects because they always work which has also a psychological aspect; "It's the town life," said she [Margaret]. 'Their nerves are quickened by the haste and bustle and speed of e everything around them" (Gaskell 1994, XXXVII: 358). In other words, thanks to the machines and production process, everything moves faster; therefore, people are always in a hurry for the same thing every day which is working. On the other hand, people in Helstone "were always at liberty to speak or be spoken to" (XL: 407). In other words, contrary to Milton, in Helstone people have the freedom and time to act as they like and talk to each other. *North and South* clearly proves Lotman's spatial theory due to the fact that it "makes uses of . . . cultural oppositions represented through spatial concepts" (Klooster and Heirman 2013, 112). Basically,

this spatial division tells a lot about the lives of the people. In the north, people do not have enough time and energy to spend for themselves due to working all the time, which creates a depressing mood among people. Whereas, in the south, people enjoy the most of their lives freely. Everything seems so different for Margaret as a southerner;

> [...]the people in the streets, although on pleasure bent, had yet a busy mind [...] in such town in South of England, Margaret had seen shop men, when not employed in their business, lounging a little air at their doors, enjoying the fresh air, and look up and down the street. Here if they had any leisure from customers, they made themselves business in the shop. (Gaskell 1994, VII: 65)

She compares the people in Milton who are very busy and selfish and who never put interest in the social relationships with the modest villagers who enjoy their free time in nature in friendly relationships. Furthermore, Gaskell offers the reader two different types of middle class in this novel. Hale family is the representative of conventional middle class and Thornton family is an example of new middle class which is regarded as bourgeois because of the wealth they possess. Southern middle class families are more aristocratic and traditional while northern middle class is urban and wealthy. Nobody cares about aristocracy or level of intelligence in the north but only money. Hence, in Milton, the power and the right to speak are at the hands of the middle class which has the capital.

Another aspect Margaret gets highly surprised is the fact that there are two different classes titled as middle class and working class in the north and there is a huge gap between these people. As the mill owner, Mr. Thornton describes how this distinction between people occurred;

> The whole machinery—I don't mean the wood and iron machinery now—of the cotton trade is so new that it is no wonder if it does not work well in every part all at once. Seventy years ago what was it? And now what is it not? Raw, crude materials came together; men of the same level, as regarded education and station, took suddenly the different positions of masters and men, owing to the motherwit, as regarded opportunities and probabilities, which distinguished some, and made them far-seeing as to what great future lay concealed in that rude model of Sir Richard Arkwright's. The rapid development of what might

> be called a new trade, gave those early masters enormous power of wealth and command. I don't mean merely over the workmen; I mean over purchasers—over the whole world's market. (Gaskell 1994, X: 95)

Basically, what Mr. Thornton means is that industrialization makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. Therefore, when the rich realize that they can acquire more wealth, they start to ignore the living and working conditions of the workers. Basically, the bourgeois gives importance nothing but money. In other words, these factory owners are such people who are "blind with their total desire to dominate others" (Ghalia 2011, 51). They are considered to be less human and selfish.

In that sense, seeing such kind of people makes Margaret feel like an alien in Milton on the grounds that Milton people are totally different from the ones in her town. In other words, "in Helstone, she has a memory about an easy life in a fresh air and humble people with whom she has good social relationships" (Ghalia 2011, 85); however, in Milton the only thing middle class people is trying to acquire more wealth and working class people are trying to survive. Margaret accuses Mr. Thornton of being as follows; "When he spoke of the mechanical powers, he evidently looked upon them only as new ways of extending trade and making money" (Gaskell 1994, XI: 101) which indicates that Mr. Thornton only cares about how much money he can earn by using the workers. In a way, he regards the workers as machines that provide him with the necessary goods for trade. Basically, Margaret is exposed to an unusual way of living in the north due to the fact that "the industrial north exhibits not only a different pace and view of life, but also financial struggles and tensions between the social classes" (Algotsson 2014, 9). That is absolutely shocking for Margaret which is why she feels highly indifferent because these greedy middle class people have no sympathy towards the poor workers.

In addition, Gaskell tries to make the difference between two classes strikingly through the depiction of their houses. The Thornton family enjoys a comfortable life which is reflected through their drawing room;

> The walls were pink and gold; the patterns on the carpet

> represented bunches of flowers on a light ground, [...] the window curtains were lace; each chair and sofa had its own particular veil of netting or knitting. Great alabaster groups occupied every flat surface, safe from dust under their glass shades. In the middle of the room, right under the bagged-up chandelier , was a large circular table [...] everything reflected light, nothing absorbed it. (Gaskell 1994, XV: 130-131)

Clearly, Thorntons are so much fond of their luxury and comfort that it can be realized from their table in the dining room as well;

> Behind the door was another table, decked out for tea, with a white tablecloth, on which flourished the cocoa-nut cakes, and a basket piled with oranges and ruddy American apples, heaped on leaves. (Gaskell 1994, X: 90)

Thornton house is the place where they have various kinds of food or fruit. The metaphor of fruit basket is important due to the fact that it not only symbolizes their opportunities in life but also it is the symbol of taste; "taste, both in the sense of aesthetic appreciation and in the sense of being able to judge what is in legitimate taste, a taste that is defined and shared by a certain social class" (Koivuuvara 2012, 145). In one of the scenes, when Mrs. Thornton visits Hale family, she brings a fruit basket which can reflect the fact that the Hales may represent that class who has the certain kind of taste. In other words, the fact that Thorntons find Hale family worthy enough to give them a fruit basket as a present signifies that "they conform to the aesthetic and consumption ideals of the Hale" (145). The issue here is that, the taste symbolizes "a way of subtly identifying and separating refined 'individuals from the lower, vulgar 'classes" (145). Even though Mr. Thornton does not treat Mr. Hale as a member of the working class, he tries to dominate Mr. Hale unintentionally. When Mr. Hale wishes to warn Mr. Thornton about his unjust behaviour toward one of his workers, Mr. Thornton, "though he respects him as tutor, reacts strongly asking him for not interfering in his business" (Ghalia 2011, 55). Both Mr. Hale and Mr. Thornton are middle class men; however, Mr. Hale's class gives importance to education, intelligence and helping people while Mr. Thornton's class only cares about money. This signifies the huge difference between the values of

these men. Besides, these two men are totally different from each other personally as well; “Mr. Hale is a gentleman with beautiful smiles whereas Mr. Thornton’s face is full of seriousness, strength and rare smiles” (Ghalia 2011, 58). Mr. Hale is an intellectual who tries to educate the people in Milton which is something he is used to doing in the south; that is why he has self-confidence for being specialized enough in a field to teach it. Nevertheless, Mr. Thornton thinks that people do not need education for the life in Milton because it is a manufacturing and an industrial city.

While middle class people are living in prosperity and comfort, working class people are experiencing the misery, hunger and poverty to the most, which is obvious from the places they live;

> The Boucher children, left motherless claimed what of Margaret's care she could bestow; and she went pretty often to see Mary Higgins, who had charge of them. The two families were living in one house. (Gaskell 1994, XV: 403)

Boucher is one of the workers working in the mill. While middle class families have spare rooms, working class families live all together in small houses in the worst conditions. From this comparison, it is obvious that the house of the working class people is deprived of everything and extremely crowded because "the Boucher family consists of six children and yet they share their house with another family" (Kalpaklı 2010, 5) due to poverty. This is shocking for Hale family since in the south there has never been such a great gap between the living conditions of people. They have never witnessed anybody who could not afford to buy even a loaf of bread for his family. Gaskell makes it clear that;

> their hunger is part of a social and economic system in which some are more entitled to food in any given circumstances: the workers lack both economic and social power. The fact that food is plentiful on the middle-class Thorntons‘ dinner table manifests possession of control and entitlement and thus the Victorian power structures: the Thorntons and the other mill owners are in control of the money circulating in the manufacturing business and indirectly also partly in control of the food available in society. (Koivuvaara 2012, 116)

In a way, by making the reader visualize the condition of north and south, Gaskell enables them to grasp these sub meanings easily. For instance, the difference between the nutrition conditions of middle class and working class emphasizes the fact that during the Victorian Age;

> in industrial places like Manchester, workers and their families are said to be living mostly on bad tea, oatmeal and potatoes . . . Sometimes things go worse and tea begins to take the place of dinner when a proper hot meal could not be afforded, since the caffeine and sugar in the hot tea give the impression that one has eaten something. Meanwhile, "malnutrition" becomes a big problem among the working class as the primary sources of nutrition are bread, potatoes and strong tea. (Kalpaklı 2010, 6)

The gap is so high and tragic that Boucher cannot stand anymore and commits suicide, which is also not a common incident in the idyllic south. Even the places Thorntons, Hales and working class people live reflect the cultural codes of these places and values of the people dwelling in these places. This can be understood from even the language of the people in the north. When Margaret starts spending so much time with working class people that she gets to learn "factory slang" which is why her mother "accuses Margaret of vulgarity" (Kalpaklı 2010, 8). This clearly shows that even the way you speak defines the class you belong to in the north due to the fact that "in contrast to the working class people, the middle-class people are reserved, kind and moderate and therefore they do not express their love or hatred, likes and dislikes openly" (8).

Another example for the suffering of the working class people is portrayed through Nicholas Higgins who is a worker in Mr Thornton's mill. Nicholas and his family lead a totally miserable life; "What wi' hard work first, and sickness at last, hoo's led the life of a dog. And to die without knowing one good piece o' rejoicing in all her days!" (Gaskell 1994, XXVIII: 261). Nicholas is a working class man and a father. All he sees is a world where terrible working conditions cause the death of people. Margaret explains the huge difference between the life of people in the north and south quite frankly, which shows she is a good observer;

> 'It is the town life,' said she. 'Their nerves are quickened by

> the haste and bustle and speed of everything around them, to say nothing of the confinement in these pent-up houses, which of itself is enough to induce depression and worry of spirits. Now in the country, people live so much more out of doors, even children, and even in the winter". (Gaskell 1994, XXXVII: 358)

Namely, Margaret is aware of the fact that this busy, mundane, and routine way of life in the north makes people depressive and tired of living whereas in the southern part people can enjoy the most of their lives in the best way. Working class people have a life full of working, suffering, sickness and poverty while the middle class people have a life full of luxury and comfort. In this way, Gaskell "points out the huge difference between the houses of the working class and the capital holders" (Kalpaklı 2010, 5) which emphasizes Lotman's spatial theory. In order to convey a message, the authors tend to achieve this through spatial representations.

One of the reasons why Nicholas is so miserable is the fact that his daughter Bessy has a serious disease and is "dying from inhaling the cotton fluff always flying in the air of the mill" (Kalpaklı 2010, 5). Bessy is a tragic example of the poverty and misery of the working class;

> I used to think once that if I could have a day of doing nothing, to rest me—a day in some quiet place like that yo' speak on—it would maybe set me up. But now I've had many days o' idleness, and I'm just as weary o' them as I was o' my work. Sometimes I'm so tired out I think I cannot enjoy heaven without a piece of rest first. I'm rather afeard o' going straight there without getting a good sleep in the grave to set me up. (Gaskell 1994, XIII: 117)

As a result of living in an industrial town which is run by factory owners, you need to work in order to survive if you are not a capital holder. This fact leads to a great distinction between people in the northern part of England while in the south there is not such conditions. Gaskell constructs all these images in the minds of the reader clearly through the basic distinction between topological opposition, north and south. In this respect, from Bessy's speech, we realize that working class people, even the children, have no life other than working. They work all day for long

hours in poor working conditions. Consequently, they get sick and eventually they die.

As a southern girl, Margaret cannot understand fully what Bessy's illness is. That is why, Bessy explains her illness to Margaret;

> 'I think I was well when mother died, but I have never been rightly strong sin' somewhere about that time. I began to work in a carding room soon after, and the fluff got into my lungs and poisoned me.'
> 'Fluff?' said Margaret, inquiringly.
> 'Fluff,' repeated Bessy. 'Little bits, as fly off fro' the cotton, when they're carding it, and fill the air till it looks all fine white dust. They say it winds round the lungs, and tightens them up. Anyhow, there's
> many a one as works in a carding-room, that falls into a waste, coughing and spitting blood, because they're just poisoned by the fluff.'
> 'But can't it be helped?' asked Margaret.
> 'I dunno. Some folk have a great wheel at one end o' their cardingrooms to make a draught, and carry off th' dust; but that wheel costs a deal o' money—five or six hundred pound, maybe, and brings in no profit; so it's but a few of th' masters as will put 'em up; . . . I wish there'd been a wheel in our place, though. (Gaskell 1994, XIII: 118-119)

Bessy tells Margaret that she is ill because of a fluff in her lungs which can be defined as "the particles that spread into air when the cotton is carded" (Koivuuvara 2012, 27). Normally, there is a solution to prevent this disease which is having a machine which blows away the fluff. However, it is regarded as an expensive investment by many mill owners because it brings no profit to them. Therefore, they do not prefer to use it. It is clear that capital owners give importance to material things more than human life. What is important for the factory owners is nothing but their trade.

In addition, Margaret has heard the word "strike" for the first time in her life in Milton. When she hears the words 'strike', she gets eager to learn the distress among workers. At some point, she asks Bessy and her father; "Why do you strike?' . . . Striking is leaving off work till you get your own rate of wages, is it not? You must not wonder at my ignorance; where I come from I never heard of a strike" (Gaskell 1994, XVII: 155). Even though Margaret is a clever woman, she has never been familiar with this act of strike in the south before. Besides, in Milton Margaret

faces with a new concept of "worker". Until the time she moves to Milton, she has only seen labourer in the fields or farms in Helstone. Therefore, she cannot imagine what a strike is and how it is performed;

> 'But,' said Margaret, 'if the people struck, as you call it, where I come from, as they are mostly all field labourers, the seed would not be sown, the hay got in, the corn reaped.' ... 'what would become of the farmers.'
> He puffed away. 'I reckon they'd have either to give up their farms, or to give fair rate of wage.'
> 'Suppose they could not, or would not do the last; they could not give up their farms all in a minute, however much they might wish to do so; but they would have no hay, nor corn to sell that year; and where would the money come from to pay the labourers' wages the next?'
> …
> 'I know nought of your ways down South. I have heerd they're a pack of spiritless, down-trodden men; welly clemmed to death; too much dazed wi' clemming to know when they're put upon. Now, it's not so here. We known when we're put upon; and we'en too much blood in us to stand it. We just take our hands fro' our looms, and say, "Yo' may clem us, but yo'll not put upon us, my masters!" And be danged to 'em, they shan't this time!' (Gaskell 1994, XV: 156)

This conversation shows the naiveness of the southern people since "going on a strike" is totally an industrial term. Therefore, it is normal that Margaret cannot understand and visualize it. Since southern part of England is agricultural, all she can fancy is field labourers not planting the seeds or plowing the soil. However, in the north, things may get even bloodier since there because of the gap between classes, working class people get furious in order to gain what they want while factory owners may highly be stubborn not to give them what they want. Hence, Margaret does not have any idea how terrifying a strike can be.

The dialogues between Margaret and Bessy are one of the tragic representations of the difference between the middle class and working class. It also helps Margaret come to terms with the wretched lives of these people as well as children again since;

> the rise of the factory system as a widespread means of manufacturing goods meant there were more jobs that were best done. . . by children . . . in textile factories where smaller hands were considered a benefit. (Lemire 2012, 254)

This is another dramatic result of the industrialization in the northern part of England which is totally bizarre for Margaret as can be understood from the dialogue between her and Bessy;

> How old are you?' asked Margaret.
> 'Nineteen, come July.'
> 'And I too am nineteen.' She thought, more sorrowfully than Bessy did, of the contrast between them. She could not speak for a moment or two for the emotion she was trying to keep down. (Gaskell 1994, XIII: 119)

Two girls are at the same age; however, Margaret is surprised and sorry to hear that Bessy does not have any of the chances she has had. Margaret is from the south and she is educated, healthy and living in good conditions while Bessy is from the north and she is uneducated, dying and living in poverty due to the fact that in the industrial north;

> children were required to work longer hours and spent considerably less time in school learning to read and write. . . Their parents were also forced to work longer hours and for many, sending their children to school was too expensive, both in terms of fees and in terms of lost hours of work. (Lemire 2012, 254)

In addition to be suffering of the adult, Gaskell portrays the pain of the children in the north as well. However, while working class people are in great suffering, Mr Thornton, as a mill owner, is proud of the superiority that his class provides as a factory owner and is fascinated by the industrial developments;

> 'It is true; and I believe it to be as much a necessity as that prudent wisdom and good conduct are always opposed to, and doing battle with ignorance and improvidence. It is one of the great beauties of our system, that a working-man may raise himself into the power and position of a master by his own exertions and behaviour; that, in fact, every one who rules himself to decency and sobriety of conduct, and attention to his duties, comes over to our ranks; it may not be always as a master, but as an over-looker, a cashier, a book-keeper, a clerk, one on the side of authority and order.'
> 'You consider all who are unsuccessful in raising themselves in the world, from whatever cause, as your enemies, then, if I under-stand you rightly,' said Margaret' in a clear, cold voice.
> 'As their own enemies, certainly,' said he, (Gaskell 1994, X: 96-97)

Industrialization seems magical to Mr Thornton. He is proud of the

industrial developments and the human capacity to develop himself as a master. He basically admires the technology and sees this as an opportunity. He also tells his story that he started from the scratch after his father's death and became rich. Thus, he is a living example of how one can rise himself. That is why, Mr Thornton thinks that it depends on the person to change his class by working hard. In a way, he accuses working class people of being lazy. As McDowall claims middle class people "[believe] in hard work, a regular style of life and being careful with money" (1989, 140). In that sense, Mr Thornton is a true representative of the middle class.

In addition, Gaskell tries to show that "the main reason of the conflicts between the capital holders and workers can be the desire for making money" (Kalpaklı 2010, 4). Mill owners want to cut the wages to earn more and to be able to compete with other mill owners. Mr Thornton explains the reason as follows;

> the Americans are getting their yarns so into the general market, that our only chance is producing them at a lower rate. If we can't, we may shut up shop at once, and hands and masters go alike on tramp. (Gaskell 1994, XVIII: 170)

Mr Thornton mentions international rivalry because of the spread of the industrial developments to other countries. Therefore, he thinks they should work hard and produce more stuff. In order to achieve this, he reduces the wages and hires cheap workers.

Gaskell points out that employers expect full commitment from the workers without giving them enough freedom and good conditions. This is wrong for Gaskell. Factory owners refer to the workers as “hands”. This shows that workers are being treated inhumanly, they are not seen as human beings; in other words, “they are marginalized since they take part in the prosperity of the city through their hard work, but they have no reward” (Ghalia 2011, 60). They are being discriminated and seen as only things that produce. For Mr. Thornton as well workers are just like machines which help him increase his wealth and continue the trade, which means “they have no rights to take decisions under the domination of Mr. Thornton on whom the poor are dependent” (61). The dominance

issue is so serious that the factory owners do not even want the workers to be educated in order to keep them submissive under their control.

Since employers do not want to listen to working class problems, they just prefer ignoring them. Factory owners always think that they are right; hence, they have prejudice against the workers. Gaskell uses Mr. Thornton to describe this conflict which becomes a war between the employers and employees;

> There can be no doubt, too, of the tyranny they exercised over their work-people. You know the proverb, Mr. Hale, "Set a beggar on horseback, and he'll ride to the devil,"—well, some of these early manufacturers did ride to the devil in a magnificent style—crushing human bone and flesh under their horses' hoofs without remorse. But by-and-by came a re-action, there were more factories, more masters; more men were wanted. The power of masters and men became more evenly balanced; and now the battle is pretty fairly waged between us. (Gaskell 1994, X: 96)

Nonetheless, this refusal of the masters' explaining the conditions to their workers worsened the situation more since "workers tried to join together to protect themselves against powerful employers. They wanted fair wages and reasonable conditions in which to work" (McDowall 1989, 121). In that sense, Nicholas Higgins explains their distress to Margaret;

> Why, yo' see, there's five or six masters who have set themselves again paying the wages they've been paying these two years past, and flourishing upon, and getting richer upon. And now they come to us, and say we're to take less. And we won't. We'll just clem them to death first; and see who'll work for 'em then. They'll have killed the goose that laid 'em the golden eggs, I reckon. (Gaskell 1994, XVII: 157)

Higgins says that without the workers, masters are nothing. In other words, without the job workers accomplish, employers cannot earn any money, which means they need the workers who “want to get satisfactory or high wages without considering the financial crisis and without giving any thought to whether the employers could afford high wages at times of financial crisises” (Kalpaklı 2010, 4). That is why, the workers come together and form a union and go on a strike to claim their rights. This incident symbolizes the Chartist movement which is the union of the workers in nineteenth century England. It was an important event as for

the first time workers united for some purposes one of which was to "make sure employers paid reasonable wages, they also tried to prevent other people from working in their particular trade" (McDowall 1989, 134). Workers go to trade unions for they cannot make factory owners hear themselves. As a middle class woman, Margaret is familiar with the middle class values and knows that the most important thing middle class people are afraid of the fact that workers may come together and cause a domestic disturbance and this would lead to riots and revolutions which are similar to France. It is obvious that even the fears and concerns of the people are different in the south and north part of England and Gaskell depicts this in a very clever and clear way.

In literary terms, *North and South* may be the most successful social novel because it depicts the difference between the north and south of England after the Industrial Revolution through northern and southern characters in a very realistic way. However, the novel is more generally about the industrial part of England and the conflicts between the middle class and working class. Basically, Gaskell demonstrates the different social, environmental and economical conditions between the north and south throughout the novel.

Considering Yuri Lotman's view about spatial representations, Gaskell's novel is the best example for topological dimension of space in a literary narrative due to the fact that Gaskell prefers to depict the difference between the north and south of England in the 19th century through the representation of north and south. It enables her to construct the deeper meanings, values, beliefs related to the northern and southern cities and people in the readers' mind. To put it another way, the semantic meaning lying behind the spatial representations is that Gaskell makes the distinction between people and collides;

> snobberies, chivalries and artificiality of the country gentry of the South of England with the distinctive energetic anti-gentlemanly world of self-made manufacturers of the North" (V.U. 2013, 4)

In order to create the binary opposition of 'good vs bad' in terms of the effect of Industrial Revolution, the 'good' is represented as the heavenly,

array, green and southern rural part while the 'bad' is portrayed as densely populated, polluted, industrial, smoky and northern urban part. Gaskell portrays the actual condition of north and south during the Industrial period together with reflecting the lives, attitudes, and beliefs of northern and southern people. In a way, as Lotman suggests authors have to use "spatial language to express non-spatial concepts" (Lotman 1990, 189) which is quite obvious in this novel as Gaskell makes use of topological opposition of north and south so as to justify her views about the actual feelings and mentalities of the southern people who live a modest life and northern people who live in a changing environment.

5.1.3. *North And South* As A Revolutionary Novel

According to Lotman, for having a proper plot "any movement in geographical space is important" (1990, 172). Gaskell, with *North and South* shows that social change is inevitable and nothing could resist this. Margaret coming from the south sees that with industrialization the north is changing; however, she is not happy about it due to the fact that Milton is covered with the grey smoke of the factories, there are ashes flying in the air, and instead of trees there are buildings. The thing changing is not only the city but also the people. Therefore, at first Margaret has been highly prejudiced against the middle class people who are the factory owners. Thus, this novel has "a remarkably mobile narrative" (Dennis 2009, 43) since the protagonist's changing settings starts with the coming to the north where she continues to discover the life in the north through her visits to working class families' houses, Mr Thornton's house, the mill and the city streets.

After the things she has witnessed in the north such as the conflict between factory owners and workers, the living conditions of working class people and suffering of them, Margaret wants to help the way she has been accustomed to in the south which suggests that "she wanders the streets not out of necessity, but because she has developed an interest in the life of the city's spaces" (Dennis 2009, 48). When Margaret is in Helstone, she has some social responsibilities as being the daughter of a

priest. She helps people in need and cares about their problems. When she comes to Milton, she realizes that she has nothing to do and feels alone. In time, the workers passing by her on the street takes her attention. One day she meets with Bessy and her father on the way and starts talking with them. When Margaret acknowledges that there are also people whom she can help, she feels glad; thus, she decides to visit the sick girl belonging to working class at their house. With her visit to Bessy's, Margaret witnesses the lives of the working class people more closely. She learns that before getting sick, Bessy has also worked in the factory like her father. With the living example in front of her eyes, Margaret could anticipate the poor working conditions in the factories and mills.

It is obvious that Margaret has come to Milton with some negative thoughts in her mind against the northerners. She has had the strong belief that they are totally different from her town's people which is why she has not felt pleased until she starts to wander around Milton and get to know the factory owners and workers well. At first, she has had the idea that working class people are drunkens due to the fact that at that time "going to pubs and drinking as a leisure activity is very common among the workers to have a break and rest from the daily work" (Kalpaklı 2010, 7). Therefore, when Margaret who has rural background encounters some working class people on the street, she feels scared because of their rude, coarse and careless attitude and language. The narrator describes the feelings of Margaret when she is faced with such kind of people as follows; "the tones of their unrestrained voices, and their carelessness of all common rules of street politeness, frightened Margaret a little at first" (Gaskell 1994, VIII: 81). This is so normal for a southern girl who has been raised with middle class values to see these impolite and unusual people of the north. Besides, she has never seen such kind of people in the north; thus, here in the north "for the first time, she is exposed to casual comments about her appearance, and naturally her first response is indignation at being treated rudely and vulgarly" (Kalpaklı 2010, 8). However, instead of remaining prejudiced against

working class people, Margaret gets rid of her thoughts and becomes friends with these people. She goes to their houses as a middle class woman which implies the fact that Margaret not only crosses the boundary of north and south by adapting to the lifestyle in the north but also she is able to construct an understanding between the working class and middle class. This change in her starts with her friendship with Bessy and her father Nicholas Higgins. They enable;

> her understand the manners of the working-people and Margaret understands that workers do not have any evil intention when they comment about her appearance but they are only out-spoken people. (Kalpaklı 2010, 8)

Namely, thanks to her friendship with Bessy, she has been able to see the extreme and poor working conditions of the working class people and the difficulties they have to bear and thanks to her talks with Nicholas Higgins, Margaret understands the reasons behind the tension between the working class and middle class. In a way, "Margaret discovers in her a surprising strain of social activism and becomes concerned about the plight of the mill workers and determined to help improve their lot" (V.U. 2013, 5). The moment she escapes from her prejudices against working class people, she becomes more open to their way of life. Basically, Lotman attaches importance to journey and the road taken in a narration; therefore, he strongly suggests that "the hero has to travel, . . . as true heroes only those characters in the story who possess the capacity to cross the fundamental boundary of the textual universe" (Löve 1994, 34). Here, in this novel Margaret crosses the boundary between north and south which makes her change. In this respect, *North and South* can be considered as revolutionary or dynamic text which "presents the place and activity of the hero, the mobile element" (Lagopoulos and Lagopoulou 2014, 445). At first, Margaret Hale is a prejudiced woman against the north as a southern naïve girl. She finds the industrial people and northern life rude contrary to the peaceful life in the south. Nevertheless, the dynamism in the novel helps Margaret change, break her prejudices, and gain a different perspective. We see that class conflict comes to an end through well-established mutual understanding and

communication. It is obvious that "as she embarks on active exploration of the city streets, Margaret begins to observe . . . initiating a process of identification with the external urban environment" (Dennis 2009, 48). Change in setting leads to a change in Margaret as well. In a way, Margaret gets rid of her prejudices and negative thoughts about Milton and its people;

> Milton became a brighter place to her. It was not the long, bleak sunny days of spring, nor yet was it that time was reconciling her to the town of her habitation. It was that in it she had found a human interest. (Gaskell 1994, VIII: 84)

Due to being raised in a peaceful, green and rustic environment with humanistic values of modest people, Margaret has been highly prejudiced against the people in Milton; especially Mr. Thornton. Nevertheless, at the end of the novel she falls in love with him and marries him. Moreover, when she inherits money, she gives the money to Thornton during the time of bankruptcy so that he can save his factory and business. The marriage between Margaret and Mr. Thornton is a symbol of reconciliation between northern and southern values. In the novel, Margaret all the time argues with sulky Mrs. Thornton and her cruel son Mr. Thornton. However, after many misunderstandings, dangers of death, misfortunes, and problems, Margaret and Mr. Thornton come to terms with each other. Similarly, Margaret from the south and Thornton from the north make a good couple even though they have been really harsh and prejudiced against each other at the very beginning. Margaret is not like any women he knows since she helps him open his eyes and makes things better.

Thanks to Margaret, Mr. Thornton changes as well. John Thornton is one of the well-known factory owners of Milton. He is known for his cruelty. Mr. Thornton is an idealist person who believes that he would be successful through trade and industry. He has suffered a lot to come to this place. However, he is eager to learn things by making mistakes he is a good man actually. He is trying to finish the education he has left due to the necessity to feed his family. Through Mr. Thornton, Gaskell tries to portray an ideal factory owner. In order to solve the problems both

employers and employees need to change and get to know each other and listen to each other. As they start to know each other, they will break down the prejudices. Gaskell believes that the problems within society can only be solved without changing the social system of the society if the miscommunication between classes can be repaired and if the individuals can be more sensible to each other. It can be asserted that;

> Margaret, recognizing the humanity of its inhabitants, no longer finds Milton threatening; these relationships form markers that contribute to her psychic construction of the city as habitable space … From this moment on, Margaret becomes increasingly attuned to her physical environment, and to the energies and concerns of the workers who populate it. (Dennis 2009, 48)

Through a series of events, Mr. Thornton understands the value of human being, acknowledges workers' legal rights, and grasps the true meaning of commerce. He visits Higgins' house and realizes the poverty, hunger and illiteracy of the working class people. Actually, Margaret's role in this cannot be denied. After her encouragement, "leaving his fortress-like factory, Thornton makes his own journey into the realm of 'the Other', visiting Higgins's home" (Dennis 2009, 51). Thus, Thornton decides to form a good system for workers to eat properly during working hours. Hence, when they hear this, workers invite Thornton to eat with them and when the business goes bad they wish to work overtime and help Thornton so that all the work can be done in time. This new communication system between factory owner and workers is really precious for Thornton. Thornton is affected by the humanly values of Margaret and her ways of handling situations which are quite southern. He respects these beliefs and values. As a result, he invites the workers to manage the factory together.

When Margaret comes to Milton, she tries to understand the source of the problems between the classes and struggles to solve the conflict between capital holders and factory workers which basically depends on money. Namely, the distress lies in the fact that; on the one hand "the capital holders or the bosses want to give low wages to the workers to increase their profit" (Kalpaklı 2010, 4), on the other hand workers'

desire is to get the wages they deserve based on their labour. Gaskell tries to show that this lack of communication between classes can be removed. For this, she listens to both sides and tries to find a way to make them listen to each other. Margaret enables Thornton to see workers as persons and asks him to talk to them face to face like human beings. The reason is that for Margaret that is the only way to solve the problems. Margaret wishes to enable each side to stop seeing each other as enemies. They need to reconcile and help each other to make things better for everyone.

Margaret can be regarded as a true heroine in the eyes of Yuri Lotman because of her mobile, brave and revolutionary character which is understood from the fact that her;

> experiences on the city streets and in the homes of the poor have given her a perspectival advantage, and her knowledge of the city's diverse spaces enables her to create pathways between them. (Dennis 2009, 49)

While Margaret acts as a reconciler, each side needs to trust each other and tries to understand each other. In the eyes of Lotman, Margaret is definitely as a mobile character that is "free to move about the plot-space [and] who crosses the boundary and moves from one sphere to another" (Majlingova 2011, 13). In order to be able to achieve this reconciliation, Margaret starts learning things related to business since she is living in an industrial town which is totally different from the agricultural south, which shows that "Margaret displays interests that are traditionally male rather than female (Algotsson 2014, 9). This is a good example of her crossing the boundary between north and south and being successful in adapting this change.

In this respect, through the strike of the workers, Gaskell shows the position of trade union at those times. For Higgins, these strikes are for getting the rights and deserved conditions of workers. Nevertheless, for the greedy workers such as Boucher, this becomes a violent act. Thus, a rightful strike may become an unjust act. In this way, Margaret comes to terms with what a trade union and strike are and how these two affect workers negatively.

Actually, he has done this for the sake of both classes because if they cannot produce, they cannot gain anything and eventually they may go bankruptcy. This means both hands and masters may fail. However, this leads to discomfort among the workers. Since they do not know the actual reason, workers cannot understand why they get lower wages. The reason for this is that Mr. Thornton believes that he does not have to explain anything about his capital and his actions to his workers; "We, the owners of the capital, have a right to choose what we will do with it" (Gaskell 1994, XV: 137). In other words, Mr. Thornton claims that he does not have to explain "the reasons that laid behind this cut" (Kalpaklı 2010, 3) or explain how he handles his own money. This passage actually shows the lack of communication and understanding between the two classes which is the main reason for the discontent in the society for Gaskell. In this respect, it can be suggested that;

> The novel depicts the industrial world of the northern town at a point of crisis: a deepening conflict between capital and labour amid a trade downturn, rising competition, disputes over wages, intensified union activity and strikes. (Knežević 2011, 88)

Gaskell claims that the lack of communication and understanding between the masters and hands is the cause of this situation. Therefore, Gaskell expresses her opinions through Margaret by representing "her a mediator between these two classes to achieve a reconciliation" (Kalpaklı 2010, 14);

> "Mr Thornton", says Margaret, "go down this instant, if you are not a coward. Go down and face them like a man. Save these poor strangers whom you have decoyed here. Speak to your workmen as if they were human beings. Speak to them kindly" (Gaskell 1994, XXII: 209)

Margaret here tries to encourage Mr. Thornton to speak with his workers and explain them the situation. In other words, she "tries to build empathy between the two classes" (Kalpaklı 2010, 3). This is exactly what Gaskell wants and she expresses her wish in her novel. Margaret has significant responsibility in the novel which is to reconcile the working class with the factory owners by enabling them to communicate with each other. Therefore, Margaret plays the main role in every event

throughout the novel. As a result of Margaret's attempts, Mr Thornton who does not accept any agreement between himself and the workers at first, now wants to understand and listen to their needs;

> I have arrived at the conviction that no mere institutions, however wise, and however much thought may have been required to organise and arrange them, can attach class to class as they should be attached, unless the working out of such institutions bring the individuals of the different classes into actual personal contact. Such intercourse is the very breath of life. A working man can hardly be made to feel and know how much his employer may have laboured in his study at plans for the benefit of his workpeople. . . . . We should understand each other better, and I'll venture to say we should like each other more. (Gaskell 1994, LI: 516)

This time Gaskell expresses her ideas through Mr. Thornton. She believes that there can be a connection between the middle class and working class. Basically, she has sympathy for both classes and wants them to reconcile. From this speech, we realize that Mr. Thornton is ready to come to an agreement with the working class people. In other words, he has the will to settle with the working class people as a result of witnessing the friendly relationship between Margaret and the workers. Gaskell also wants to show that it is possible for both classes to live without any conflict;

> one day, two or three of the men—my friend Higgins among them —asked me if I would not come in and take a snack. It was a very busy day, but I saw that the men would be hurt if, after making the advance, I didn't meet them halfway, so I went in, and I never made a better dinner in my life (Gaskell 1994, XLII: 433)

From the speech of Mr. Thornton, we realize that he dines with the lower class people at the mill. Gaskell depicts such scene to demonstrate that it is possible for both sides to respect each other and consider each other individuals. This is a huge step for unity and peace for Gaskell. When she gets to know Thornton, the factory owner and understands that he has the tendency to help the workers, Margaret wants to act as an initiator and a reconciler. Margaret changes the feelings of the worker Higgins and the factory owner Thornton towards each other by making them talk each other. They break their prejudices against each other. In one scene

workers who have had unpleasant thoughts about Mr. Thornton wish him to dine with them;

> the result of Margaret's intervention, leads to the institution of a dining-room scheme, in which 'masters and men' take their midday meal together. Gaskell's suggestion is that the scheme will enable meaningful and sustained dialogue through the merging of previously distinct social spaces; as Elliot argues, '[t]he dining room domesticates the factory [and] blurs the boundaries between public and private spheres. (Dennis 2009, 49)

The naïve southern girl, Margaret, leads to dramatic changes in the lives of the workers and Thorntons. This incident suggests that instead of being miserable about the devastating difference she is exposed to in the north, Margaret not only does her best to adapt to the circumstances but she also tries hard to break the tension between the workers and factory owners by transgressing boundaries. Therefore, it can be claimed that "the novel is concerned with the journeying and border-crossing of its heroine, Margaret, a spatial mediatrix of considerable social and imaginative mobility" (Dennis 2009, 43). Thanks to her, not only Mr Thornton but also the workers gain a different perspective.

When the workers go on a strike for wage increase, Thornton explains to Margaret the situation that there will not be any increase due to cheaper Irish workers. Margaret is curious why he does not tell this to the workers. Gaskell tries to show that workers have the right to learn what is going on in the place they are working for. Workers only expect to be taken seriously like a proper individual. Gaskell tries to show that the factory owners are not aware of the poor living standards, financial problems and poor working conditions of the workers because they are predominantly concerned with self-interest. They do not try to make the conditions better at mills or factories. Therefore, many workers die or get injured. This is represented through Bessy. Owing to the fact that factory owners have done nothing to improve these conditions.

Through Margaret who "comes to understand the differences between 'north and south'" (Brantlinger and Thesing 2002, 178), Gaskell, as the author of this novel, tries to make the two parts of the country understand

each other. However, Gaskell presents the ideas of the two classes and their living and working conditions without showing favour for one side; in other words, "Gaskell shows the two sides of the coin; the conditions of the working-class people and capital holders" (Kalpaklı 2010, 5) in an equal way. Maybe it is not possible to abolish class conflict forever; as Kalpaklı suggests,

> it can be lessened or softened for the benefit of each class. And this softening of the class boundaries paves the way for more "cooperation and communication between the members of different classes" and in this way Gaskell's ideal society would be achieved. (2010, 14)

While Gaskell presents the disunity between these two classes, she does not favour one side over the other because she thinks both sides depend on each other. For Gaskell, the only problem is the lack of communication which is crucial "to achieve harmony between different classes" (Kalpaklı 2010, 14). Gaskell expresses that if they talk to each other, they can solve their problems.

Basically, *North and South* realistically presents the living and working conditions in the southern and northern part of England after the industrial developments; as well as, the conflict between the two classes, masters and men. However, the novel offers compromise at the end since in her novels Gaskell never takes a side. She always tries to look at the issues on both sides and attempts to show each side their mistakes and tries to make them familiar with each other. She strongly believes that in order to solve the problem between classes, a mutual understanding is needed; therefore, she suggests "communication" as the only way to abolish conflicts and boundaries between the classes" (Kalpaklı 2010, 14). Gaskell also believes that the cause for identity seeking to turn into violence is trade unions. She says that trade unions appear as a result of the class difference and the pressure upon workers. However, instead of reducing this conflict, trade unions create more violence and distress among workers. She finds trade unions highly dangerous because of the power they have on people to control them and change their opinions.

In conclusion, Margaret "provides the primary narrative of cartography in the novel, organized by her various travels in different social spaces" (Knezevik 2011, 86); therefore, *North and South* is one of the best examples to be given for Lotman's spatial theory for its having a revolutionary plot and quite mobile protagonist.

5.2. *Brave New World*

Written by Aldous Huxley in 1931, *Brave New World* is recognized as one of the best social satires of modern world. In addition to being a warning against the technological developments for the contemporary reader, Huxley touches upon many themes such as happiness, solitude, power, individuality and so on. Therefore, *Brave New World* is not a simple science-fiction novel since it enables people to contemplate on certain issues.

5.2.1. A Short Introduction

Thomas More's great work *Utopia* (1516) in which he depicts an ideal but imaginary society can be regarded as the most significant work initiating utopian fiction. The word 'utopia' has Greek roots meaning "no place" or "good place". In utopian worlds, everything is perfect; hence, there are no problems such as inequality, oppression, war, disease, or poverty. Basically, it can be inferred that "the utopian genre imagines another way of life, which is often set in direct contrast to the way things actually are" (Crawford 2009, 84). Therefore, by creating a perfect world, Thomas More actually aims at pointing out the flaws in his own society. Since then, many writers have preferred to use utopian genre in their novels so as to show their "desire for a better life" (Sargent qtd. in Crawford 2009, 84) from which we can assume that utopian writers are actually optimistic about the future. Namely, utopian genre portrays splendid worlds where politics, laws, social relations and all aspect of a society perform at an ideal level.

Nevertheless, as a result of the world wars, their effects and consequences in the 20th century, utopian literature started to lose its

influence. Some novelists criticize this optimism of utopian writers and reflect the idea that the sacrifices made for being an ideal society would lead to the downfall of many other things. Industrialization beyond control, unbalanced capitalist spread, Nazi Germany, Russia under the rule of Stalin, rapid technological developments, and fears caused by monopolar world order are some of the reasons for the writers to change their perspective while writing their novels. Aldous Huxley is one of these novelists who creates fictional worlds but they are far from portraying a "good place". Thus, they are considered to be negative utopias called *dystopia* that is "a kind of response to utopias which idealized civilization fuelled by technological and scientific progress and regarded it as a way to the better society of the future" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 139). Generally, in dystopian fiction a society is depicted with its follies due to the corruption of technology or a totalitarian government. It is clear that dystopian worlds are totally "bad places" which people do not wish to live in. This reveals the fact that dystopian writers are rather pessimistic about the future. Accordingly, it can be inferred that while utopian fiction "paints the future in glowing tones; [dystopian fiction] colors it black" (Kumar qtd. in Crawford 2009, 85). In dystopian novels, crooked relationships between social classes and individuals, distorted identity notion, and a powerful government are portrayed. In such a society, the government generally controls the lives of people by repressing their thoughts and movements. This leads to the fact that such states bring their own objectives into the forefront without paying any attention to the needs of their people. Basically, individuals have no right to speak or act in such societies which is why dystopia can be regarded as the anti-thesis of utopia.

With the intention of bringing criticism to the optimism of utopian writers, Huxley creates his well-known dystopic novel *Brave New World* in which he shows the reader that "unreasonable use of technological and economic progress threaten[s] man's innate freedom and independence by fostering a false concept of the common good" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 139). When Huxley wrote *Brave New World*, he "had [already] seen the

unimaginable destruction wrought by World War I and [watched] Hitler consolidate power in Europe before triggering World War II" (Bloom 2011, 51). It was a time of despair and disillusionment which affected Huxley in a great extent.

Moreover, while writing the novel, Huxley "was concerned with the problem of overpopulation" (Tripp qtd in Virchow and Boller2015, 36). He had the fear of fascism which might be caused by the flow of people to urban areas. Huxley became alarmed due to an increase in the number of people "beyond economic resources" (36). Wherefore, he was seriously worried about the emergence of totalitarian governments so as to keep poverty, health care, hunger, and peace under control as a result of this change in the population. Basically, he was afraid of the fact that governments would think that overpopulation might cause instability; hence, they would try to prevent this from happening by total control over everything.

However, there were also scientific and technological developments, revolutions, and inventions which altered the lives and thoughts of people. For example, Russian scientist Ivan Pavlov proved the theory of conditioned response in animals thanks to an experiment with dogs. Meanwhile, people started to have a fancy for hypnopaedia; in other words, sleep teaching. This was popular in 1920s and 1930s. People wanted to educate themselves by listening to a recording while they were sleeping. Furthermore, Sigmund Freud became popular with his theory of psychoanalysis. He believed that psychological problems stem from early childhood experiences. In addition to these scientific improvements, American manufacturer Henry Ford "introduced the first automobile in 1896" (Reiff 2010, 37) and started mass production in his own factory. Many years later, Henry Ford produced his famous Model T car at a very low price so that everyone could afford his cars. He even gave his workers more salary in order to enable them to consume his car as well.

Needless to say, Aldous Huxley was affected by all these revolutionary improvements while writing his novel; therefore, it can be suggested that *Brave New World* is "a satire on contemporary culture, a

prediction of biological advances, a commentary on the social roles of science and scientists, and a plan for reforming society" (Woiak 2007, 106). He creates a world which is based on advanced science and technology and which has total control over human beings by misusing these concepts. Basically, what Huxley tries to achieve is that he "takes the values of positive technological enhancement of human beings and represents what is missing in its success" (Carbonell 45). In that sense, Huxley portrays an imaginary world in 26th century where there is no grief, war, misery, or chaos supported by advanced technology. Everything is provided through happiness and pleasure that every single person feels. From this aspect, *Brave New World* is considered to be a utopian work of art. Nevertheless, it can also be regarded as a dystopia for portraying the worst ways to create this utopia.

In the novel, Huxley features two contradictory worlds; World State and Savage Reservation. Based on Yuri Lotman's spatial theory, these two clearly opposing worlds are created for a deeper purpose. In other words, what Huxley wishes to convey through these topographical representations is the difference between the civilized and barbaric even though which one is more barbaric is debateable.

5.2.2. Spatial Analysis

Compared to *North and South* where spatial forms 'north' and 'south' are taken as topological representations based on Lotman's spatial analysis theory, in *Brave New World*, Aldous Huxley portrays two topographical spaces which is the direct geographical representation. For instance; "in the topographical space of the Odyssey, Troy and Ithaca are two places" (Zoran 1984, 317) which means the World State and the Savage Reservation can be taken as topographical features in this narration. In order to constitute abstract notions, Huxley uses these two spatial forms "as a sign system filled with meaning upon which social reality is constituted" (Hess-Lüttich 2012, 8). They can be considered as two contradictory worlds which perfectly fit to Yuri Lotman's binary opposition concept. The boundary between these two worlds is quite

clear enabling Huxley to reach his goal of describing certain concepts through spatial representations.

In this novel, the author mainly concentrates on a spatial division "contrasting an internal with an external field correlates with a semantic opposition" (Fuchs and Holub 2013, 92) which can be categorized as 'self' and 'other'. The notion of 'self' may refer to an organized and safe space while 'other' may be a hostile and chaotic environment. In fact, this opposition can clearly be seen in the name of the two worlds between which a significant distinction is made because;

> Lotman pays special attention to the external boundaries of the semiosphere, where whatever lies beyond the boundary is generally characterized by a large number of diverse human cultures as uncivilized, animal-like, pagan, chaotic, a space where all that is disallowed within the given semiosphere. (Andrews 330)

In that sense, one space constructed by Huxley is called the World State while the other is called Savage Reservation which clearly sets the huge division between the two. They symbolize distinct cultural values; on the grounds that "any culture is defined first and foremost by its boundaries . . . between the inner space—that which belongs to our culture, "us"—and the outer space, that which belongs to the outside, "them" (Lotman qtd in Semenenko 2012, 58). Accordingly, the World State happens to be a powerful and modern world while the Savage Reservation is a primitive and wild one as it "is a place which, owing to unfavourable climatic and geographical conditions, or poverty of natural resources, has not been worth the expense of civilizing" (Huxley 2011, 11: 215). In this story, the human being's urge of separating oneself from 'the other' can be revealed. The relatively civilized part, the World State, projects all the negative habits, deeds and desires onto the people living in the reservation. This gives the authorities in the brave new world the right to call the people in the reservation Savages. This attitude is quite normal because if a community or individual wants to dignify itself or himself/herself, it or s/he needs to find another one which or who will be defined as inferior. However, Huxley does not content himself with only forming names for two different worlds; hence, he presents dramatically

two distinct ways of life thanks to these spatial representations in order to comment on "hedonism, the totalitarian world state, the optimistic belief in scientific progress, . . . consumer culture" (Tripp qtd in Virchow and Boller2015, 43). Basically, *Brave New World* is based on two spatial portrayals waiting "to be deciphered" (Lotman 1990, 177).

Aldous Huxley whose "novel is famous for its bottled babies, colour-coded classes, hypnopaedic conditioning, and the pharmacological marvel soma" (Frost 2006, 447) depicts a future society of the World State whose motto is "COMMUNITY, IDENTITY, STABILITY". These three terms are actually enough to define the brave new world for being an excessively stable society where political control can be felt at maximum level; wherefore, "'identity' here refers not to the development of individual self, but to the state's effort to make everyone identical" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 140). The story takes place in London and people are ruled by a totalitarian government which has a "culture of genetic and psychological control" (Frost 2006, 447). The World State which is built after the economic depression and world war is a huge company and a global caste system. They do not have any wars, hatred, poverty, disease or pain in the society. They take pleasure in material wealth, and physical desire. People live here in absolute happiness so intensely that there is not even one kind of crime or health problem. This may seem like the best place to live. Nonetheless, in order to achieve such a world, the Controllers of the World State eliminate civil freedom and change social values;

> 'Stability,' said the Controller, 'stability. No civilization without social stability. No social stability without individual stability.'. . . The machine turns, turns and must keep on turning-for ever. It is death if it stands still. . . In a hundred and fifty years there were two thousand millions. Stop all the wheels. In a hundred and fifty weeks there are once more only a thousand millions; a thousand thousand thousand men and women have starved to death. (Huxley 2011, 3: 58)

As it is obvious in the quotation above, the only things the authorities care about are standardization and progress because of the fear of over

population. Everybody needs to contribute to the economy in order to prevent hunger. Basically, Huxley represents;

> a technologically advanced, minutely organized world state whose inhabitants are programmed to eliminate individual differences in order to enforce a stable society. (Sion 2010, 127)

In this respect, the title serves for the purpose of reflecting a world which is perfect and filled with peace thanks to being based on advanced technology and standardization supported by utmost control. Huxley takes the title from Shakespeare's play *The Tempest* where the character Miranda utters these lines on an island she has been exiled to with her father; "How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world, / That has such people in it" (Shakespeare 2005, V. I: 103) by which "she means handsome, noble, or courageous," (Sion 2010, 131) for the "shipwrecked people" (131). Nevertheless, this is quite ironic because "these newcomers will destroy the island paradise. In like manner, the appearance of Huxley's future world in the novel may be attractive, but beneath the surface the lack of humane principles will ruin the utopian dream" (131). Likewise, as the novel progresses the title turns out to be an ironic one as well due to the fact that "instead of referring to an idyllic island paradise it now describes a terrible place of degrading uniformity and oppressive control" (Zhamurashvilli 2014, 140) which means at the end the World State turns out to be a place of modern and technological slavery for its citizens.

The world Huxley portrays a future society in 632 AF. The 'F' letter may seem strange but it refers to Henry Ford who is a famous car manufacturer. The World State gives so much importance to science and technology that they become like a religion for the people. In that sense, this date symbolizes the fact that history begins with the coming of Henry Ford who was "a golden idol [and he] was famously so focused on profit and efficiency that he sacrificed empathy, morality, and the health and happiness of his workers" (Wilkinson 2010, 22). Huxley highly admired Ford's management strategies and production line for Henry Ford was the one who invented the assembly line in order to mass

produce cars. In this respect, it can be suggested that *Brave New World* is like a parody of American society after the WWI when it was a consumer country dealing with mass production. Therefore, it is not surprising that the beginning of history is considered to be production of T model car of Ford since T model is the first car manufactured in mass production techniques. At the time it was produced, it became a phenomenon. This mass production system is called Fordism on which the whole economic system is based. Nevertheless, more importantly, Ford sold the cars at such prices that workers could also afford to buy them. The production became faster because workers were able to work faster and without any mistakes. As a result, more products could be produced in less time. What Henry Ford did was that he gave higher salaries so that workers could afford his cars. Hence, in a way, Ford takes what he gives. Thus, working class seem to afford whatever they want and seem to be happy with their situation. Therefore, Fordism contributes to capitalism's immediate rise.

Huxley forges a world where people worship Ford instead of God; "Thank Ford, he was not the last!" (Huxley 2011, 5: 103). As it is obvious from this sentence, instead of being grateful to God, people pray to Ford because in this society science and technology are their religion. People even reshape the crosses to be fully committed to Fordism; "All crosses had their tops cut and became T's" (Huxley 3: 70). People make 'T' on their chests instead of a cross during religious ceremonies and call out his name which is a sign for "Ford's divine status" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 142). It can be inferred that brave new world completely rejects the faith in God as they have their own type of religion based on Henry Ford's industrial policy; in other words, this world is the representation of a culture where "religion has been replaced with a worship of technology" (Reiff 2010, 88). As a result of the improvements, religious decline can be observed. Therefore, in the libraries one cannot find any religious books; "God in the safe and Ford on the shelves" (Huxley 2011, 17: 308). Besides, the world controller Mond justifies their act with the fact that people want to pray and remember God when they become old.

Since, there is no aging in the World State, people do not need God. Instead, they read books for pleasure or scientific purposes.

Being fond of scientific and technological developments, Huxley was also able to foresee "the development and dangerous abuses of technology by government in its perpetual search for way in which to control its subjects" (Barr 2010, 849). Therefore, it is not surprising to see Huxley applying the idea of mass production in the field of biology in his novel. Huxley takes the reader to a world which has gone through a revolution after wars and economic crisis. This world is run according to the industrial philosophy of Ford. The stability in the World State is achieved through genetic engineering and conditioning which means "this future society has achieved unity and stability by minimizing the individuality of its citizens" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 140).

To begin with, in this Fordian society children are not born from a mother and a father in a natural way. Rather, they are produced in factories from a fertilized egg which is taken from women's wombs. The eggs are taken from the women with an operation. They separate the good ones from the bad ones in order to fertilize the useful eggs in sperm baths. As a result of this process, they have Alpha and Beta zygotes. However, the Gammas, Deltas and Epsilons go through a different process called "Bokanovsky Process";

> One egg, one embryo, one adult-normality. But a bokanovskified egg will bud, will proliferate, will divide. From eight to ninety-six buds, and every bud will grow into a perfectly formed embryo, and every embryo into a full-sized adult. Making ninety-six human beings grow where only one grew before. Progress. (Huxley 2011, 1: 9)

Thanks to this procedure, one egg is divided until it gives ninety-six humans instead of one. In this process, the eggs are exposed to radiation; therefore, many eggs cannot endure the process and die. Nevertheless, the ones which are able to survive keep duplicating. During this process; they are also "genetically manipulated to assume a specific role within society, and to never think or deviate from the established and respected norm" (Sion 2010, 141). In the World State, nobody has parents because everybody is a product of genetic engineering through mass production.

For instance, “many Betas may come from the same woman, but they do not know whom their mother is” (Babaee, Yahya and Sivagurunathan 2013, 493) which suggests that many citizens are related to each other. This also relates to their lack of identity, since it is important for a person’s identity to know their ancestry” (493). They consider this ‘progress’ which is essential to their society since;

> mass-produced bottle-babies are “predestined” to their future jobs using eugenic selection, cloning, and conditioning; after “decanting” from artificial wombs they are subjected to a lifetime of brainwashing techniques designed by ‘Emotional Engineers’. (Woiak 2007, 107)

The most important place in this world is the “Hatchery and Conditioning Centre” which is simply a factory producing humans. They are cloning identical individuals “for the good of the society” (Huxley 2011, 1:8). This condition leads to the fact that “children’s bodies and minds are regarded as the property of the government” (Babaee, Yahya and Sivagurunathan 2013, 493). This creates the sense of dehumanization among people as there is nothing emotional about being born. The act of cloning kills the humane side of the process of birth.

Huxley achieved showing how people would misuse technology in a very striking manner at a time when there were not any experiments on cloning. Normally, a person grows mature in at least thirty years; however, in Huxley’s world it takes only two years; “Podsnap’s Technique had immensely accelerated the process of ripening" (Huxley 2011 1: 12). Besides, while producing the human beings, the scientists “also predestine and condition” (1: 20) everything about human beings such as their appearance, intelligence, and roles in the society. Therefore, individuals “are deprived of free choice and personality even as the embryos” (Zhamurashvili 2014, 141). In this brave new world, people who are physically and genetically conditioned to become what is predestined for them are also categorized like commodities belonging to different castes titled as Alpha, Beta, Delta, Gamma, and Epsilon. Namely, the government produces individuals according to its needs creating different classes among the society for different jobs “forming a

Caste system of superiors- the Alphas and Betas- and inferiors- the Gammas, Deltas, and Epsilons" (Reiff 2010, 66). This suggests that the caste system is formed through artificial methods. Every class is produced with specific codes and qualities. Caste system is really strict "with decreasing intelligence, skill, physical beauty and sophistication of work" (Tripp qtd in Virchow and Boller2015, 35). Alphas and Betas are the top classes; yet, "every individual has a predetermined job, for which he or she is perfectly fit" (Barr 2010, 854). For instance, Alphas are created as the most intelligent individuals and they are in a way leaders of the community; Betas deal with civil service; and Epsilons are responsible for the job which requires muscle force and minimum intelligence.

Basically, the authorities in brave new world play the role of God by predetermining the fate of every single individual which is strongly degrading for human beings since as an individual, nobody can decide on anything about themselves since there are people who make the decisions for them;

> mass production, the assembly line, management structures, and consumer manipulation all mean more controls over the individual, so that a rich social variety has been reduced to an unnatural, dull conformity. In the process, people have come to act like robots. (Sion 2010, 132-133)

In a way, one's whole life is predestined by strangers who work for the government. The destruction of family ties and conditioning the embryos with their future roles in society bring the loss of identity. Citizens of brave new world are in a sense just pieces of meat. Besides, within the society, the classes are distinguished by the colours they wear; Alphas are grey, Betas are mulberry, Deltas are khaki, Gammas are green and Epsilons are black. This clearly reveals the fact that people are reduced to letters and colours. The World State gives rise to dehumanization for the sake of stability.

Nevertheless, there is no competition or conflict between classes surprisingly for everybody is pretty happy about their qualities, duties, and social rank. The reason is that human beings "are perfectly designed

for the tasks they are meant to fulfil in society" (Schermer 2007, 120); hence, there happens to be no reason for contradiction between classes as everybody concentrates solely on her/his own task and way of life. Even before people are born, their physical and emotional qualities, intelligence and skills are all decided by the authorities; thus, during their life time "they not only perform their social function efficiently, but they are also never dissatisfied with their lives and accept their occupations easily" (Babaee, Yahya and Sivagurunathan 494-495, 2013). In other words, nobody could oppose to anything which is why everybody performs his duty in the best way because they are conditioned to be pleased with their positions.

Brave new world is devoid of war because there is no reason to have war. Everything is designed to have pleasure and be happy. People do not feel envy, fear or aggression because every individual is satisfied with their lives. They do not have the mentality and vision to dream of and desire for something they do not have or know. This is maintained generally through hypnosis; however, if it is not enough, they would take drugs.

Mustapha Mond, the controller of the World State, explains the idea behind the caste system and why they do not prefer to have equality between the classes as follows;

> "We believe in happiness and stability. A society of Alphas couldn't fail to be unstable and miserable. Imagine a factory staffed by Alphas-that is to say by separate and unrelated individuals of good heredity and conditioned so as to be capable (within limits) of making a free choice and assuming responsibilities.
>
> . . .
>
> "It's an absurdity. An Alpha-decanted, Alpha-conditioned man would go mad if he had to do Epsilon Semi-Moron work-go mad, or start smashing things up. Alphas can be completely socialized-but only on condition that you make them do Alpha work. "Only an Epsilon can be expected to make Epsilon sacrifices, for the good reason that for him they aren't sacrifices; they're the line of least resistance. His conditioning has laid down rails along which he's got to run. He can't help himself; he's foredoomed." (Huxley 2011, 16: 296)

Namely, individuals are “laboratory germinated, nurtured, and conditioned to love their role under a totalitarian caste system. There is no hatred, class envy or crass desires for what belongs to others” (Sion 2010, 136). It is quite clear that in brave new world no caste envies the other since people do not feel greed as it has been eliminated and people are conditioned to be satisfied with what they have. If there were not any class differentiation, there would be chaos for every single person would want the same job, physical qualities and life. Then, nobody would be happy which would result in instability. However, in brave new world every class is brainwashed into thinking that their caste is the best one and what they do is the best occupation in the world which refers to the fact that “all conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny” (Huxley 2011, 1: 23). To put it another way, the World State citizens have no chance of objecting to any aspects of their lives. If they are conditioned to be workers, they have to spend their entire lives and die as a worker. In a way, they are doomed to be devoted. In this respect, the government is aware of the fact that this devotion is best planted during childhood. Based on this notion, one institution within the government called Conditioning Centre basically creates human robots but happy robots. In order to maintain this peaceful environment, the government uses hypnopaedia in order to condition the individuals into anything they desire;

> “… all wear green," said a soft but very distinct voice, beginning in the middle of a sentence, "and Delta Children wear khaki. Oh no, I don't want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse. They're too stupid to be able to read or write. Besides they wear black, which is such a beastly colour. I'm so glad I'm a Beta." There was a pause; then the voice began again.” (Huxley 2011, 2. 39)

This is an example for the conditioning of Betas who listen to this sentence over and over again while they are sleeping. As it can be seen in the quotation, while the children are sleeping, a voice whispers into their ears so that they are conditioned to whatever the government wants. The passage above shows that “identity is formed by giving sleep lessons in

class-consciousness" (Reiff 2010, 68) which results in forming docile bodies of meat. Children have been brainwashed since an early age on the ground that if they grew up and did not like their caste, they would try to get out of the caste and this would cause instability and conflict among people. Wherefore, the government firmly believes in the idea that differences are needed in order to create peace. Social predestination is the main focus of the brave new world for the sake of stability. Besides, persistence in community could only be achieved through individual happiness; therefore, every single person has to feel that happiness.

Hypnopaedia is used to brainwash; therefore, it is not only used for children. Adults are also exposed to sleep teaching for the sake of stability; "'But old clothes are beastly,' continued the untiring whisper. 'We always throw away old clothes. Ending is better than mending, ending is better than mending, ending is better…'" (Huxley 2011, 3: 66). This voice is basically for encouraging people to buy products rather than repairing them. The government wants its citizens to consume. In other words, "to have economic stability, the leaders brainwash citizens to spend money continually on new items" (Reiff 2010, 69). The Controller of the country explains this idea as follows;

> "We haven't any use for old things here."
> "Even when they're beautiful?"
> "Particularly when they're beautiful. Beauty's attractive, and we don't want people to be attracted by old things. We want them to like the new ones." (Huxley 2011, 16: 291-292)

Huxley implies that the contemporary world is a world of consumption; therefore, in his imaginary world every individual has to be a consumer for the economy to improve; "Nowadays, the Controllers won't approve of any new game unless it requires at least as much apparatus as the most complicated of existing games" (Huxley 2011, 3: 43). The authorities do not even allow any new game if it does not make people buy more items or equipment. In that sense, the act of brainwashing here is supposed to direct people to shopping. Every individual has to be a consumer in order for a better economy. The reason why hypnopaedia is so useful is that

after certain number of repetitions, people start to use the slogans in their daily lives unconsciously; “Years of intensive hypnopaedia . . . made the taking of these precautions almost as automatic and inevitable as blinking” (Huxley 2011, 5: 102). This arouses the feeling of slavery and manipulation. This brave new world boosts of its free citizens; however, people in the World State are not different than caged animals. Basically, people live in an illusion as a result of which they become conditioned to do whatever the government wishes. It can be suggested that people are mindless robots in the World State in which there is total control over everything.

The World State does not only interfere with human evolution scientifically but also psychologically as they use some methods to condition people psychologically as well. Pavlov method is one of them. Regardless of the class, all the individuals are physically conditioned through Pavlov experiment so that every single embryo can become devoted to its class and occupation. For instance, the system supports the fact that nature love is not necessary for factory workers which is the only important job in the World State; therefore, it should be removed from the society. In that sense, they condition the babies with Pavlov experiment by associating books and flowers with electroshock and noise. They put flowers and books on the floor and each time the babies move towards them, they give electric shocks to the babies which is a clear example for the fact that “the government even attempts to condition children to like particular things" (Babaee, Yahya, and Sivagurunathan 2013, 494). After two hundred repetitions, babies start to feel hatred towards books and flowers as the Director mentions;

> They'll grow up with what the psychologists used to call an 'instinctive' hatred of books and flowers. Reflexes unalterably conditioned. They'll be safe from books and botany all their lives. (Huxley 2011, 2: 31)

With this method, the babies “are taught to strive for beauty, for the books, for the nature. Consequently, they cannot perceive these values” (Zhamurashvili 2014, 144). Their purpose is to deprive human beings of romantic emotions to create senseless individuals. Namely, the

authorities shape people's feelings and thoughts in order to have a perfect world. They aim at creating stability and uniformity in order to prevent any divergents.

Pavlov experiment is an effective way of conditioning due to the fact that bodily fears in time become habits and lifestyle since the messages "penetrate children's sub-consciousness and become common sense" (Babaee, Yahya and Sivagurunathan 2013, 494). Since this kind of conditioning starts when the individual is an embryo and a baby, when it grows up it cannot live outside these limits or borders and do not wish to change its class. Therefore, all the classes do their jobs well just like the government wants. This definitely reinforces the government's power. It creates conscious awareness together with sleep teaching, repeating slogans proverbs mindlessly over and over again because the government wishes to instil its ideologies and values from the beginning so that children will have no time to think outside the borders which the authorities set through "hypnotic messages, repeated several times" (Babaee, Yahya and Sivagurunathan 2013, 494).

Furthermore, in the brave new world, the words 'mother', 'father', and 'family' are prohibited since life is not created emotionally at homes, but in labs. Therefore, the artificiality of this issue can be sensed directly. These delicate concepts are considered to be disgraceful. The word "mother" sounds sexual in the world state and "birth" is considered to be most dangerous word for the people who are produced scientifically. In order not to destroy the system and its stability, the family institution has to cease to exist;

> Our Freud had been the first to reveal the appalling dangers of family life. The world was full of fathers-was therefore full of misery; full of mothers- therefore of every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity; full of brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts- full of madness and suicide. (Huxley 2011, 3: 54)

As it is mentioned in the novel, family ties may lead to disadvantageous situations for the society as family members feel connected to each other. When people feel attached to each other emotionally, they would start to isolate themselves from the rest. Therefore, family institution is not

considered to be something contributing to social homogeneity and stability. The basic idea behind this prohibition is to eradicate individuality from society "which is made acceptable by the abolition of the family" **(**Reiff 2010, 70).

Accordingly, in this dystopian world love is considered to be a threat for stability. Therefore, society forbids any romantic bond between people. The reason for this is that totalitarian governments do not care about individual interests but the common interest. Thus, no individual emotion or pleasure is taken for granted. "Every one belongs to every one else, after all" (Huxley 2011, 3: 55) clearly shows that there is no individuality for this world's citizens;

> "But seriously," she said, "I really do think you ought to be careful. It's such horribly bad form to go on and on like this with one man. At forty, or thirty-five, it wouldn't be so bad. But at your age, Lenina! No, it really won't do. And you know how strongly the D.H.C. objects to anything intense or long-drawn. Four months of Henry Foster, without having another man-why, he'd be furious if he knew… (Huxley 2011, 3: 56)

This tragic dialogue between Lenina and Fanny demonstrates the fact that it is not possible to have long relationships with only one man or woman in Huxley's dystopia. Ideal length of time for having a relationship with someone is one week. More than one week of affair is condemned. Zhamurashvili summarizes the issue of love in this world as follows;

> Love is forbidden . . . Promiscuity has been encouraged by eliminating such phenomena as family. Parenthood has become evil. Children are deprived of parental love as they are not born in labor any more. And there is no love of wife or husband as monogamy is prohibited. Love is completely eradicated. (2014, 146)

The government which anticipates that strong feeling of loyalty can cause conflict and disrupts harmony in the society. This cannot be accepted because the well-being of the society is more important than the well-being of the individual; namely, "the individual has ceased to matter as an individual" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 151). In that sense, having a

passionate and long-lasting relationship with someone is totally prohibited which can be observed between Lenina and Bernard;

> 'Every one says I'm awfully pneumatic' said Lenina reflectively, patting her own legs.
> 'Awfully.' But, there was an expression of pain in Bernard's eyes. 'Like meat' he was thinking. (Huxley 2011, 6: 120-121)

Throughout their lives citizens are taught to see each other as commodities which are ready to be consumed. Since there is no concept of love or family, people are deprived of emotional attachments which makes them careless and senseless. In a way, they become dehumanized like clockwork mechanisms, machines, or devices. Namely the World State citizens can never feel true love "as it will cause strong emotions and will endanger the social stability" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 146).

In addition to the concept of love, the act of sex is also under the control of the government. People have unusual attitude towards sex in Huxley's brave new world. Promiscuity is valued over commitment to only one person or monogamous relationships. They need sex not for propagating but for having pleasure which is one of the ways to maintain happiness in society; hence to keep everything in order. By controlling people's sex life, the World State creates inhabitants who cannot cause any kinds of destructive or emotional trouble; in other words, "the old values have been eradicated by developing a society based on compulsory consumption and the universal availability of sex" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 143). Government enables stability by fulfilling the people's basic instincts such as sex. This sense of sexuality is fulfilled from childhood through "erotic games". And if a student does not want to play in this game, he is treated as if he were mentally sick;

> 'What's the matter?' asked the Director
> The nurse shrugged her shoulders. 'Nothing much,' she answered 'It's just that this little boy seems rather reluctant to join in the ordinary erotic play'. . . 'I'm taking him in to see the Assistant Superintendent of Psychology. Just to see if anything's at all abnormal'. (Huxley 2011, 3: 44)

The notion behind this practice is based on the idea that in order to maintain peace in the society, the basic needs of individuals need to be

fulfilled. Therefore, government starts this exercise from the childhood. The act of sex is conditioned to be a normal and usual activity. In a way, sex which is a powerful source of instinct is designed to be treated as something for source of entertainment through games. In fact, the way sexuality is performed without any limits or constraints in the World State is the "biggest form of self-indulgence" (Reiff 2010, 70) for the people. Besides, adults are also exposed to the same practice through orgies, feelies or movies whose theme is generally based on sex. During the orgy parties, everybody can have sex with anybody they want suggesting that having sex with someone loses its emotional significance and turns into an unworthy and a senseless act. If two people are sexually attracted to each other but cannot have an intercourse, this is considered to be shameful. The ideal relationship is that one offers sexual intercourse and the other directly accepts. You can also have more than one lover at the same time which is extremely normal. This is a great way to remove the discomfort and frustration from the individuals for the sake of stability since the worst enemy of stability is rebellion. Therefore, government tries to eliminate rebellious thoughts from the citizens' minds as much as possible. In a way, people can have sex freely so that they do not have psychological complications. Since their animal desires are satisfied, people are not aware of the fact that there could be another social order better than the existing one.

With free sexuality, emotional structure is abused. When people become promiscuous, Huxley shows how love is cheapened. As a matter of fact, having sex is so common that women wear Malthusian belts in order to carry contraceptives since they need to take precautions against birth which reinforces the fact that "the rulers use scientific advances to make sexual promiscuity possible by sterilizing most women, making them "freemartins" who cannot get pregnant" (Reiff 2010 70). Basically, the individual has no worth in the World State because what is important is the community.

Even though sexuality is not limited, reproduction has to be kept under surveillance through contraceptives. Reproduction cannot be done

without the control of the government. Sexual activity is a natural instinct but it is still considered to be a savage activity. Therefore, propagation is restricted. This means, the government enables people to have sex not for having children but for fulfilling their sexual desire in order not to feel distracted and distressed. This is a justification for the government to tell the other that they would do everything for their citizens; nevertheless, with all these the brave new world regulations, it can be suggested that the brave new world is the most selfish government on earth.

In Huxley's dystopic world, the drug called *soma* manages to keep adults free from stress, anxiety, pain, grief, humiliation or any feeling that the society cannot control. People solve their problems or conflicts by taking a few tablets. Huxley himself explains the purpose of soma in his book *Brave New World Revisited*; "the daily soma ration was an insurance against personal maladjustment, social unrest and the spread of subversive ideas" (2000, 54). Soma creates the feeling of numbness "mainly to escape from unpleasant situations and from 'real life'; it produces only shallow feelings of well-being" (Schermer 2007, 120). This way the government thinks they can create a society which is devoid of any crisis, rebellion or trouble with endless happiness. Every need of the people is provided by the government. People can basically do everything with *soma;* play games, watch films or have sex. In other words, world state citizens "take soma as a kind of 'holiday' from everyday life, a trip to a temporary state of bliss. It makes them happy, relaxed and good-humoured" (Sion 2010, 120). It can clearly be suggested that people are allowed to have everything they require in order to prevent any maleficence in the society. Therefore, they never feel any pain or suffering since they are in a trance-like condition of constant happiness. When you take soma, you can even go to Hawaii while you are actually sitting on your bed.

Soma was first produced almost 500 hundred years ago and it is given to the citizens for free as a sedative, an anesthetic and a hallucinative. In other words, soma is used by the World State citizens to kill their emotions; "Swallowing half an hour before closing time, that second

dose of soma had raised a quite impenetrable wall between the actual universe and their minds" (Huxley 2011, 5: 101). Namely, soma refers to "alienation, de-humanization and superficial mind-numbing pleasure" (Schermer 2007, 119). Soma is taken in grammes and it creates happy memories and moments. Therefore, people take soma in order to escape from reality or to be able to put up with the situation they are in or the bad feeling they have. Nevertheless, since soma makes you high, you become susceptible to any act of government. When you take soma, you immediately fall asleep meaning soma does not boost the emotions but numbs them. Generally, when people feel angry, stressed, frustrated or have negative thoughts, they take soma in order to cope with the reality. Soma in a way makes people content themselves with what they have; wherefore, "it is better to evade problems by taking soma than suffering the ailments of one's conscience" (Martin 2011, 187). However, if you take a lot, it may result in death. Thus, Huxley in a way shows that soma is actually not a medicine but an opiate. This drug is actually a better version of alcohol. Like alcohol, soma also creates an illusion, makes people happy and partially asleep and when the person wakes up, she/he does not remember anything. The main purpose of the use of soma is to enable an individual not to feel abnormal and unhappy. The phrase the statement "Ignorance is bliss" is totally true for the World State citizens because the use of soma turns one blind to the things going around them. The citizens are happy not because they are genuinely happy but they are fooled and numbed.

Huxley refers to soma as "chemical persuasion" and mentions that this chemical is actually political institution. In fact, soma is a really powerful tool for the government in order to control people; hence, "the chemical substance soma, the Greek word for 'body,' is another indication of the biopolitical 'processes-regulatory' mechanisms of power" (Tripp qtd in Virchow and Boller2015, 40). It can be suggested that unlike many totalitarian governments, the World State is not built upon the idea of fear but anesthetization and conditioning. In that sense, soma deals with

the anesthetization part. Daily distribution of soma prevents individual discordance, social unrest and unconformity.

Soma has all the advantages of religion and alcohol and it has no side effects. Intoxication with drugs is one of the best ways to control the citizens. Soma enables people to forget about their faults, miseries, exhaustion and dissatisfaction. It creates the illusion that nothing is wrong in one's life and they live in a perfect world. The government does not force citizens to use soma but conditions people to use it through slogans, sleep teaching and advertisings etc. since childhood. Therefore, soma is an important part of brave new world's culture. Since the government wants happy, satisfied, and foolish citizens, soma makes them become exactly such individuals. Since it is free and legal, everybody can carry it and take whenever they want which creates a fully happy and satisfied community;

> In brief, soma promotes a superficial hedonism and causes alienation from the kind of 'real human life' that we know. Furthermore, soma is used to keep the social order as it is. It is used as a kind of substitute for religious feelings in Community Sings and Solidarity Services, where the values of the World State are celebrated and enforced. It is quite literally opium for the people. (Schermer 2007, 121)

Namely, limitless sexuality and drug usage provide a happy life for the citizens of the World State. Besides, all the things that give pleasure are legal and cheap, or free and government provides people with these things. Nevertheless, what overshadows this utopic happiness is the costs people have to pay in order to live in such a world. Brave new world is associated with the fact that there is no art or science, no concept of religion or philosophy. All the works of literature are forbidden to read such as Shakespeare or Dante which means "arts have also been eradicated to deprive the man of love for romanticism, beauty and nature" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 144).

Besides Mond explains that people would not understand any of Shakespeare's plays because first of all they are not allowed to consume anything old, even when it is beautiful. Secondly, they would not understand the relationship between the characters because in the World

State, individuals do not have any perception of the feelings of love, jealousy or any experience on the incidents being described in the play. Accordingly, the World State is portrayed as;

> a society where fidelity is scorned, where intelligence and empathy are psychological abnormalities, and where creative literature and art are no longer possible because there is no natural joy, sympathy, or meaningful suffering in life. (Sion 2010, 136)

In such a world which lacks any work of art, humanly feelings and ability to think turn out to be unknown. This shows that this novel is based on a "a cautionary . . . world in which artefacts of high culture are held under lock and key while the populace is supplied with 'imbecile' entertainment" (Frost 2006, 447). Such kind of prohibition is necessary for preventing people from liking the old since the World State is the representation of a culture based on newness and consumerism.

The citizens have become passive receivers of pleasure which makes them harmless, safe and calm about their fate. Since there is no art, they are not aware of the fact that they are actually used and suffering from their fate. Lack of art leads to lack of humanity and therefore people are reduced to the role of plants or animals which are used for the good of the ruling power.

In addition, art and culture are two important tools for society as they keep some values alive such as individuality, freedom, liberty, right to revolt, right to happiness and they are highly emotional. Therefore, it is not allowed in order to avoid the independence of human beings. All the museums are closed, historical monuments are blown up and all the books were burnt. In a way art is degraded especially in the scene where Lenina and Henry, an upper-caste member, go to Abbey Cabaret where they are going to listen to "CALVIN STOPES AND HIS SIXTEEN SEXOPHONISTS." (Huxley 2011, 5: 99). One may think that Henry and Lenina are interested in art from their going to the Cabaret; however, this show and music is far from the real ones since its all purpose is to give sexual satisfaction. Therefore, this show is "deprived of any feelings" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 149). As it has been mentioned before, every kind

of activity should serve for the purpose of pacifying human beings and preventing them from having an artistic pleasure and this cabaret does exactly this. These are all for the stability of the society and a peaceful life. Art, history and culture have been totally removed from the society which does not make any difference for the people who are occupied with amusements, orgies, feelies, or endless satisfaction in every way possible. They are not even aware of the fact that there is something called 'art' in the world. Otherwise, it would be difficult to make people submissive beings since they would use art as a means for expressing their feelings and thoughts. Likewise, government limits people's thoughts of past so that they cannot compare the present with the past; "History is bunk" (Huxley 2011, 3: 48);

> On the one hand, history is a waste of time (which is one of the most important economic factors). On the other hand, however, history is a dialectic process implying changes that need to be arrested to procure one of the major principles of this society – stability – which is potentially threatened by knowledge of the past. Hence, the focus is on present actions alone. (Tripp qtd in Virchow and Boller 2015, 33)

The World State does not want its citizens to stick to the past and learn from the mistakes of the past in order to make changes in the present; therefore, "history in terms of dialectical change represents a potential threat to stability" (Tripp qtd in Virchow and Boller2015, 40).

Furthermore, solidarity is not supported in the World State which implies that individuals have to be social all the time and have sex with whomever they find available. In other words, in the world state, individuality is considered to be a risk and danger. According to the authorities, individuality threatens more than one person's life which is why they support "no leisure from pleasure, not a moment to sit down and think" (Huxley 2011, 3: 72). In a way, the authorities reject personal thoughts and never want people to have free time for themselves since they think this is a threat for the whole society. Therefore, solidarity is never allowed. Therefore, administration continues by providing happy and superficial satisfaction in the way that individuals forget about their personal freedom and happiness through soma.

The hidden torture of the World State citizens does not end here. People are conditioned towards death as well. They are stimulated to take death as normal. On no condition, citizens can feel sad after a dead person. They even regard death as something pleasant. Children are taken to the hospital where the dying stay. They eat their sweets and watch the dying people with enthusiasm which is provided with "intensive conditioning from the early age, regular visit to the Hospital for the Dying, keeping the best toys there, special helpings of chocolate cream on death days" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 151). They are totally unaware of the sorrow and tragedy of death due to the illusion of conditioning. Besides, people are convinced to the fact that when they die, their dead body will be used as fossil. Knowing this makes people even happier; therefore, it can be suggested that in this brave new world "there is only the death deprived of fear" (151). They are reasoned that there is not a ceremony after the dead since its body is burnt and used as fertilizers for the common good. The conversation between Lenina and Bernard proves how people are senseless towards death;

> 'What a marvellous switchback!' Lenina laughed delightedly.
> . . . 'Do you know what that switchback was?' he said. 'It was some human being finally and definitely disappearing. . . there's one thing we can be certain of; whoever he may have been, he was happy when he was alive. Everybody's happy now'. (Huxley 2011, 5: 98)

This shows that brave new world citizens are totally unemotional towards death; "in civilized world the individual has ceased to matter as an individual. Naturally, the act of dying has been stripped of all significance in dehumanized world" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 151).

Based on Yuri Lotman's spatial analysis, there is the depiction of a futuristic world which is surrounded by dehumanization. Huxley needs to create such a dystopic world in order to express his concerns and make people understand his thoughts. People in the World State lack of spirituality, family and they have an obsession with physical pleasure and misuse of technology. People accept their conditions willingly due to conditioning from birth. Controlling birth and killing emotions, the new

person is educated to surrender. Every individual is conditioned to fit in the society's needs and to like the jobs they work in or the lives they lead. As Barr states; the citizens "have no options, no free will, no chance to make a difference; only the opportunity to be another happy cog in a vast machine designed and run by the government" (2010, 856). Basically, *Brave New World* is a society "in which the values (or non-values) of scientific technology are dominant, and which has therefore reduced man to a species of machine" (Firchow 1975, 301). Aldous Huxley shows that in this dystopian world people live happily ever after in stability only with the loss of individuality which means this society needs robots not people. Emotions drive a person to act on something, to become a better person, to grow and learn to love; yet, the government does not want such intense emotions and characteristics therefore they keep emotions under control with drugs or sleep teaching. They think stability can be achieved when everyone is happy. Therefore, they eliminate all passions, pains and deep feelings from human beings.

The values of this dystopian society are based on industry, economy, and technological growth which "demonstrates how can the progress made in manufacturing, technology made the man subordinated and dehumanized" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 140). People do not have individual needs or identities. They are all conditioned to pursue the well-being of the society as a whole. Grushow claims that;

> In *Brave New World* Aldous Huxley enforces in us disgust toward the future society largely through constant reference to our own society. We find the World State intolerable largely because we see in it perversions of our most cherished ideals and institutions. (1962, 42)

Namely, *Brave New World* "is a terrifying look at a world in which science and technology are used by powerful rulers to control the masses, making them into mindless automatons" (Reiff 2010, 63). After finishing the analysis of Huxley's novel, people may start to question the contemporary values of life. Even though we are expected to appreciate the achievements, progress or efficiency, when we face with such extreme conditions depicted in the novel, we may not feel so hopeful

about technology. The reason is that the ones who have power start to misuse technology and science for their interest just like the one in Huxley's dystopian novel. The totalitarian government causes technology to become a dehumanizing force; in that sense,

> there is no path but the one given. These inhabitants have no options, no free will, no chance to make a difference; only the opportunity to be another cog in a vast machine designed and run by the government. (Barr 2010, 854)

Thanks to Aldous Huxley and his dystopian world, we understand that not all progress is helpful as a warning about the technological and scientific advances is portrayed. Huxley aims to make people realize that these developments not only changes the inner selves of human beings but also enables political institutions have extreme power. In this respect, *Brave New World* portrays a government which uses technology to suppress and control its citizens at the maximum level. In order to portray the danger of this situation, Huxley creates an opposing topographical representation which is the Savage Reservation where "castaways, aliens who have been expelled from society" (Martin 2011, 188) live. In the World State relatively more civilized, educated and cultured people are living while in the Savage Reservation savages who are never considered to be human try to survive. Huxley depicts the reservation as follows;

> …about sixty thousand Indians and half-breeds…absolute savages..our inspectors occasionally visit… otherwise, no communication whatever with the civilized world…still preserve their repulsive habits and customs…marriage, if you know what that is, my dear young lady; families…no conditioning…monstrous superstitions…Christianity and totemism and ancestor worship…extinct languages, such as Zuni and Spanish and Athapascan…pumas, porcupines and other ferocious animals…infectious diseases…priests…venomous lizards. (Huxley 2011, 6: 134)

People here have belief in love, religion, family and marriage. They have religious faith and follow some rituals of their own unlike the World State where it is considered to be obscene; that is why "the Savage Reservation is not attractive to a Fordian culture in which people are manipulated by disciplinary systems" (Babaee, Yahya and Sivagurunathan 2013, 491). However, citizens in the World State are

curious and enthusiastic about the rituals in the reservation. Their beliefs are like Christian beliefs because they believe in a man who died on a cross. Savages make sacrifices and perform spirit journeys. On the contrary, in the World State, citizens strictly believe in Ford but they do not go deeper in terms of beliefs, ceremonies or rituals.

In the world state, people are encouraged to consume and buy new things other than trying to fix and use old things; however, in the Savage Reservation, people fix things;

> "look at these clothes. This beastly wool isn't like acetate. It lasts and lasts. And you're supposed to mend it if it gets torn. But I'm a Beta; I worked in the Fertilizing Room; nobody ever taught me to do anything like that. It wasn't my business. Besides, it never used to be right to mend clothes. Throw them away when they've got holes in them and buy new. 'The more stitches, the less riches.' Isn't that right? Mending's anti-social. But it's all different here. It's like living with lunatics. Everything they do is mad." (Huxley 2011, 7: 159-160)

They are not as careless and reckless as the World State citizens. They prefer to use things as long as possible instead of buying another one which is a relatively more human behaviour. More importantly, people in the Savage Reservation believe in the supremacy of monogamy. They strictly support having one partner for a romantic relationship. They totally believe in the idea that couples should be together as a result of loving each other not for self-interest. Besides, as an ex World State citizen Linda describes that in the reservation there is nothing like birth control;

> they're so hateful, the women here. Mad, mad and cruel. And of course they don't know anything about Malthusian Drill, or bottles, or decanting, or anything of that sort. So, they're having children all the time-like dogs. It's too revolting. (Huxley 2011, 7: 161)

This is also shocking for Linda because she is living in the World State before being left in the reservation. Furthermore, the book taste of the people is also different. Linda teaches John how to read in the reservation; however, the only books she is familiar with are the ones she could bring from the World State which are scientific books;

> He began reading. The Chemical and Bacteriological Conditioning of the Embryo. Practical Instructions for Beta Embryo-Store Workers. It took him a quarter of an hour to read the title alone. He threw the book on the floor. "Beastly, beastly book" he said, and began to cry. (Huxley 2011, 8: 172)

John basically is not satisfied with these theoretical books since he is interested in art. Besides, he is the only one who can read at the reservation. He reads Shakespeare in the reservation. Linda finds it uncivilized but lets him read it; "it seemed to be full of nonsense. Uncivilized. Still, it'll be good enough for you to practice your reading on" (Huxley 2011, 8: 174).

Besides, you can observe the conventional family structure in the Savage Reservation because the babies are born in the traditional way into a family where they can have parental love. They do not have any kind of technology therefore their lives are quite simple. Women also give birth to children through natural ways. These things are highly inappropriate for the World Staters which is why they call the people living in the reservation as 'savages'. Authorities of the World State believe that the savages are the unfavourable representation of humanity; wherefore, no one can leave the reservation without the permission of the World State. Anybody born in the reservation dies there only. This is how the Word State controls the savages.

People in the reservation live in nature. They hunt and try to live in the wilderness. However, in the brave new world, they are disgusted by such kind of a lifestyle because "cleanliness is next to fordliness" (Huxley 2011, 7: 143). It is totally unnatural and dirty for them because in brave new world everything is sterile which prevents any kind of disease; therefore, when Lenina goes to the reservation she says;

> 'The dirt, to start with, the piles of rubbish, the dust, the dogs, the flies. Her face wrinkled up into a grimace of disgust. She held her handkerchief to her nose.
> 'But how can they live like this?' she broke out in a voice of indignant incredulity". (Huxley 2011, 7: 143)

Since people live in nature, nothing is provided for them. This means they have to find what they need in nature which may sometimes bring

pain. In other words, life in this place is really hard; yet, it is more earthly for people can feel the happiness, pain or passion without being brainwashed. It can be a chaotic world; however, people can feel their humane selves in this place.

When Lenina Crowne, a citizen of the World State, visits the reservation for the first time, she gets confused because it is totally different from the social order in the World State. First thing she gets surprised at is the way of going somewhere; "I hate walking. And you feel so small when you're on the ground at the bottom of a hill" (Huxley 2011, 7: 141). She is so used to living with technology that she cannot adapt to these changes. Another surprising thing for Lenina is that women are with only one man. They can never have more than one partner which Lenina is not capable of understanding. In this respect, Linda who is an ex citizen of the World State has been beaten up by other women in the reservation for having slept with their husbands.

Through the visit of Lenina and Bernard, the reader is able to distinguish the apparent difference between the World State and the Savage Reservation. Therefore, Lenina finds it difficult to get used to the environment and the savages. Lenina cannot cope with the things she witnesses in the Savage Reservation because it is a totally different place. She gets frustrated. In addition, when Lenina sees Linda in the reservation, she feels disgusted by Linda's appearance since she is "fat; having lost her youth; with bad teeth, ad a blotched complexion" (Huxley 2011, 11: 203). Until the moment Lenina sees Linda, she has not known that a person may look old, fat and ugly; that is why, she has difficulty in acknowledging this reality. That is why she uses soma in order to soothe her astonishment;

> Lenina felt herself entitled, after this day of queerness and horror, to a complete and absolute holiday. As soon as they got back to the rest-house, she swallowed six half-gramme tablets of soma, lay down on her bed, and within ten minutes had embarked for lunar eternity. It would be eighteen hours at the least before she was in time again. (Huxley 2011, 9: 187)

Soma constantly keeps you happy and gives you fake feelings; therefore, it can be suggested that;

> Opium, or rather Soma, was the people's religion. Like religion, the drug had power to console and compensate, it called up visions of another, better world, it offered hope, strengthened faith and promoted charity. (Huxley qtd in Bloom 2004, 70)

Therefore, she immediately takes soma once more in order to forget these ugly truths. Another shock for Lenina was childbirth because in the World State women do not bear any children since they are produced in bottles which suggests that no child knows her/his parents. Therefore, it is highly weird for Lenina. Moreover, Lenina gets shocked by the germs which she is not used to seeing in the World State. When Lenina sees Linda who is old and fat, she gets more surprised; therefore, she takes soma to deal with all these feelings. She cannot adapt to the different lifestyle in reservation. She finds this life terrifying. In addition, when Lenina sees an old man she gets frustrated; "'What's the matter with him?' whispered Lenina . . . 'He is old, that's all' Bernard answered" (Huxley 2011, 7: 144). This is a big deal for Lenina because nobody ages in the brave new world. Therefore, this is so absurd for her. Namely, they experience nothing natural in the World State;

> Savage Reservation is outside the World State and it is surrounded by electrical wires and walls. Since the savages live outside the borders of the brave new world, they are considered to be barbars which is based on Lotman's spatial distinction of 'self' and 'the other' due to the "as a consequence, from the position of a given culture the outer space is usually defined as nonculture". (Semenenko 2012, 58)

Through this description, Huxley draws the line between the World State and the Savage Reservation in a quite obvious way. In fact, this boundary is highly important for Lotman in order to reflect more than the actual geographical space does. In this respect, what can be inferred from the concept of boundary in literature is that;

> it is the boundary that separates a culture from nonculture or the culture of alterity. It separates the territory of one's own, good and harmonious culture from its bad, chaotic, or even dangerous anti-culture. It is a frontier between an inner and

> an outer space. (Nöth 2006, 255)

The savages are stick to their old values, traditions which are considered to be twisted by the world state citizens; "in Malpais, reservation in New Mexico, which is not civilized because of the bad climate and lack of natural resources, people still live with old values" (Zhamurahsvili 2014, 147). They live the feelings to the fullest for example, they can marry, bear a child, have a romantic sex and age. In the Savage Reservation, one can still observe family ties and structures with mothers, fathers or siblings which cannot be recognized in the World State because natural propagation is banned. Babies are produced in hatcheries. While producing, scientists manipulate their genetic codes and change their physical and mental qualities. This is to be able to satisfy the needs of the World State. What makes the World State a utopia is the fact that in reservation, "poverty, dirt, illness, wrinkles, and old age which the modern man has overcome due to civilization still exist in Malpais" (Zhamurahsvili 2014, 147). Even though the World State may seem to be the happiest and safest place on earth, important sacrifices have been made. It is an unsettling and a loveless environment;

> The whole society of the World State revolves around economy and amusement. People work the whole day in Ford-like production processes and in the evenings they go to the 'feelies', play electromagnetic golf or have recreational sex. People have superficial friendships, but love relationships, let alone family-relationships, are absent. The main activities besides labouring are consuming and having fun. People do not go through the process of ageing, but instead remain in perfect health until in their sixties they die in a special Hospital for the Dying, in a soma-induced ecstasy. Their remains are processed into useful materials like phosphor. (Schermer 2007, 120)

By taking Yuri Lotman's spatial theory for granted, it can be suggested that Huxley intends to discuss the issue of technology and totalitarian governments by illustrating two opposite topographical designs. Actually, creating two contradictory worlds, the World State and Savage Reservation, is like the "opposition of the two areas of the model is of the kind *we vs them,* expressed, according to the cultural model, by such oppositions as *cosmos vs chaos, culture vs barbarism"* (Lagopoulos and

Lagopoulou 2014, 479). Therefore, these topographical representations refer to many abstract concepts. The two worlds as binary oppositions serve for proving Huxley's claims about technology and totalitarian governments. To understand the dystopic side of the brave new world, the readers need to compare it with the Savage Reservation. To sum up, "technology's massive power to mold, condition, control, and determine the quality of life is imaginatively portrayed by Huxley" (Sion 2010, 138). Clearly, Huxley needs this binary opposition of "the civilized mechanical world and natural primitive world" (Zhamurahsvili 2014, 147). Huxley by creating these two contradictory worlds implies many semantic meanings; "one sanitized and emotionally anesthetized while the other is dirty, raw, and harsh" (147).

In this respect, unlike the brave new world which is highly technological and restricted, Savage Reservation is an absolutely free society which is closer to nature. Huxley basically tries to create the distinction between two spatial landscapes to imply that people in the World State are actually living in extreme estrangement. Since there is no political system or no institutions in the Savage Reservation, it is the direct opposite of the World State which is sterile and controlled. In a way, the novel "offers a sophisticated critique of how scientific knowledge emerges from and in turn serves the social, political, and economic agendas of those in power" (Woiak 2007, 124).

Aldous Huxley basically tries to show that if a government becomes too controlling, it may lead to loss of individuality for the people. Namely, this novel is in the form of a warning against people in terms of the use of technology. That is why, he divides the novel into two with the help of two spatial imageries so as to demonstrating the difference between what is artificial and what is natural.

5.2.2. Brave New World As A Confirmative Novel

One day, out of curiosity, Bernard Marx who works in the Conditioning Centre goes to the Savage Reservation with Lenina and visits Malpais "which means 'evil country' or 'bad place' in Spanish"

(Sisk qtd in Babaee, Yahya and Sivagurunathan 2013, 491). There, he meets with John the Savage who is the son of an ex-Beta "as a member of the elite ruling class, is guilty of procreating a child by the forbidden natural means" (Sion 2010, 129) which is something unacceptable. As a result, Bernard decides to bring John to the brave new world, to London. After that moment, everything changes. Actually, the whole novel is based on this Savage's transgression of the boundary between the World State and the Savage Reservation. The notion of boundary transgression is important for Lotman to decide on the type of a narrative; whether it has an immobile or a mobile plot. The thing that determines this issue is the character "because while he states that the boundary is impenetrable, movement across the boundary . . . is in fact one of the most typical forms of plot construction" (Schermer 2007, 125). Namely, according to Yuri Lotman, this boundary is the main element in a story. Hero's movement across this boundary is crucial for the plot to be formed.

In this respect, John can be taken as the hero who changes location and transgresses the boundaries which symbolizes the movements from primitivity towards modernization. He lives in the reservation with his mother, Linda, who has lived as a Beta in the World State. However, one day she gets pregnant; therefore, out of embarrassment, Linda is left behind in the Savage Reservation which is why John has to be born here. John belongs to a world which has old values and traditions based on natural life;

> about sixty thousand Indians and half-breeds… absolute savages… our inspectors occasionally visit… otherwise, no communication whatever with the civilized world… still preserve their repulsive habits and customs… marriage, if you know what that is, my dear young lady; families… no conditioning… monstrous superstitions… Christianity and totemism and ancestor worship… extinct languages, such as Zuñi and Spanish and Athapascan… pumas, porcupines and other ferocious animals… infectious diseases… priests… venomous lizards…(Huxley 2011, 6: 134)

Savage Reservation is depicted as a primitive, dirty and barbaric environment with savage people whose beliefs are totally different from the World State citizens. Their culture is considered to be an inferior one;

that is why, people from the brave new world do not tend to have communication with these people. Since the World State has a hedonistic and highly technological lifestyle, John can never adapt to this kind of living. All the things John witnesses make him think that people are actually not free in the World State due to being controlled in every aspect and phase of their lives.

However, at the very beginning, before going to the brave new world, John is enthusiastic about the journey due to the fact that "he is enthralled by the technological novelties of this brave new world" (Sion 2010, 129) as a result of living in a primitive environment which is deprived of any technological advances. He, in a way, admires these scientific and technological improvements until he sees the true effect of all this artificiality and becomes disillusioned.

John is aware of the fact that the people do not have true happiness in the World State. John believes in the worth of individual not the community. He strictly supports the fact that true happiness comes with freedom not with slavery. John finds it difficult to internalize the life in the World State since "with the loss of art, scientific progress, and religion comes the loss of freedom, something the Savage refuses to give up" (Reiff 2010, 75). Through the eyes of John, the readers witness the real world and remember true feelings of a human being because John is quite different than the citizens in the brave new world since he supports one's right to make mistakes, feel pain, mourn after a dead person etc. Basically, he claims the right to be unhappy.

Unlike Lenina and the others in the brave new world, "John has a soul—not in the religious sense, but in the anthropological sense. By reading Shakespeare and yearning for true love and understanding" (Sion 2010, 146). John is really genuine in his hatred of the brave new world. When he is exposed to the way people live in the World State, he starts objecting to that kind of lifestyle because he wants to experience the natural way of living and feel the pain. Therefore, he cannot understand why people take drug like soma to create a false feeling. John is an

example of an individual who is pure, untouched by the modern technology. Therefore, it can be suggested that;

> John Savage in this Brave New World reacts much like Tarzan of the Apes after he has left the familiar jungle. At first he is fascinated with this technologically prosperous society and the attention that he receives, but he soon comes to feel troubled in a world that is devoid of God, philosophy, and literature. (Sion 2010, 135)

Basically, John feels estranged because World State is a totally different place. This is because every culture is a system of "signs consciously created by man. In order to use them, one has to be acquainted with the set of rules governing them" (Thompson 1977, 227). Since John does not belong to the World State, he feels unfamiliar. He has difficulty in resolving the meanings attributed to the signs and their emotional interpretation. Therefore, in the brave new world, all the people are pleased with taking soma, going to feelies, playing erotic games and being mindless and thought free beings. Everyone seems to be soulless and reckless about living in a society which is without sorrow and life-like feelings and relationships. Therefore, throughout the novel John repeats the sentence "O brave new world that has such people in it" (Huxley 2011, 8: 188); however, every time he mentions this line from *The Tempest,* it means he gets more disillusioned; namely, "each time the meaning of it changes together with the change of John's idea about the civilized world" (Zhamurashvilli 2014, 147). What disturbs John most is the fact that World State citizens do not have emotions. In that sense, through John, Huxley implies that men without suffering are men without souls.

After seeing so many cruel things in the World State, John thinks that technology may not be as useful as it is thought. In other words, after arriving in London, John gradually understands that the civilized world is not as beautiful as it has seemed to him; "he faces the mechanized control, [loss] of creativity and intolerance to diversity and difference within the brave new world" (Zhamurashvili 2014, 147). John definitely does not want to live in the brave new world and he expresses it directly to Mond; "So you don't much like civilization, Mr. Savage," he said." /

“No.”” (Huxley 2011, 16: 290). John cannot understand why people do not read artistic works such as Shakespeare’s plays and Mond explains this as follows;

> Because our world is not the same as Othello's world. You can't make flivvers without steel-and you can't make tragedies without social instability. The world's stable now. People are happy; they get what they want, and they never want what they can't get. They're well off; they're safe; they're never ill; they're not afraid of death; they're blissfully ignorant of passion and old age; they're plagued with no mothers or fathers; they've got no wives, or children, or lovers to feel strongly about; they're so conditioned that they practically can't help behaving as they ought to behave. And if anything should go wrong, there's soma. (Huxley 2011, 16: 292- 293)

Basically, in the World State since everybody is always happy, and they do not have any family ties, they have not experienced any of the feelings Shakespeare portrays in his plays and they cannot sympathize with the characters and the things happening in the play. These works of art are totally unfamiliar for the people.

Apart from the issue of art, another thing that leads to John’s downfall is Lenina. When John sees Lenina in the reservation, he is attracted by her; “he was enchanted” (Huxley 2011, 9: 190). Therefore, he is different than the robot-like citizens of the World State. He respects love and can feel it; however, the men in the World State only care about how many girls they have slept with; “'I had six girls last week' he confided to Helmholtz Watson” (Huxley 2011, 11: 207). For John, this is extremely weird considering women as a material for showing off. This shows that love is not appreciated in the World State.

Someday, John and Lenina go to see a movie, ‘Three Weeks in a Helicopter’ which includes erotic scenes. Therefore, John gets really disturbed and says;

> “I don’t think you ought to see things like that” he said. . .
> “Things like what, John?”
> “Like this horrible film”
> “Horrible?” Lenina was genuinely astonished. “But I thought it was lovely”
> “It was base” he said indignantly, “it was ignoble” (Huxley 2011, 11: 226)

This dialogue clearly reveals the romantic side of John unlike the civilized men in the World State. John is the living example of a sensitive man who cares about his love and is afraid of offending a woman; therefore, “While Lenina's "flushed" arousal by the feely is appropriate to her conditioning, John is "pale, pained, desiring, and ashamed of his desire."” (Frost 2006, 453). John loves Lenina so much that he wants to prove it not by having an intercourse with her but by doing something for Lenina;

> “At Malpais," the Savage was incoherently mumbling, "you had to bring her the skin of a mountain lion-I mean, when you wanted to marry someone. Or else a wolf."
> . . . "I'll do anything," he went on, more and more incoherently. "Anything you tell me. There be some sports are painful-you know. But their labour delight in them sets off. That's what I feel. I mean I'd sweep the floor if you wanted.”
> “But we've got vacuum cleaners here," said Lenina in bewilderment. "It isn't necessary." (Huxley 2011, 13: 253)

John wants to marry Lenina and he wants to be useful for her due to the fact that this is the way he has been accustomed to. However, Lenina does not find that kind of behaviour reasonable since she is not used to it. Therefore, when John asks to do something for her, she in a way refuses him because she does not need anything in the World State as they are living in an age of technology. Then, John tells Lenina that he wants to marry her which is quite normal in the Savage Reservation;

> “… Listen, Lenina; in Malpais people get married."
> "Get what?" The irritation had begun to creep back into her voice. What was he talking about now?
> "For always. They make a promise to live together for always."
> "What a horrible idea!" Lenina was genuinely shocked”. (Huxley 2011, 13: 253-254)

When she hears the idea of marriage, she gets terrified of the idea of being with only one man for her whole life. The reason is the emotional conditioning towards marriage. The only romantic relationship, she can think of is having sex with a man. Therefore, she is also attracted by John but instead of marriage, she wants to be with her and she starts to undress;

> "I wanted you so much. And if you wanted me too, why didn't you? …"
> . . .
> She put her hand to her neck and gave a long vertical pull; her white sailor's blouse was ripped to the hem; suspicion condensed into a too, too solid certainty. "Lenina, what are you doing?"
> …
> "Kiss me till I'm in a coma. Hug me, honey, snuggly…" The Savage caught her by the wrists, tore her hands from his shoulders, thrust her roughly away at arm's length.
> "Ow, you're hurting me, you're… oh!" She was suddenly silent. "
> "What is it?" she almost screamed. And as though awakened by her cry he caught her by the shoulders and shook her.
> "Whore!" he shouted "Whore! Impudent strumpet!" (Huxley 2011, 13: 256- 258)

Brave new world is devoid of love; both family love and romantic love. Lenina is also attracted by John but her understanding and nature only direct her to have sex with him due to the fact that love is something Lenina has never experienced in her life before. However, John thinks having sex would dishonour Lenina which she does not care. In that sense, John symbolizes purity and humanism because he thinks Lenina more than himself. When Lenina offers sex, John treats him like a prostitute and feels ashamed. This scene is quite unusual for us because we are not used to a man who refuses a woman who wants to have sex with him. From this refusal, it can be understood that John is a perfectly romantic man who wants to feel love rather than have sexual pleasure. Therefore, John gets really irritated by Lenina's attitude as he found this totally disgraceful due to the fact that unlike the men in the World State, John does not consider women as a piece of flesh; in other words, "he rejects her because she fails to understand that he does not want to regard her as merely a sex partner but as a love partner" (Sion 2010, 153). Basically, John has strong emotions toward Lenina; that is why, he cannot stand her inconvenient behaviour while this is totally normal for Lenina.

All the laws in the World State serve for the good of the community not the individual. The reason for satisfying personal needs is to be able to create collective conscious. The society is shaped by the

understanding, “everybody is for everybody”. All sexual tension of the people is fulfilled thanks to orgy parties and free sex while unobtainable needs are satisfied with soma. John cannot understand this way of life which is so selfish and artificial for him.

John gets more disappointed with the life in the brave new world when he witnesses the citizens’ superficial understanding of art while reading a passage from *Romeo and Juliet* to the children since “they laugh at the preposterous idea that these two young lovers would take their lives rather than exist without each other” (Sion 2010, 153). John gets terrified with the fact that citizen does not have any imagination.

Moreover, when John’s mother, Linda is in hospital waiting to die and John is beside her mourning, a group of kids come for death conditioning. They get surprised at the appearance of Linda as they have never seen a human being like her before;

> “A group stood clustered at the foot of her bed, staring with the frightened and stupid curiosity of animals suddenly confronted by the unknown.
> "Oh, look, look!" They spoke in low, scared voices. "Whatever is the matter with her? Why is she so fat?”
> …
> “They had never seen a face like hers before-had never seen a face that was not youthful and taut-skinned, a body that had ceased to be slim and upright. All these moribund sexagenarians had the appearance of childish girls. At forty-four, Linda seemed, by contrast, a monster of flaccid and distorted senility.” (Huxley 2011, 13: 268)

Life is so artificial in the World State that nobody can imagine that a human being may not be as perfect as themselves who are genetically manipulated. John gets really furious about the attitude of the senseless children which is an example for “how can the progress made in manufacturing, technology make the man subordinated and dehumanized” (Zhamurashvili 2014, 140) even as a child. Then, his mother dies due to overdose of soma. In the civilized world, nobody feels sorry for the dead and there is no idea of mourning, being sad or crying. However, as the symbol of natural human beings not the artificial ones, John “displays the typical reaction of a savage by staging a violent scene at the hospital” (Sion 2010 129). He cannot control his feelings due to

sorrow and blames the World State for his mother's death. Therefore, John wants to awaken every single person in the World State by trying to deter them from taking the medicine soma. Basically, he does not want people to numb themselves against humanly values and feelings;

> "Listen, I beg of you," cried the Savage earnestly. "Lend me your ears…" He had never spoken in public before, and found it very difficult to express what he wanted to say. "Don't take that horrible stuff. It's poison, it's poison. (Huxley 2011, 15: 280-281)

As a result of this anger at the hospital, John opens a window and throws soma out of the window. The reason why John is in conflict with the World State is that he believes in the human values. John sees the hyper advanced World State as chaotic and terrifying. He wants to feel the suffering; therefore, it can be suggested that "in essence, John is claiming the right to see reality and deal with it, rather than living in a world of illusion" (Sion 2010, 146). What John desires a world with conscious individuals and sensible relationships as opposed to this unnatural way of living.

In consequence of witnessing so many things, and attempting to break the order in the society after the death of his mother, "the feelies and the shallow, promiscuous culture they represent drive the Savage to retreat to the countryside, where he mortifies his body" (Frost 2006, 453). In other words, John exiles himself to a place in nature, to a lighthouse to get away from this degenerated society, people and life which is absolutely against his pure nature.

In the lighthouse, his only desire is to cleanse himself from civilization and his sexual desire for Lenina; therefore, "He spent hours on his knees praying . . . 'Oh, forgive me! Oh, make me pure! Oh, help me to be good!" (Huxley 2011, 8: 326). He basically tries to purify himself from the dirt called 'civilization'. Therefore, John performs some rituals such as flogging himself according to his own beliefs. In a short time, John gets the attention of the press and media. They want to make an interview with him; however, he sends them away violently for he wants to be all alone. This incident is published in the news. More

reporters and people come to watch him as if John were a caged animal and they were visiting a zoo. Besides, reporters turn his self-denial video into a popular movie called *The Savage of Surrey* based on his attempts to purify his soul. Unfortunately, John "is regarded as a newsworthy curiosity by the public media" (Sion 2010, 129); thus, everybody gets excited. In a way, John's life has become a reality show.

Together with the corruption of the technological and scientific developments and political system, John also feels guilty for his sexual desire for Lenina. Whenever he thinks of Lenina, he whips himself. Therefore, this scene is released as feely. In this respect, when Lenina comes to the place John is staying he feels disgusted by himself for desiring Lenina in a sexual way; as a result, he not only whips himself but also Lenina. The crowd watches John with admiration and they want to take part in this event also. Suddenly, this ritual turns out to be an orgy performance. "In a state of despair, he consumes the drug *soma"* (Sion 2010, 129) and falls asleep after a while. When he wakes up, John remembers everything with fear which may suggest that he has had sex with Lenina during the orgy. He feels an intense shame and guilt because of the orgy. Until that moment, John has defended love and emotional sex; however, it can be deduced that he could not prevent himself from being with Lenina. Therefore, he cannot take this and commits suicide. He cannot admit the fact that he has behaved just like the mindless and soulless citizens of the brave new world. That is why, John cannot forgive himself for not being able to resist; therefore, he "cannot escape notoriety and he ultimately chooses death" (135). John's suicide may have been designed by Huxley "to reinforce a theme that the scientifically organized society leads to a loss of human freedom" (Carbonell 50).

The failure of John the Savage shows us that even though one society calls itself as a perfect and flawless community, there can be many invisible or internal problems. It is clarified that this oppressive;

> order came about because mankind yearned for total happiness [which] had to be paid for, however, at the cost of the outworn ideals of truth, beauty, religion, freedom, and

> individuality. (Sion 2010, 129)

Aldous Huxley creates the character John the Savage in order to show that no matter how appalling technological developments may seem, they destroy far more things than one can imagine;

> John is a single character of the novel who understands the reality of the new world. Only he can see how the illusion created by the World Controllers differs from reality. Impossibility of real happiness in illusive world where everybody believes in false happiness, leads him to suicide. John cannot accept the world without Shakespeare, God, emotions, and high art. He cannot hope for any prospective for spiritual development in a new dehumanized world and he takes his own life. (Zhamurashvili 2014, 153)

Basically, John can be characterized as the only character who can see the reality; hence brutality in the World State. He is the one who believes in human values. John sees the World State as chaotic and terrifying. However, no matter how far he has gone from the World State, he cannot escape from committing the sins he has witnessed in the brave new world. It can be suggested that in essence, John is claiming the right to see reality and deal with it, living in a world not artificially made.

As Yuri Lotman suggests, in order to construct abstract ideas, authors create spatial representations. In that sense, Aldous Huxley's novel *Brave New World* can be analysed in a structuralist way perfectly due to the clear distinction between the civilized world; the World State and the barbaric community; the Savage Reservation. Accordingly, in this novel these two spatial forms in fact portray many non-spatial concepts as discussed in the previous section. In addition to the notion of boundary in the novel, the character John the Savage can also be analysed as a mobile; yet confirmative character depending on Yuri Lotman's thoughts on the plot and the character.

Huxley shows how the technology and artificial happiness can destroy one via the depiction of John. He is aware of the fact that the people do not have true happiness in the Word State. Hence, his admiration at first becomes a disillusionment leading to his death as he commits suicide which is "an individual suicide as a response to an overregulated society" (Tripp qtd. in Virchow and Boller2015, 42). In a way, John is a mobile;

yet confirmative character with Lotman's terms since he transgresses the boundary between the World State and the Savage Reservation; however, he cannot stand living with the standards of the brave new world and cannot endure the life deprived of emotions.

5.3. *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit*

Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit is Jeanette Winterson's first novel written in the second half of the twentieth century, in 1985 when she was only twenty-six. This novel has a remarkable place in literature thanks to the references to fairy tales, fables and well-known literary works with the story. Winterson's allusions are all related to the life of the protagonist which is built through a humoristic and witty language. Besides, being a semi-autobiographical narration, *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* tells a lot about the difficulties Jeanette Winterson has had which reinforces the importance of the novel. While reading, the story based on the relationship between a religious mother and her adoptive, young, lesbian daughter may seem so unexceptional. However, it points out many universal themes such as gender, homosexuality, religion, and family issues which make the novel much more intriguing than its contemporaries.

5.3.1. Gender Roles And The Perception Of Homosexuality

The whole world is concerned with one main binary opposition, which is between man and woman. In order to clarify this distinction, one has to come to terms with the differentiation of *gender* and *sex*. Even though many people use these two terms as an alternative for each other, *gender* and *sex* are defined differently. While *sex* refers to the biological condition of a person, *gender* describes the cultural and social roles of that person. In other words, *sex* is used to define whether an individual is male or female based on physical and anatomical differences while *gender* signifies the social and cultural norms and roles for the individuals of each sex which transforms male into man and female into woman. To put it another way, *sex* is a biological term, "*gender*, on the

other hand, refers to the meanings, values, and characteristics that people ascribe to different sexes" (Blackstone 2003, 335). It is apparent that "'sex' in the physiological sense, is distinguished from 'gender', which is seen as cultural and learned" (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 2005, 35). The traits based on the differences in emotions, attitudes, roles and behaviour do not come naturally, inasmuch as these characteristics are started to be imposed upon people the moment they are born "because of the overwhelming need of society to prepare the next generation for the social order, males and females are groomed to fit different adult roles" (Harris 2005, 9). In this respect, "family, school, sports, friends, church, clubs, scouts, jobs, and the media" (Kaufman 1987, 7) are some agents that society uses so as to achieve its purpose forming a stable community.

Basically, there are many distinctions between women and men. Most obvious ones are biological, physical and anatomical differences. However, there is also the cultural aspect; since, in order for individuals to form their social existence, "each man constructs his own identity in relation to specific gender notions deeply embedded in his culture" (Harris 2005, 9). In other words, they need to be raised by different expectations, values, responsibilities and roles based on their sex. In that sense, the division between the roles of women and men results in the development of some stereotypes for both genders creating the concepts of *femininity* and *masculinity*.

The terms, *masculinity and femininity*, are fragile concepts because they do not exist in the biological sense but they appear as ideologically. While *femininity* refers to the socially constructed roles for women, *masculinity* refers to the common codes for what it means to be a man. Wherefore, if a person is healthy or not is determined by their sense of belonging to *femininity* or *masculinity* in terms of attitudes and behaviours. As a result, it can be inferred that these gender codes are highly important for a society due to the fact that;

> these stereotypes provide collective, organised and dichotomous meanings of gender and often become widely shared beliefs about who women and men innately are. (Pleck qtd in Courtenay 2000, 1387)

Namely, gender roles actually reflect the expectations of a society from men and women. No individual can avoid paying attention to these roles since they are exposed to these expected behaviours in every aspect of their lives; at home, work or school, on the bus or street; basically, in every situation where there is social interaction. In this way, they are motivated to "conform to stereotypic beliefs and behaviours, and commonly do conform to and adapt dominant norms of femininity and masculinity" (Eagly, Deaux and Bohan qtd in Courtenay 2000, 1387). Based on the common codes for both genders, men are characterized with leadership, dominance, freedom, aggressiveness, protection and competitiveness while women are symbolized as fragile, sensitive, understanding, obedient, and nurturing creatures.

The truth is that, the division of gender roles dates back to ancient civilizations. Due to the fact that women and men are biologically different from each other, division of labour was handled in a way which was suitable for each gender in ancient societies. As required by her anatomy, a woman gets pregnant; hence, her ability to move gets restricted. This biological fact led men to go out and become hunters and protectors to take care of their families in ancient period. In this respect, women became the ones who ran the house and raised the children which is why men had to struggle to provide food and shelter for their families and bear all the difficulties for their wives and children. This condition triggered the way of living in which women's only roles were giving birth to children, keeping the house clean, cooking food, fulfilling their man's desires and doing whatever the man tells without questioning. This reflects a typical patriarchal society "in which fathers rule, where women have subordinate roles" (Harris 2005, 17). As a result of this, gender roles were shaped in the way in which men were always active whereas women were in a passive situation.

Today, the process of shaping one's gender identity begins at birth. "Gender-role socialization" (Harris 2005, 41) is given great importance for the well-being of a society. Therefore, gender roles which "are based on the different expectations that individuals, groups, and societies have

of individuals based on their sex" (Blackstone 2003, 335) are started to be imposed upon people at the moment they are born and their construction continues as long as one is alive. Parents "handle girl and boy babies differently" (Harris 2005, 41). For instance, in terms of the colour of clothes and rooms, generally parents try to use blue for boys and pink for girls. Moreover, girls are allowed to play with dolls, plush toys or dollhouses while boys are expected to play with cars, toy guns, swords or robots. In this respect, it can be claimed that individuals are not born with the cultural and social norms belonging to their sex since they are entirely socially constructed. From their styles of clothing to their behaviour, everything is under control; thus,

> parental approval for behaviour that conforms to gender norms and disapproval for inappropriate behaviour sculpts schemata within a child's gender identity. (Harris 2005, 41)

Namely, it can be asserted that "from infancy, boys and girls receive different cues from adults in their environments" (Harris 2005, 41). Furthermore, girls grow up by taking their mothers as role models while boys imitate their fathers "because father's constant presence provides a dominant image of masculinity" (24). Therefore, "males express feelings in ways similar to their fathers" (12) while girls witness their mothers' tasks and responsibilities at home.

In consequence of having a father and a mother who has internalized the gender roles constructed within a patriarchal society as a role model, when the children become teenagers, boys have more freedom compared to girls. While boys can form their self-confidence by giving their own decisions, by doing whatever they want without asking for permission, and by standing on their own feet just because they are male, girls stay at home and learn how to cook, clean the house, do housework. This is a clear image of a patriarchy which is;

> the power of fathers: a familial-social, ideological, political system in which men- by force, direct pressure, or through ritual, tradition, law and language, customs, etiquette, education, and the division of labor-determined what part women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed by the male. (Harris 2005, 17)

This is based on the fact that in time "young boys become men by responding to situational demands and social pressures" (Harris 2005, 9). They start to function as the breadwinner of the family who is responsible for the economic needs and protection of the house. Since the man is the head of the family, he controls everything related to the house and his family. While the men try to provide for their family, the mothers and the girls should be dignified, do their best to create peace and order at home. Compared to a woman, a man's responsibility is greater because he is the one who is expected to take care of all the family members; therefore, "a man is judged by how much money he makes and the status of his job" (12). These features all symbolize the classical understanding of gender roles. For instance, a mother who neglects her child, a father who is not performing his responsibilities towards his family, a girl who is coming home late at night, a boy who is wearing pink clothes or behaving feminine are condemned for not following the culturally and socially accepted roles based on their gender which proves the fact that "violating roles leads to social condemnation and negative psychological consequences" (Harris 2005, 16). In other words, gender roles bring different responsibilities to the individuals. When the individuals do not perform the socially constructed roles, they either become isolated or punished. To put it another way, if an individual acts outside these gender norms, they are subjected to discrimination, isolation, oppression and sometimes violence.

Gender norms in a society make people adopt how they are supposed to feel, behave and think based on their sex which can be explained as follows; "gender identity is formed in relation to his culture that contains patterned ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting that form the basis for [one's] world views" (Harris 2005, 16). These norms even decide on the appropriate professions for women and men. Men are associated with jobs which require strength and power because;

> men are economically dependent on the sale of their labour, the expression of maleness provides a means to exert power; power is associated with maleness, its absence with feminization. (Cohen qtd in Cornwall and Lindisfarne 2005, 171)

On the other hand, women are preferred in domestic tasks and nurturing business such as health care, child care, teaching etc. Basically, all the cultural, political, economic, and social beliefs force individuals to function as a proper woman or man. This reveals the fact that individuals who are born as a male or female unconsciously start to apply the roles that are imposed by the society. If they cannot, they have to take the consequences. In this respect, one of the ills for gender roles is being labelled as homosexual within a society which "makes conformism a virtue and inconformism a vice, a sickness, a kind of madness" (Sigrid qtd in Hadaeg and Pilehvar 2016, 147).

In the late 1950s, homosexuality was considered to be a mental illness; hence, homosexuals were treated as dangerous and violent beings by many people. If someone was diagnosed with the disease of homosexuality, they would be put in asylums or hospitals where they went through some procedures and therapies. The purpose was to make these individuals feel disgusted with this disorder. To put it another way, the purpose of these therapies and treatments was to convince the patient that same sex attraction was abnormal and bad. Moreover, making love with a person from your own sex was declared to be illegal. If one was caught committing the crime, they could be sent to jail. In this respect, if a person was labelled as gay or lesbian, they might lose all their legal rights, their family, their friends, and their job. In short, in the past homosexuality was one of the worst things that could happen to an individual since when a person was labelled as gay or lesbian, they would lose not only their opportunities in life but also their honour and dignity. Therefore, the only sexual choice accepted by the patriarchal society was heterosexuality. It is obvious that society even decides which sex you can be attracted to.

Society has certain codes for women and men to how to behave and act. In this respect, for ages, masculinity has been associated with strength, dominance, aggressiveness while femininity refers to passivity, nurturing, and subordination. Since people follow the same norms for centuries, they become repeated actions for each sex which leads for

people to think that these codes come naturally. Basically, there are certain traditional gender roles for men and women. However, people who are characterized as gay, lesbian, homosexual, bisexual, or queer are considered to be the individuals breaking these conventional gender norms. That is to say, according to the traditional gender norms, heterosexuality is regarded as the normal way of being attracted to someone, which means you cannot have sexual interest for someone from your sex.

5.3.2. Autobiographical Aspect Of The Novel

Jeanette Winterson, who is one of the prominent post-modernist writers, was born in 1959 in Manchester; yet, she was adopted when she was a baby and raised in Lancashire. This was an industrial and a working class mill-town located in the north of England. Winterson's adoptive father, John, was a worker in a television factory while her adoptive mother, Constance, was a devoted evangelist Christian. Constance married John not because she loved him but because fulfilling her duty of being a married woman. As an evangelist, she strongly believed that fornication was a sin; therefore, Constance and John never had children except from their adopted child Jeanette Winterson. Her mother's only occupation was to teach Jeanette the religion and train her according to the doctrines of Pentecostal Christianity. As a result of being brought up in a strict evangelist family, she had an intense teaching of the holly book, Bible. Therefore, at the age of twelve Winterson started writing sermons and preaching in the streets. At home, Winterson was not allowed to read anything which was not religious. As one can imagine, "Winterson's mother hides non-biblical books from her, but they both leave certain books for their daughters" (Chen 2014, 37). Nevertheless, apart from the religious books, she had the tendency to read literary works. As it was expected, when her mother found these books, she burnt them all. This clearly shows that her adoptive mother never cared for Winterson from her heart. She used Winterson for her religious ambitions. It can be inferred that Winterson has lacked the

parental love for all her life. As a result of having being raised in a dysfunctional family and seeing her mother behaving hypocritically, Winterson moved away from religion more.

At the age of sixteen, Jeanette Winterson fell in love with a girl. This relationship was a little bit ironic because the girl whom she was attracted to is the one, whom Winterson convinced to attend the Church. After her affection with the girl was discovered, she was "excommunicated from her Church" (Chin-Yi 2015, 311) which made Winterson leave home. In a way, Winterson started to see and feel the things that her mother and the Church had concealed for so long; "religion is thus seen to be so suffocating for Jeannette Winterson that she would rather choose the demonic than to be esteemed highly by her church by going on to be a missionary" (310-311). Being alienated and alone, Winterson had to work in many different jobs in order to survive. She drove an ice-cream van, worked in a funeral parlour and an asylum. When she was outside world, Jeanette felt highly inadequate because she realized that she knew nothing but preaching. However, she never gave up since Winterson was "willing to pay for authenticity and being true to herself" (Chin-Yi 2015, 311).

Winterson is a quite frank writer and "she disregards censorship both in her life and in her work, be it fictional or not" (Preda 2013, 857). She has given some clues about why she is interested in women in her essay 'The Semiotics of Sex'; "it is helpful for a woman artist not to have a husband" (Winterson 1995, 105). What Winterson suggests is that if you are an artist, a mother and a wife at the same time, it becomes hard for you to contemplate on your art because your husband and children need you as well which would become a distraction. You cannot ignore them and focus on your work. In that sense, with this novel, Winterson "displays her negative notions regarding the gender biased perceptions" (Önal 2007, 1) based on the expectations from women in a patriarchal society. Accordingly, when she fell in love with a girl when she was a teenager, Winterson's mother asks her why she felt that way, Winterson answered that she was happy with that girl. Thereupon, her mother asked

'Why be happy when you could be normal?'. Even this simple question makes the dramatic difference between Winterson and her mother as "This question reveals her mother's opinion on pursuing true self and desires: pretending to be normal is much more crucial than being happy with your true self but being seen as different" (Chen 2014, 36). Apparently, Winterson has had no interest in being the 'normal' one characterized by the norms of the society;

> Winterson is rebellious; she attempts to break all interdictions, refuses to conform to society's norms regarding the ban placed on certain topics, and embarks on the challenging endeavour of investigating taboo issues pertaining to gender and sexuality. (Preda 2013, 857)

Even though, not so fanatically, today there are still homophobic people looking at gays or lesbians as freaks. Hence, there is the tendency to keep homosexuals out of society, to isolate them and to label them as abnormal as they do not fit in the socially constructed gender norms. This leads homosexual people to hide their sexual preferences. Nevertheless, Jeanette Winterson strongly believes in the idea that these conventional gender codes and roles are useless for individuals based on the fact that these stereotypes prevent people from fully discover their potentials. The traditional roles are nothing but limitations for both men and women which oppress them as she suggests;

> What we do need is to accept in ourselves, with pleasure, the subtle and various emotions that are the infinity of a human being. More, not less, is the capacity of the heart. More not less is the capacity of art" (Winterson 1995, 108)

Winterson suggests that people should be encouraged to follow their own desires and truths so that they can be useful for not only themselves but also for the society. Shortly, what Winterson cannot help herself criticizing "the patriarchal notions, which stem from the belief in the superiority of the male and which consequently, assign insignificant and passive roles to the female in the social structure" (Önal 2007, 18). Winterson openly defies the values of patriarchal values and characterizing men as the powerful and superior beings; basically, she is opposed to;

> the absolute power that men command over women when they do not seem to do anything to deserve that respect, instead exploiting women as slaves and sex objects in the household to be mistreated and abused. (Chin-Yi 2015, 310)

Winterson believes that men do nothing to deserve the devotion and submission of women. Therefore, she thinks it is normal for women to seek love in someone from her own sex;

> What Winterson thus objects to in the Christian suppression of lesbian love is thus the arbitrariness with which same sex attraction is made a sin when the legitimate kind of love, heterosexual love, seems to put women at a losing end it is ultimately women who suffer whichever choice they make, only that homosexual love is viewed as a grave sin subject to being demonized and rejected by most of the Christian congregation, especially the church elders and the clergy, who view it as a visitation of demonic spirits and thereafter the need for exorcism or excommunication, when all Winterson can find is a more authentic kind of love than the love held between a male and female. (Chin-Yi 2015, 310)

As Chin-Yi states, Winterson is highly emotional and sensitive about the issue of love. She firmly believes in the fact that men are not suitable for the love of women because of being insensitive and vulgar towards them. In a way, Winterson does not trust the love between a woman and a man. On the contrary, Jeanette Winterson has strong faith in the love between two women which is more genuine for her. Therefore, contrary to the common belief of the Church and many people, for Winterson homosexuality is neither an illness nor a sin. In a way, by falling in love with a girl and becoming a lesbian feminist writer, Winterson "chooses to reject servility to the male race" (Chin-Yi 2015, 311) which seems ridiculous for her.

Although the novella was published in 1985, the story in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* covers the period between 1950s and 1970s when England was facing many transformations. England had to disclaim its imperial rights on many of her colonies which caused a change in the social structure. Moreover, towards the end of 1960s, sexual revolutions took place "together with the civil rights and the gay and lesbian movements" (Mendez 2010, 10). All these incidents, reactions of the

people led to social and psychological changes in the society. As a result, these issues form the basis of Winterson's novel.

The novel begins with the introduction of a young girl called Jeanette who is adopted by an evangelist couple. Just like the author, the protagonist Jeanette turns into a lesbian and is rejected by her family and the Church. The main aim of the novel is to reflect "Jeanette's evolution from an obedient religious follower to a critical defiant who tries to make sense of the world and people" (Çeker 2016, 56). In this respect, *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* can be categorized as a Bildungsroman which focuses on the character's journey from childhood to adulthood. It is the story of individual growth which is about maturity. The pattern of Bildungsroman is that something happens to the character in an early stage of their life which constitutes the beginning of their journey. In this journey, we see the conflict between the expectations of the society and of the character. The individual generally clashes with the society's norms and codes; thus, they have to change and reshape their expectations to fit in that community and to be considered as an individual. This is the classical understanding of Bildungsroman which is defined as "story of formation" (Antosa 2008, 29). However, Jeanette Winterson as a post-modernist writer, never accepts the classical attitudes. Therefore, in this novella, one can see an unusual ending as opposed to the conventional Bildungsroman as "she aims at defamiliarising the familiar, uses exasperating narrative patterns and avoids closure" (Preda 2013, 858). In addition to this, Jeanette Winterson also criticizes the hypocritical "Christian fundamentalism" (Ticha 2008, 19) in a quite humoristic tone with highly clever parodies, allusions and metaphors.

In short, by depicting the growth of a young lesbian girl who has been raised in a religious couple, Winterson comments on conventional understanding of femininity.

5.3.3. Spatial Analysis

On the surface, *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* may seem an ordinary story of a young girl adopted by a working-class Pentecostal couple living in the north of England. However, the story holds much deeper symbols and meanings regarding the issues of religion, love, marriage, sex and gender. By giving life to totally ordinary characters, Winterson breaks all the conventions and deconstructs the traditional values in terms of these topics.

Young Jeanette is the daughter of a militant mother who is a strict fundamentalist evangelist Christian who "chooses a more active lifestyle with her conversion to the church as opposed to her lifestyle as a housewife" (Önal 2007, 24). Pentecostal Church is an extremely dogmatic and fanatical community which has strict regulations. Jeanette is raised by her parents to be a missionary. For sixteen years, her mother shapes Jeanette's life and does not let her pursue anything other than what she tells and dictates based on the church's doctrines. All Jeanette knows about life is shaped by the writings in the Bible. She knows nothing outside of it. Therefore, it can be suggested that in this novel religion creates a cultural space for the people which they can never move beyond. In a way, religion organizes the invisible boundaries and borders in their lives. This suggests that the concept of "boundary is also marked within the human psyche" (Zylko 2001, 394). In that sense, the semiosphere in this society is shaped by religion to which every individual has to adapt.

Together with Jeanette's mother, all female characters are extremely active figures in the Church who work for the Pentecostal Church all the time. The reason why Jeanette Winterson draws such dynamic women is that;

> In evangelical society, women have an important and influential place. They are regarded as domestic leaders although neglected and underrated outside this sphere. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, women in this society took a feminist standpoint by claiming themselves a place in religious activities outside the house and created some religious organisations run by women. Thanks to their struggle for including themselves in such social activities,

> women are regarded as 'reformers'. (Çeker 2016, 57)

In that sense, it can be suggested that the traditional perception of gender roles for man and woman is reversed in the novel because at home the father figure is really passive. The first issue Winterson deals with is the traditionally accepted gender roles which is why "the patriarchal household is deconstructed into a matriarchal one where the father has no decision-making power and he is not a "father" at all but "her husband" since he is deprived of his mighty status" (Önal 2007, 22). This is a quite non-traditional approach of gender roles;

> In the traditional binary organization, certain gender stereotypes have been produced and coded within the society. From the very beginning of their lives onwards, human beings are exposed to a definite social dualistic framework dictating what each sex is permitted to do and not to do, or what gender roles each sex should internalize. That is, in the conformist matrix, women and men are made to perform certain gender roles in the society, which produces the practical extension of those restrictive gender expressions. (Yakut 2011, 64-65)

Unlike the conventional norms, "in the novel, the supreme power is embodied by Jeanette's mother, not her father" (Chen 2014, 22). He even gives the feeling to the reader as if he did not even exist. Even though a male character must always be powerful, active and superior, quite an opposite father figure who is passive, silent, and ineffective is portrayed here.

Another aspect Winterson touches upon in order to form her plot is religion. As Vernadsky suggests; culture "creates a social sphere around man which, like the biosphere, makes life possible; that is, not organic life, but social life" (qtd in Nöth 2015, 16). In this novel, this social space is formed through religion which creates a cultural space for the believers. Therefore, Yuri Lotman's third and final spatial dimension can be seen in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* which is the *semantical* dimension. The existing spatial representation in the novel is created through religion; therefore, "the space of the semiosphere carries an abstract character" (Lotman qtd in Semenenko 2012, 114). In other

words, the space depicted in this novel is an invisible space with invisible boundaries.

Since religion is at the centre of the course of events, Jeanette Winterson divides the book into chapters whose titles are from the Bible; in other words, "she frames her narrative with the Biblical chapters" (Önal 2007, 42), from *Genesis* to *Ruth*. Winterson does this in order to reinforce the religious atmosphere. More wisely, "each chapter deals with one aspect of the Biblical book it refers to" (3) which Winterson uses in order to describe the events happening in different phases of Jeanette's life from the age of seven to sixteen. In other words, each chapter has a significance because the stories in the Bible coincides with the events in Jeanette's life. This proves the fact that Jeanette Winterson is not only a smart but also a skilful writer. However, Winterson does not use the stories as they are; she changes some incidents and fictionalizes the fairy tales, biblical stories and rewrites them. Therefore, it can be suggested that fact and fiction is interwoven in her novel. She draws parallelism between the Biblical stories and Jeanette's experiences.

The first chapter *Genesis* "in the Old Testament includes the accounts of God's creation of the world" (Önal 2007, 19); therefore, in the novel, Jeanette's adoption and her strict Christian parents are depicted. Jeanette describes her evangelist mother as follows; "she had never heard of mixed feelings. There were friends and there were enemies" (Winterson 2014, Genesis: 5). Right from the beginning, the author draws the boundaries which create certain spatial borders for the mother. Basically, the mother has the belief that someone or something can be either good or bad; there can never be a characterization in between. Here, Lotman's semantical analysis of spatial representation can be observed; the mother creates a cultural space based on religion. Therefore, the mother's *semiosphere* depends on religious practices. She can only live within the boundaries of Christianity; hence, anything or anyone outside these certain borders is regarded as enemy for the mother. In a way, the mother does not accept any kind of feeling which would lead one to unnatural

deeds. She goes further and lists the good ones and the bad ones as follows;

> Enemies were: The Devil (in his many forms)
> Next Door
> Sex (in its many forms)
> Slugs
> Friends were: God
> Our dog
> Auntie Madge
> The Novels of Charlotte Bronté
> Slug pellets (Winterson 2014, Genesis: 5)

Namely, Jeanette's mother sees the world as black and white; there are no accent colours or shades for her which fits the notion of binary oppositions. This suggests that "the mother lives with some dogmatic binaries" (Önal 2007, 19). Basically, she accepts everything the Church tells without questioning and rejects everything that is against the sacred codes. In other words; Jeanette's mother blindly follows the norms of the church and performs her religious duties. For instance; "Sunday was the Lord's day, the most vigorous day of the week" (Winterson 2014, Genesis: 6) for the mother; hence on Sundays she starts the day with pray; "My mother got up early on Sundays and allowed no one into the parlour until ten o'clock. It was her place of prayer and meditation" (Winterson 2014, Genesis: 6). This is not the only implication of religion's influence on the people in the novel. The faithful characters in the novel;

> occasionally impl[y] that they are intolerant towards alcohol and that they can only tolerate heterosexual sex which take place after marriage. Desire and passion are regarded to be sins by Jeanette's mother and her friends. Education is initially received at a very early age at home through religious doctrines. (Çeker 2016, 57)

As it can be understood, people in this town constitute a space for themselves formed through the religious regulations. Jeanette's mother is such a devoted Christian that she even bears the idea that having sex is a great sin;

> She had a mysterious attitude towards the begetting of children; it wasn't that she couldn't do it, more that she didn't want to do it. She was very bitter about the Virgin Mary getting there first. (Winterson 2014, Genesis: 6)

It is really funny that “the mother envies the Virgin Mary” (Önal 2007, 20) in terms of having a child without the sexual intercourse with a man. Therefore, in order to be at the same level with Virgin Mary, the mother adopts a child, Jeanette. Even their life at home totally depends on the religious activities of Jeanette’s mother. Normally children play outside with their friends, or play with toys; however, in this novel, children have to attend the church and play Bible quizzes in order to prove that they are learning well. This society forms a space whose walls are made by religion. In that sense, her mother has such an important influence on Jeanette that she grows to be a girl who knows everything in the Bible and gives impressive sermons. This is all because of the way her mother has raised Jeanette; in other words, “Jeanette lives inside the body of the family/church which strictly regulates the life of its members’ bodies” (Antosa 2008, 38). Therefore, Jeanette is loved by the community until the moment it is revealed that she is interested in women. Basically, Jeanette’s maturity from childhood to adulthood, which is formed according to the doctrines of the church, is interrupted with her affection for women. In brief, it can be claimed that;

> the novel presents a microcosm of evangelical society through Jeanette’s mother and some of her friends. It reflects their way of thinking, their daily lives, their taste in music, their literary preferences, and the way how their religion shapes their life styles and their relationships with other people. (Çeker 2016, 57)

The religion depicted here is so oppressive that it “determines the boundaries of everything: people’s behaviours, preferences, public or private relationships" (Çeker 2016, 58). Everything in this society is defined by binary oppositions. This means, people are categorized as divine and heretic based on their practice of the norms of the Church; you have to either follow the rules of the Church or be ready to be condemned.

Jeanette’s mother has had no plans for sending Jeanette to school since she considers schools as “Breeding Grounds” (Winterson 2014, Genesis: 22). She thinks schools mislead students and move them away

from religion. That is why, she never gives up keeping Jeanette away from any astray activities, deeds or people. For instance; Jeanette sometimes drop by a shop owned by a lesbian couple; which is why her mother does not allow Jeanette go to that paper shop owned by a homosexual couple whom Jeanette has become friends with. The mother does not want these women to mislead Jeanette in terms of sexuality and she explains to Jeanette that those women "dealt in unnatural passions" (Winterson 2014, Genesis: 10). In her own world, for Jeanette's mother one of the enemies is homosexuals due to the fact that religion only allows heterosexuality. Hence, she always tries to prevent Jeanette from being influenced by wrong people. No wonder, Jeanette does not understand that her mother is referring to homosexuality because she has never known or visualized that word in her life before. That is why, she thinks that her mother is talking about the fact that these women put chemicals in the sweets. Based on this naïve way of thinking, it can be claimed that Jeanette represents the uncorrupted perception of a child against the ways of adults. Basically, the mother tries to keep Jeanette within the borders of religion and her sexuality. To put it another way, religion constitutes a cultural space for survival for Jeanette's mother enabling her to feel herself connected to somewhere. Thus, she rigorously endeavours to keep Jeanette within the borders of this space as well.

Besides, oranges are important symbol in the novel because throughout the novel, Jeanette's mother constantly gives oranges to Jeanette whenever she feels low, sick, angry or sad; "`Here you are,' said my mother, giving me a sharp dig in the side. `Some fruit. You're rambling in your sleep again.' It was a bowl of oranges." (Winterson 2014, Joshua: 144). Here, orange carries an important role. The repeated offer of oranges shows how Jeanette's mother views the world; from only one point of view which is based on religion. By sending only oranges to Jeanette, her mother obviously tries to limit her perception and desires as well. Actually, oranges symbolize normality and heterosexuality in this context in terms of gender. Moreover, from Jeanette's mother's

perception “orange indicates the only possible, right and holy world. Her mother teaches her that the other kinds of fruit are not holy. She compares the other fruits to unnatural passion that she finds filthy” (Ticha 2008, 23). At some point, Jeanette asks herself why she cannot have another fruit; “What about grapes or bananas?” (Winterson 2014, Joshua: 144). This shows that Jeanette in a way tries to object to the boundaries forced upon her via her mother. She does not want to limit her desires and preferences as opposed to the socially accepted norms. She desperately wishes to transgress this boundary. In that sense, through the orange metaphor, her mother simply tries to make it clear for Jeanette that heterosexuality is the only true choice of living.

In addition, in this scene, Jeanette has difficulty in reaching the orange’s pulp; “I took out the largest and tried to peel it. The skin hung stubborn, and soon I lay panting, angry and defeated” (Winterson 2014, Joshua: 144). Her having difficulty in reaching the core foreshadows the difficulties she will have later on based on her sexual preference due to her mother’s endless restrictions and assertions;

> as the hard exterior of the orange prevents easy access to the fruit itself, her environment makes it difficult for Jeanette to come to terms with her inner self and to establish her lesbian identity. (Önal 2007, 38)

That is why, she finds it much easier to eat grapes or bananas. Nevertheless, her mother still insists on her to try eating oranges. This is a brilliant metaphor for the boundaries and limitations within which Jeanette has to live but finds it difficult to adapt. Her helpless desire to break these limits can be felt right away. Her mother’s insistence on oranges reflects her views about gender and sexuality. She would never let her child to have homosexual relationships which is totally against the regulations of the Church. This proves the fact that “in such a reality, there is no freedom of signification for natural bodies, which are instead inscribed by the prescriptions of the Divine Law” (Antosa 2008, 38). Basically, Jeanette’s wish to have another fruit other than orange symbolizes her desire to be with females rather than males. In this case oranges simply represent her mother’s oppressive world; in other words,

this fruit is the symbol of the boundary between being a good and a bad member of the church.

Namely, oranges are the symbol of the entire oppressive power of the church that her mother feels herself totally devoted to; in other words, "the orange represents the repressive heterosexual law Jeanette's mother and her church have imposed on her" (Chen 2014, 24). Throughout the novel, her mother believes oranges which refer to the heterosexuality is the only appropriate choice which she struggles to impose upon Jeanette. However, the mother needs to understand that there are other options as well.

Second chapter, *Exodus,* is an important chapter in Jeanette's life because with the beginning of this part, her life changes;

> the word "exodus" means departure in Greek. It signals departure for Israelites from their homeland how Jeannette leaves the strict household to see the secular world outside. Like the Israelites who try to survive in the wilderness, Jeanette struggles to fit to the wilderness of the secular world. (Önal 2007, 24-25)

Therefore, this journey means liberation for Israeli people. Likewise, Jeanette is liberated in this chapter by being sent to school. She finally gets away from home and sees outside world and experience things without the control of her mother, religion and Bible. In fact, the mother has been quite successful in raising Jeanette as a true believer. Confined in the space shaped by the religious norms, Jeanette has been homeschooled, until a letter comes from the authorities to the mother. In a way, Jeanette has had to go to school; otherwise, her mother would go to jail. This is a turning point for Jeanette since until this moment, her mother's "dogmatic binaries shape Jeannette's religious environment as well as her viewpoints. . . Thus, she [has been] under the influence of her mother's binary logic" (Önal 2007, 19). Nevertheless, leaving home and meeting with the secular world, Jeanette witnesses many other point of views and different lifestyles. In a way, Jeanette comes to terms with the "relative nature of perceptions" (26) which results in a conflict between what she has been taught in the closed and supposedly protected house and what she actually experiences in outside and real world. Hence, she

has to bear some mistreatments and misunderstandings. Similarly, in the writing lesson, Jeanette feels quite unusual with her essay;

> We had been set a project just before we started last autumn, we had to write an essay called `What I Did in my Summer Holidays'. I was anxious to do it well because I knew they thought I couldn't read or anything, not having been to school early enough. I did it slowly in my best handwriting, proud that some of the others could only print. We read them out one by one, then gave them to the teacher. It was all the same, fishing, swimming, picnics, Walt Disney. . . I was at the end of the alphabet, and I could hardly wait. . .
> . . .
> . . . I started my essay.... `"This holiday I went to Colwyn Bay with our church camp." (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 49)

While her peers talk about fishing trips, swimming, having picnics, Jeanette describes a day when you can camp with the church. Therefore, Jeanette becomes isolated and excluded due to not being able to come up with any other activity which has been done without the church. As a result of this, Jeanette can never be embraced by her peers or teachers. After the warning from students and parents, teachers send a letter to Jeanette's mother but this makes her mother happier and she loves Jeanette more. She is quite pleased with the fact that her daughter is finally in the safest space as she belongs to the 'friends' section, not the 'enemy'. This incident leads the reader to think that mother loves Jeanette on the condition that she obeys the dogmas of the church and never steps outside the religious norms. Based on this assumption, the mother might be categorized as Lotman's conservative character as she never approves of anything beyond what the church enforces. She does not have the courage and wish to transgress the boundary of religion. In a way, she is stuck within the borders of this cultural space, semiosphere.

Another strange incident Jeanette has experienced at school is that; when the class starts needlework, she picks up the colour black which attracts the attention of the teacher because "this shows Jeanette's initial limited view on the world, which she is taught by her mother; only friends or enemies, white or black, dualism" (Ticha 2008, 28-29).

Clearly, Jeanette cannot help herself from using religious examples and stories in the activities which makes other students, teachers and

even the parents disturbed. For instance; in sewing classes, when the teacher wants students to decorate their work with sentences, Jeanette's friends write sentences like "TO MOTHER WITH LOVE" (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 51) and some birthday motifs. However, Jeanette preferred a text which is "THE SUMMER IS ENDED AND WE ARE NOT YET SAVED" (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 51). Basically, Jeanette keeps using religious symbols, or texts perpetually owing to the fact that her whole world is under the control of her mother; hence religion. Therefore, at school Jeanette can never win any rewards or get any appreciation. This is rather odd for Jeanette because this is all she has learned in her life. Therefore, she thinks she is not the one who is different but the others. This causes a trauma for Jeanette as a result of the difficulty Jeanette has in adapting to the outside world. Accordingly, when she is at school, no matter how hard she tries to be recognized, "she is ostracized by teachers and students mainly because of her evangelic Christianity" (Ticha 2008, 28). Namely, the fact that Jeanette relates all the activities with religion causes disturbance not only for teachers, students and parents but also for Jeanette as well. The school experience proves that thanks to being out of the house, Jeanette is exposed to various kinds of points of view, thoughts and practices which are totally different than her mother's.

After some time of being free from the oppressive atmosphere of her house and dominant attitude of her mother, Jeanette is still fed with the norms of the Church the moment she steps inside the house. This situation is depicted in the third chapter called *Leviticus*. In the Old Testament, this chapter "contains God's guidelines for His newly redeemed people, teaching them how to worship, praise and obey the holy God. It records the laws the priests of Leviticus must obey" (Chen 2014, 18). Accordingly, in the novel this chapter deals with the things Jeanette must learn every rule of religion before becoming an evangelist missionary. For instance; Jeanette and her mother hear a loud noise coming next door;

'What is it?' I asked.

> ‘I don’t know,’ she said in loud whisper, ‘but whatever it is, it’s not holy’
> . . .
> At that moment another burst of wailing began from Next Door.
> Very clear this time.
> `They're fornicating,' cried my mother, rushing to put her hands over my ears. (Winterson 2014, Leviticus:69-70)

After some time, mother understands that the sound is as a result of the act of fornicating while Jeanette has no idea what that means. However, from her mother’s panicked attitude, she takes it as a sin. This scene reveals that Jeanette is in a way conditioned towards religious dogmas without even being aware of the true meanings of them and without clarifying the reasons why she has to behave that way.

As one can imagine, the mother does everything to instil her religious beliefs into Jeanette. That is why, she even changes the stories ending in the way that they would serve for the purpose of the religious doctrines. One of such stories is *Jane Eyre* which is mother’s favourite novel. In the original narration, Jane Eyre marries Mr Rochester by following her desires. However, mother changes this and tells Jeanette that Jane Eyre marries John Rivers who is a religious and reliable guy. The mother retells the story so as to avoid Jeanette from following her passions and desires. For the mother, even the marriage should serve for the good of the religion. Basically, the fact that the mother plays with one of the most well-known novels of English literature has the intention of “deceiving Jeanette into accepting the religious lifestyle decreed by her mother” (Önal 2007, 31). Normally, Jane Eyre loves Mr Rochester; nevertheless, on their wedding day, she learns that he is married to a mad woman in the attic which becomes the reason for the cancellation of the wedding. After that, John proposes to Jane which she declines as they do not love each other. In the mother’s version of the story, Jane accepts this offer and they sail to India for missionary work. It can be anticipated that “from the mother’s perspective, St John Rivers represents the Christian duties whereas Mr. Rochester represents worldly passions” (32). The mother tries to impose on Jeanette the choice between desire and

religious responsibilities. In a way, the mother does not give Jeanette a right to choose as she is filling Jeanette with her own preferences. Apparently, Jeanette's mother get carried away with religion so much that she does not even hesitate to rewrite the stories' ending while telling Jeanette.

Moreover, it can be suggested that Jeanette's mother does not give any importance to the notion of love. This can be understood from her love story. Someday, Jeanette's mother falls in love with a Frenchman. After that, she goes to a doctor due to feeling "giddy or fizzy in the belly" (Winterson, 2014, Numbers: 111). She decides to go to a doctor who tells her that "You may well be in love, [...] but you also have a stomach ulcer" (Winterson 2014, Numbers: 111). Therefore, Jeanette's mother puts love and stomach ulcer in the same equation. She considers love as a kind of disease which can be healed by aspirin. Namely, for the mother love is not something to be cared for. This thought of her justifies her loveless marriage. Based on this incident, it is not hard to guess that Jeanette's mother does not have deep feelings about her husband. She married him in order to fulfil her duties as a woman in a patriarchal society. In her society since everything is put in an order according to religious doctrines, only valid marriage is heterosexual marriage.

The mother is really good at constructing the semiosphere whose "boundary cannot be visualised by means of the concrete imagination" (Lotman 2005, 208) for Jeanette based on religious dogmas which she never questions. Just like herself, she provides Jeanette a world formed of binary oppositions of good and bad, enemy and friend or selfish or faithful based on religion. Basically, Bible is highly important for the story because the main character's fundamentalist mother live her life according to this book which she has utmost commitment. In this respect, she raises Jeanette with the understanding that the whole world is based on the Bible which constitutes and prohibits everything in their lives. This reinforces that "religion is described on Winterson's terms as a highly oppressive institution" (Chin-Yi 2015, 310). Accordingly, as Lotman emphasizes for the plot development, the character must move

across the established boundary. In this respect, even though Jeanette has grown up with the fear of breaking the regulations in the Bible, the whole story is based on her act of defying the norms of the church and her bible-blinded mother. It can be claimed that Jeanette transgresses the invisible boundary between religious and sinner people in order to follow her own desires.

5.3.4. *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit*: Rethinking Yuri Lotman's Spatial Theory

At first, when she is young, Jeanette thinks she has a great mission of saving humanity. However, as she grows old, she realizes that her actual mission is to find her identity and acknowledging her true self. In this semi-autobiographical novel, the author describes the clash between what societies need and individual desires. Winterson mixes fantastic and biblical elements in order to depict a young girl who is isolated due to her sexual preference and how she questions the cultural and religious dogmas and norms; therefore,

> Winterson creates a chaotic atmosphere by bringing together two extreme situations. She chooses to deal with the narrator's homosexuality in a conservative surrounding in order to portray people's outrageous reactions that only emphasize their hypocrisy and irrationality and foreshadow Jeanette's mental and religious transformation. (Al-Shara 2015, 238)

In this respect, the plot is based on self-discovery of Jeanette in a world defined by extremely conservative and fanatic norms and her journey out of this world by following her own desires and choice, not somebody else's. The novel criticizes the impudent beliefs of the church "that is based on a patriarchal system" (Ticha 2008, 39) and how these dogmas turn an individual to an outcast. In that sense, the moment;

> Jeanette transgresses the covenant by starting a love affair with a girl, her relationships with both God and her mother, who like God, represents ultimate authority for Jeanette, are broken. (Chen 2014, 17)

Even though having been raised as a child who is devoted to Church and its doctrines, Jeanette shows signs of peculiarity from the beginning. Her

friendship with two women from a paper shop signals Jeanette's unusual nature; therefore, "the dualist world, in which Jeanette has been brought up, with either enemies or friends, does not accept lesbianism at all" (Ticha 2008, 28).

The main reason why Jeanette grows a hatred towards religion is her mother who is a "religious monster and hypocrite" (Chin-Yi 2015, 312). What makes Jeanette move away from religion is both her mother's inconsistent attitudes and Pastor Finch's unmerciful decision of judging Jeanette;

> instead of finding some way to show some grace and mercy to Jeannette as a sinner when it is exposed that she is a lesbian and find some way of loving her back into the Christian family, condemns it wrathfully instead with the result of Jeanette being very bitter about being excommunicated by the Church. (Chin-Yi 2015, 313)

As a result of these incidents, it is really hard for Jeanette to trust the Church and her mother. Neither her mother nor the Church behaves honestly. For instance; Jeanette's mother firmly condemns homosexuality; yet, she has taken a woman's picture out of the photo album. This may suggest that "Jeanette's mother may have experienced a same sex romantic love in one point of her life which she now hypocritically tries to hide" (Ticha 2008, 29). Another example for her mother's hypocrisy is "the presence of a wine glass in Jeanette's home" (31). This is quite ironic because she always abases drinking alcohol. Therefore, it can be claimed that Jeanette's mother's "hypocrisy is not only about her actions but also about her feelings" (Çeker 2016, 58). However, one of the biggest disillusionments Jeanette has experienced is the scene where she learns the actual ending of *Jane Eyre*;

> I did remember, but what my mother didn't know was that I now knew she had rewritten the ending. *Jane Eyre* was her favourite non-Bible book, and she read it to me over and over again, when I was very small. I couldn't read it, but I knew where the pages turned. Later, literate and curious, I had decided to read it for myself. A sort of nostalgic pilgrimage. I found out, that dreadful day in a back corner of the library, that Jane doesn't marry St John at all, that she goes back to Mr Rochester. It was like the day I discovered my adoption papers while searching for a pack of playing cards. I have never since played cards, and I have never

since read *Jane Eyre*. (Winterson 2014, Numbers: 96)

Her mother was a total disappointment for Jeanette as everything she has told Jeanette turns out to be false. She realizes that her mother is capable of doing anything for serving the Church including deceiving her child. Moreover, Jeanette's mother's blind faith in religion can be revealed also when Jeanette goes deaf for a short period of time;

> I was lying in bed one night, thinking about the glory of the Lord, when it struck me that life had gone very quiet. I had been to church as usual, sung as loudly as ever, but it had seemed for some time that I was the only one making a noise. (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 31)

When Jeanette becomes deaf for three months, her mother does not understand the problem and thinks that she is in a kind of trance or "in a state of rapture" (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 31). Therefore, instead of taking her to a hospital, her mother prevents people from talking to her because she anticipates that Jeanette is having something spiritual. It is Miss Jewsbury, another lesbian in the story, who realizes that Jeanette has become deaf and takes her to a hospital so that she can be treated. She is in a way all alone because her mother does not pay attention to her illness as much as a mother is supposed to. Therefore, Jeanette remembers the tragic fact that she is an adoptive child. She feels this truth to the bone. Also, Jeanette realizes that her condition is due to a natural problem not a spiritual one like her mother has told. Hence, Jeanette loses his faith in her mother as obviously because she clearly ignores Jeanette under the cover of being busy with religious activities and organizations. She is a hypocritical woman who does not love Jeanette at all as a result of which "Jeanette questions her life and identity, and she comes to realize that she has been living in a world founded on delusions and lies" (Yakut 2011, 78). This shows that her mother is blindly connected to the Church and views everything happening around her with blinkers. In this moment, with this incident Jeanette starts questioning the perfection of the church;

> Since I was born I had assumed that the world ran on very simple lines, like a larger version of our church. Now I was finding that even the church was sometimes confused. This was a problem. But not one I chose to deal with for many years more. (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 36)

Namely, Jeanette is faced with the reality that neither her mother nor the church is always right about everything. This is one signal that signifies Jeanette is becoming mature and self-aware. Moreover, when her mother and all the other people think that she is in a rapture, she takes care of her but when she learns that there is something wrong naturally, she leaves her alone at the hospital. Only Miss Jewsbury realizes that it is not something spiritual but physical and takes her to hospital. Therefore, "Jeanette witnesses that what the church puts forward as true may not always be true. This leads Jeanette into a sense of self- contradiction" (Önal 2007, 25). During her time at the hospital, her mother does not take care of Jeanette. Instead, she sends her a basket full of oranges;

> My mother came to see me quite a lot in the end, but it was the busy season at church. They were planning the Christmas campaign. When she couldn't come herself she sent my father, usually with a letter and a couple of oranges.
> `The only fruit,' she always said.
> Fruit salad, fruit pie, fruit for fools, fruited punch. Demon fruit, passion fruit, rotten fruit, fruit on Sunday.
> Orange are the only fruit. I filled my little bucket with peel and the nurses emptied it with an ill grace. (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 39)

That is the scene where we are introduced to the motif of oranges. It is obvious that "Jeannette is left alone in the wilderness of the hospital this time and seeing that the church has been wrong about the reason for her plight, she understands that the church is not an absolute power" (Önal 2007, 25). Apparently, her mother does not have any time to even visit her daughter let alone accompanying her at the hospital. Jeanette describes this situation as follows;

> I sniffed; disinfectant and mashed potatoes. Then my mother prodded me, put her letter on the bedside cabinet, and emptied a huge carrier bag of oranges into the bowl by my water jug. I smiled feebly, hoping to gain support, but instead she patted me on the head and rolled away. So I was

alone. (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 37)

Unfortunately, Jeanette has a mother who cares about her whenever she wishes. This proves the sad fact that the mother cares about her daughter as long as she fits and obeys what she tells. In this incident, when the mother realizes that her condition is not related to anything spiritual, she does not pay any attention anymore.

Church, on the other hand, loses its value in the eyes of Jeanette as a result of the wrong decisions it makes since "what the church calls love can be unnatural for Jeanette and homosexuals" (Tischa 2008, 39). The Church only allows heterosexual love while the relationship between man and woman is totally cruel for Jeanette since she has totally negative thoughts about heterosexual marriages; she even,

> feels extremely bitter about the process because she feels that her authentic self has been suppressed. Jeannette views marriage as an empty and meaningless institution. This feeling of marriage being a sham is derived largely from her observations of marriage in her own family. The passionless marriage of her adoptive parents seems a far cry from the unbridled passions she discovers in the arms of women from her church, who take to falling from her because of her extreme devoutness. (Chin-Yi 2015, 309).

She sometimes hears from other women that their marriages are not as fairytale-like as it is described in the stories. She witnesses that these women are actually extremely unhappy in their marriages due to drunk, disrespectful, violent and disloyal husbands. Therefore, Jeanette starts thinking beyond the constructed norms. Accordingly, in this novel, one of the targets of Winterson is patriarchal values in terms of gender as she;

> finds patriarchy unfair because she cannot bring herself to respect the male species who would become her master, who lust after women and make use of women and oppress women in their households without offering anything much in return. (Chin-Yi 2015, 310)

She cannot acknowledge the irony in heterosexual marriages; men do not love and respect the woman, yet, they have to be together. This is false for Jeanette. Just like the protagonist, the writer also "does not come to respect heterosexual marriage as a sacred institution" (Chin-Yi 2015, 313-314) as it is filled with defects. Basically, according to Winterson

men do not deserve the importance, priority and superiority they have been given. More precisely, Winterson thinks of men as beasts which she expresses through Jeanette;

> There are women in the world. There are men in the world. And there are beasts.
> What do you do if you marry a beast? Kissing them didn't always help. And beasts are crafty. They disguise themselves like you and I. Like the wolf in `Little Red Riding Hood'. Why had no one told me? Did that mean no one else knew? Did that mean that all over the globe, in all innocence, women were marrying beasts?
> I reassured myself as best I could. The minister was a man, but he wore a skirt, so that made him special. There must be others, but were theree enough? That was the worry. There were a lot of women, and most of them got married. If they couldn't marry each other, and I didn't think they could, because of having babies, some of them would inevitably have to marry beasts. (Winterson 2014, Numbers: 93-94)

Accordingly, in patriarchal societies women are seen as "child bearing slaves and domestic helpers in marriages" (Chin-Yi 2015, 313). Therefore, Winterson has no trust in heterosexual marriages which is the ideal union accepted by the Church and society. As a woman defying all the conventional norms, Winterson directly supports homosexual relationships and marriages which are more authentic for her. However, this is never accepted by the Church as "these relationships are viewed as unnatural and unholy in the Church's sight" (313). At this point, Jeanette is in a pure contradiction with the Church since "to her the experience of lesbian passion is never anything less than a very pure kind of love rather than the unnatural lust her Church describes it as" (313). Based on this contradiction, two opposite ideals for marriage can be observed which highlights that;

> There is thus a fracture between what her church views as unclean and damning and what she finds an intensely spiritual experience, which is what she believes each one of her relationships to be. Indeed, what the Church view as sin and profanity Jeanette Winterson takes to be an intensely spiritual pure and fulfilling experience. (Chin-Yi 2015, 313)

Jeanette has the strongest belief that men are monsters who use women in every way while they just enjoy their lives. In this respect, even though

the Church regards the relationship between Jeanette and Melanie is a sin, how she feels for Melanie is rather intense and real. It can be suggested that Jeanette tries to reach out genuine love through Melanie. Whereas, the Church always declares that the perfect relationship in a patriarchal society can only be between man and woman and "no possibility of re-signification is allowed" (Antosa 2008, 38). That is why, Winterson attacks the patriarchal values through a lesbian daughter and hypocritical religion.

In addition, Jeanette realizes that the real reason why all the women go to the Church is not about spiritual need but for physical satisfaction. They say to each other; "He (Pastor Spratt) was very impressive. My mother said he looked like Errol Flynn, but holy. A lot of women found the Lord that week" (Winterson, 2014, Genesis: 11). It can be suggested that "what was attractive to Jeanette's mother and other women was the pastor himself rather than the promise of divine relief in the first place" (Önal 2007, 23). In a way, Jeanette tries to show that "Christians who are supposed to be God followers and preach guideline do not follow them in their heart" (Ticha 2008, 39). As a result, with the loss of faith, Jeanette starts to see beyond the constructed realities formed by her mother and religion. She gradually becomes aware of her true self.

Contrary to what her mother has dictated for years, Jeanette experiences the unnatural feelings at an early age which is why she is exposed to unjust and violent punishments. Jeanette has been raised according to religious doctrines which has not caused any trouble until she has to start school because this time she is faced with the real world. In a way, Jeanette steps out of the space that religion constructs via her mother. In other words, her mother raises Jeanette to be a missionary child, servant of god and a blessing; however, Jeanette "is not able to be the perfect person that her mother and community expect and it causes her rejection by the church and by patriarchal society" (Ticha 2008, 39). Her only desire is to discover her true self; even though her lesbianism is a danger for the power of the church. In this case, Lotman's view of plot can be analysed; "the events brought by the protagonists and their

agencies are represented in the form of movements resulting in changes of locations" (Nöth 2015, 14). In Jeanette's case, she has to cross the invisible walls and boundary in order to break the constructed realities and find her own truth.

Accordingly, Jeanette's own desires and preferences constitutes the narration and the story. The religious community is highly strict, dogmatic and intolerant. They never accept anything from outside their borders, limits. Therefore, when they discover the affair between Jeanette and Melanie, they consider it immediately as a great sin and the children are thought to be possessed by demons. This reflects the fact that "the world is based on the binary system that does not accept variations like being homosexual" (Ticha 2008, 39); you can either be female or male and you can only have interest for the opposite sex. This is evangelists' way of dealing with anything they do not accept and control. What is abnormal is the fact that Jeanette crosses the boundary between woman and man which makes her a revolutionary character.

Jeanette meets with Melanie in the church while she is preaching which helped Melanie to convert to religion. In a way, Jeanette saves her with her appeals. While the community in the church sing the hymn "he touched me", they look each other and their eyes locked on each other. The religious responsibilities and her sexual desires overlap. Jeanette has really intense emotions for Melanie. Actually, Jeanette loves her; "'Melanie is a gift from the Lord, and it would be ungrateful not to appreciate her'" (Winterson 2014, Joshua: 133) Melanie and Jeanette spend the night together at Elsie's house and make love. However, for Melanie, this homosexual relationship is degrading for her heterosexuality identity. Therefore, she feels the urge to deny her love for Melanie and "hide her difference, but she still feels like an outcast" (Chen 2014, 31). When Jeanette tells her mother about Melanie, she gets furious and hard times begin. She cannot feel motherly love anymore because her daughter does not fulfil he desires of being a religious and loyal daughter;

> In the beginning, Jeanette is a good daughter by her mother's criteria as she is heavily involved in biblical study. When Jeanette abandons performing gender/ sexual/ heteronormative acts, she is banished and marginalized since she is gradually digressing from the patriarchal circuit. (Yakut 2011, 72)

In this respect, after informing the Church about Jeanette's sin, mother at home, behaves indifferently to Jeanette. This is not the way an actual mother would behave. Therefore, it can be claimed that Jeanette's mother is a selfish woman who only cares about her own interest.

When Jeanette falls in love with a girl and starts to be attracted by women not men, she starts to question the teachings of the Church. In a way, Jeanette's sexual preference clashes with the norms of the church which imposes heterosexuality. Therefore, the Church regards Jeanette as an individual possessed by the devil and tries to exorcise her because the Church believes that homosexuality is Devil's job; "anyone could be saved and anyone could fall to the Devil, it was their choice" (Winterson 2014, Judges: 164). That is why, people treat Jeanette as if something was wrong with her.

Being totally different and queer among the 'normal' people makes Jeanette's life harder and more painful. After her affection with Melanie is discovered in the chapter called *Joshua*, Jeanette is publicly disgraced by the Church. She has to deny her affair and interest with Melanie. The authorities agree on the fact that these two girls have been possessed by the devil himself. Hence, the torture begins for Jeanette, a teenage girl, which was like a "military war between conservative religious faith and individual freedom in sexuality and love" (Chen 2014, 20). Out of fear, Jeanette runs out of the church and takes shelter in Miss Jewsbury's house but here suddenly they have a sexual intercourse;

> `Perhaps this will help.' And she began to stroke my head and shoulders. I turned over so that she could reach my back. Her hand crept lower and lower. She bent over me; I could feel her breath on my neck.
> Quite suddenly I turned and kissed her. We made love and I hated it and hated it, but would not stop. (Winterson 2014, Joshua: 136)

After this incident, tension gets higher as the members of the Church start

an exorcism on Jeanette which is both tragic and horrific. After lots of praying beside Jeanette, she is locked in a room for thirty-six hours during when she eats or drinks nothing. In order to get something to eat, Jeanette has to repent. Both girls are publicly humiliated led by the Pastour who is the symbol of patriarchal society;

> `These children of God,' began the pastor, `have fallen under Satan's spell.'
> His hand was hot and heavy on my neck. . .
> `These children of God have fallen foul of their lusts.'
> `Just a minute...,' I began, but he took no notice.
> `These children are full of demons.'
> A cry of horror ran through the church.
> `I'm not,' I shouted, `and neither is she.'
> `Listen to Satan's voice,' said the pastor to the church, pointing at me. `How are the best become the worst.'
> `What are you talking about?' I asked, desperate. `Do you deny you love this woman with a love reserved for man and wife?' `No, yes, I mean of course I love her.'
> `I will read you the words of St Paul,' announced the pastor, and he did, and many more words besides about unnatural passions and the mark of the demon.
> `To the pure all things are pure,' I yelled at him. `It's you not us.'
> He turned to Melanie.
> `Do you promise to give up this sin and beg the Lord to forgive you?'
> `Yes.' She was trembling uncontrollably. I hardly heard what she said.
> `Then go into the vestry with Mrs White and the elders will come and pray for you. It's not too late for those who truly repent.'
> He turned to me. (Winterson 2014, Joshua: 134)

Jeanette is being literally accused and judged in front of the public which is extremely insulting for a child. She feels herself in the middle; "`I love her.' / `Then you do not love the Lord.' / `Yes, I love both of them.' /`You cannot.'" (Winterson 2014, Joshua: 134-135). Jeanette desires to have both spiritual and emotional love at the same time; yet, she is never allowed for that which creates the conflict. She is made to believe that if she wants to be a member of the church, she cannot love a woman. Jeanette is forced to realize the fact that she "loved the wrong sort of people. Right sort of people in every respect except this one; romantic love for another woman was a sin" (Winterson 2014, Judges: 163-164). Basically, Jeanette's affair is brought to public and she is disgraced by

various sorts of punishments.

Nonetheless, while some of the people at the Church find Jeanette innocent, her mother is one of the people who react in the most horrible way;

> There are shades of meaning, but a man is a man, wherever you find it. My mother has always given me problems because she is enlightened and reactionary at the same time. She didn't believe in Determinism and Neglect, she believed that you made people and yourself what you wanted. Anyone could be saved and anyone could fall to the Devil, it was their choice. While some of our church forgave me on the admittedly dubious grounds that I couldn't help it (they had read Havelock Ellis and knew about Inversion), my mother saw it as a wilful act on my part to sell my soul. (Winterson 2014, Judges: 164)

After repenting for her relationship with Melanie, Jeanette this time has an affair with another member of the church, Katy. She finds out that her sexual life and spiritual life can exist together. In other words, Jeanette accepts her true identity and desires as she is portrayed "standing up against the community in defence of her lesbian sexuality" (Coslett qtd. in Önal 2007, 35). In the chapter titled as *Joshua*, Jeanette is likened to the Biblical figure from the battle of Jericho, Joshua, who "is the successor to Moses, follows God's instructions and walks around the city walls of Jericho together with seven priests blowing trumpets" (Önal 2007, 35). During the war, the walls of the city fell down and he could be able to conquer Jericho. Winterson uses this biblical story to make a resemblance between Joshua and Jeanette because "in Jeanette's case the walls belong to the church which surrounded and protected her till then" (36) collapse. She starts a war against the religious and sexual dogmas which is why she is labelled as devil or possessed. However, this chapter has an importance because "by the end of this chapter, she becomes more determined to leave her adoptive home and accept her true desires" (Chen 2014, 27) which makes her a mobile and revolutionary character;

> My mother wanted me to move out, and she had the backing of the pastor and most of the congregation, or so she said. I made her ill, made the house ill, brought evil into the church. There was no escaping this time. I was in trouble. Picking up my Bible, the hill seemed the only place to go just then. On the top of the hill is a stone mound to hide behind when the

wind blows. (Winterson 2014, Judges: 163)

After she gets caught, Jeanette is rejected by her mother and the Church; "'You'll have to leave' she said. 'I'm not havin' demons here" (Winterson 2014, Judges: 174). This time she does not reject her lesbian identity and leaves home knowing that she has to stand on her own feet. She moves to the city and begins her new journey and life. However, she lacks the family love and misses home no matter how she hates. This is a trauma for the girl because the church, mother and society which once claimed to love her and protect her now tell her to leave. Nevertheless, she embraces this decision strongly and she supports herself by working in different jobs. She stands upright against these problems.

The conflict depicted here is between the boundaries set by the evangelical community and the way one feels of themselves. Jeanette has been raised by her mother "within the binary understanding of gender and sex" (Yakut 2011, 83) together with the clear distinction between faithful and sinner which causes "the boundaries operate as a mechanism of semiotic (cultural) individuation" (Skulj 2004, 26).

The novel is divided by the invisible boundary which "is to be conceived as an abstraction" (Kotov and Kull 182) between living according to the regulations of religion and your sex and disobeying religious doctrines and the sexual norms. These representations form two distinct semantic; hence cultural spaces for the characters in the novel. From Yuri Lotman's perspective, semantically, if you are a true believer of Christianity performing all the requirements of the Church and if you comply with the limitations of your gender, you belong to the world of "friend". Nevertheless, if you question religion and act against the norms of your gender and the Church, then you are seen as an "enemy" possessed by the Devil. The division is drawn quite sharply by the mother at the beginning of the novel. By becoming a lesbian Jeannette has broken the boundaries set by the religion; "The devil had attacked me at my weakest point: my inability to realise the limitations of my sex" (Winterson 2014, Judges: 172). In other words, she rejects and changes the traditional perception of matching women with men by becoming a

lesbian. This invisible spatial representation helps us decode the hidden meanings underlying. Within the patriarchal boundaries, Jeanette is coded with the roles and norms of being a woman; yet, by being a lesbian she performs the opposite sex's roles. Therefore, at some point, her mother tends to justify Jeanette against the church by telling that she has a lot of responsibilities so she confuses herself with a male figure. Yet, this makes Jeanette really angry because her mother still considers her daughter's situation as something impossible and wrong. This leads Jeanette to leave home which means "by refusing to be frozen into a 'sexed' body and to be located in heterosexual desire, Jeanette is positioned in a decentered/denaturalized space" (Yakut 2011, 83).

When we look at the unusual experience of Jeanette through Yuri Lotman's eyes there are two options for Jeanette who chooses to become a lesbian as she grows old in a prudish community. She could destroy herself by surrendering to God and purifying her soul as a result of the cruel objection of her mother and the Church. In other words, Jeanette would suppress her true feelings as a result of not being able to adapt to live within the boundaries of a space which is totally against your understanding, thoughts and desires. Or, Jeanette could make all the people in the novel including her mother and the Church members realize and accept her lesbian identity. Basically, as Lotman argues in order not to have any conflicts either side needs to submit to the other's perception. According to structuralist method, there needs to be a certain boundary and characters could belong to only one side.

However, in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* the protagonist neither changes anybody around her nor changes herself according to the conventions. Everybody accepts each other the way they are. Jeanette realizes that world is not consisted of right and wrong, good or bad. There are not only two contradictory sides. There can be also things which do not conform to neither good side nor bad side.

At the end of the novel in the chapter called *Ruth*, Jeanette returns home to visit her mother, who seems to show some understanding and sympathy towards Jeanette. Jeanette has worked in many jobs but she

returns home to spend the Christmas with her family. They never talk about Jeanette's love or sexual life and they do not contradict each other or have an argument. The ending is quite surprising because her mother is portrayed eating fruits other than oranges and telling "oranges are not the only fruit" (Winterson 2014, Ruth: 219) which implies that "her mother is finally beginning to accept the coexistence of different worldviews" (Chen 2014, 24). Even though many people believe that Jeanette is still ill and possessed, her mother acknowledged Jeanette's lifestyle and feelings. In a way, the mother is not so compulsive about Jeanette's sexuality any more. Just like white and black communities live together, the mother's clear-cut perception of black and white, enemy and friend now start to blur because they now could stay at the same room together without having a conflict. Jeanette is still a lesbian and her mother is still a devoted Christian but they do not try to change each other anymore. That is why, this novel has an important place in literature as it shows the reader that the protagonist;

> struggles to break free from her mother and her religious belief and eventually accepts her true self, making others especially her mother. . . aware that heterosexuality is not the only sexuality in the world. (Chen 2014, 24-25)

According to Lotman's spatial analysis, while the mother can be given as an example for a conservative and immobile character for she tries hard to live her life based on religious regulations, Jeanette can be taken as a revolutionary and mobile character as she defies the conventions and follows her desires no matter what. Nevertheless, the privilege of this novel is the fact that these two types of characters can live together without abandoning their own beliefs.

In a post-modern world like ours, personal needs are more important than everything. The concept of plurality is valued over singularity; therefore, there cannot be only one truth. There is the sense of tolerance for each other's feelings and thoughts. Nobody tries to change themselves or the other person. They simply try to live together by respecting one another. The idealism belonging to modern age does not exist anymore which is based on the fact that there can only be one

common truth which every single person needs to acknowledge. This notion seems to be artificial and useless in a post-modern world as it makes people slaves.

It is a well-known fact that human beings are capable of killing or destroying each other. They have this cruel potential. However, people need to learn how to stay together in order to live. Otherwise, there would be constant disunification and conflict. Therefore, in post-modern times people tolerate each other with their differences; Elsie tries to explain this to Jeanette; "'There is this world,' she banged the wall graphically, 'and there's this world', she thumped her chest. 'if you want to make sense of either, you have to take notice of both'" (Winterson 2014, Exodus: 43). Elsie tries to make Jeanette realize that one needs to be open to every kind of perception in the world so that they can find the best thing for themselves. Accordingly, when Jeanette comes to visit her mother at the end, she welcomes her daughter with open arms. In a way, the author here suggests the reader that people can "listen to [their] internal self as well as seeing the external world" (Ticha 2008, 31). Jeanette still feels attached to her mother even though she does not feel like a family member and does not share the same thoughts with her. However, she has been successful with having her religious beliefs and homosexual identity in harmony with each other. Formerly, because of her sexual preference she could not have total faith in God due to the attitude of her mother and the church; yet, now she is not ashamed of herself and she has the courage to show people who she really is. This is a post-modern understanding because "since people do not look alike, there is no reason why they should think alike" (Ticha 2008, 40). Namely, in the battle between the dogmatic views of the Church and Jeanette's desires, no one defeats the other. In a way; "semiosphere represents clearly a post-structuralist position" (Nöth 2015, 17) in this novel.

Jeanette Winterson breaks all the conventions of gender and religion in this novel with the intention to prove that "the society should be a place where women and men can live a full value life" (Ticha 2008, 40).

With such an ending, Winterson actually portrays that people can actually respect each other's choices and preferences and hence, two totally contradictory people can live together without changing one another or destroying themselves. Post-modernists seek for a world which is devoid of fixed judgements and values. In this respect, Winterson questions the reliability of a single and objective truth due to the fact that labelling, categorizing and classifying people cause one to miss the importance of being a human being. This prevents people from feeling the love for another human being just the way they are. Putting this love in a box bordered by the gender norms and cultural values limits our perception. In *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit*, Winterson may seem to criticize the evangelist religion; however, what she actually comments on is "the way people understand and practice it in the society" (Çeker 2016, 58). Therefore, she gives many hypocritical behaviours of people who claim to be true Christians. Wherefore, this novel can be considered as a "strong criticism of the wrong practices, prejudices, and stereotypes" (Çeker 2016, 59).

It has been discussed that according to Lotman, there is a certain border between binary oppositions portrayed in a literary work such as good vs bad, inside vs outside, up vs bottom etc. He also claims that for the good of the plot development, the protagonist has to cross this border. If they succeed in adapting, they would change. However, if they cannot succeed, they either kill themselves or go back to their previous condition. However, in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* we cannot observe these two claims as we have done in *North and South* and *Brave New World.* In this novel, we have a different perspective; neither sides of the binary opposition try to change themselves or the other. They learn to appreciate each other's condition and live together without any conflicts. This can be acknowledged as "Lotman's post-structuralist model of culture as a semiosphere" (Nöth 2015, 12) since there is not one simple right or truth. Instead, each person has their own understanding of life; hence, everybody has to get along with each other by respecting the other's views. This brings culture a post-structuralist perspective for not

depending on single and common truth which is opposite what Lotman formerly suggests based on structuralism.

This is a reflection of our post-modern world where people choose to live together with all their oppositions. They do not try to change themselves or the other person, they basically respect each other. They have tolerance for each other's choices in life. In the first two novels, Lotman makes the sharp distinction between two sides of semiosphere such as *north* and *south* in the first novel and *barbaric* and *civilized* in the second novel. In these texts, the narration demonstrates one side superior to the other. Basically, one part of semiosphere is considered to be good and the other bad. By taking Lotman's theory into consideration, it can be assumed that formerly Lotman has favoured the fact that the boundary in the semiosphere serves for separating the two parts between which there can be no communication or transition as "the boundary which divides the space into two parts must be impenetrable" (Lotman qtd in Nöth 2015, 16). In other words, previously Lotman has introduced "a more intransient view of cultural space" (Nöth 2015, 16) which suggests that any kind of formation outside the borders of a culture is associated with anything negative such as evil, chaotic or uncivilized. In a way, this representation of culture which does not approve of anything beyond its boundaries is considered to be quite traditional since in ancient as well as modern times, people would tend to ignore a different point of view out of their semiosphere or contradict with the way of life that does not fit in their cultural space which is a reason for his idea that "outside the semiosphere, there can be neither communication, nor language" (Lotman qtd in Nöth 2015, 17). Thus, it can be suggested that Lotman used to represent "the semiosphere as a windowless closed space" (Nöth 2015, 16). That is why, when Lotman adapts this cultural phenomenon to literature and explains the *revolutionary* and *confirmative* texts, he actually means that in order for communication to occur either side needs to change. Otherwise, there would be conflict between two parts since there can only be one accepted way of life which means either you have to change and adapt or die trying.

Nevertheless, in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit,* the idea of singular truth belonging to modern age does not exist anymore because post-modern world is based on plurality. Therefore, Lotman has started talking about "a plurality of semiospheres of reciprocal interchange" (Nöth 2015, 17). To put it another way, two cultural spaces are not in opposition to each other or one does not predominate the other. Rather, they exist in an equally valuable position.

In modern ages or in the past, if people contradict each other, they had the tendency to destroy either themselves like John does in *Brave New World* or at least try to change themselves or the other people like Margaret does in *North and South*. On the contrary, in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit*, nobody destroys anybody or changes anybody. Every individual lives with their own values in life which forms their own semiospheres. This suggests that "Lotman's new model of culture as a semiosphere represents clearly a post-structuralist position" (Nöth 2015, 17). They do not consider someone out of their cultural space as enemy anymore; hence, there are no "coded messages structured in binary oppositions" (17) no longer. Namely, Lotman formerly has argued that culture shapes the meanings we give to the signs; but, now "it tends to supersede the binary categories left over from structuralism" (Schönle and Shine qtd in Nöth 2015, 17). That is why, the semiotic environment that uncovers the meanings of signs is not fixed but fluid.

In his earlier studies, Lotman has strongly supported the concept of binary opposition in structuralism and tried to explain everything based on "bipolar asymmetry" (Nöth 2015, 19). In other words, Lotman has had a strict understanding of boundary separating the culture into two parts. Nevertheless, even though the boundary in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* is quite clear, with the characters accepting each other as the way they are, a "third space" (Kostogriz qtd in Nöth 2015, 19) can be observed. Namely, "the boundary . . . between the semiosphere and its external environment" (Nöth 2015, 19) turns into a different space which can be taken as the middle of the division between the internal and external organization of a culture. With this understanding, it is clear that

Lotman softens his structuralist approach as “the boundary no longer functions as the hermetic enclosure of the semiosphere” (Nöth 2015, 20). Therefore, Lotman’s theory of crossing the boundary and adapting to the changes or not being able to adapt and destroying oneself is not applicable in post-modern world because people do not try to change each other anymore. Instead, they prefer to live together with all the contradictions which refers to the “mediating function of the boundary” (Nöth 2015, 20). In short, the structuralist understanding of boundary as a tool for separating one thing from the other is abandoned and boundary as a reconciling space which can be clearly observed in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* when the mother and the daughter choose to respect one another’s decisions and choices even though they both belong to two different cultural spaces.

6. CONCLUSION

Unlike other literary analysis, structuralism offers a more detailed, systematic and technical approach to life. Structuralism handles how language operates and brings certain frames or boundaries on how individuals use words or signs. It argues that a sign results from the relationship between the *signifier* and the *signified* and this relationship is totally random which does not prevent it from being same for every person. According to structuralism people using the same language unconsciously hold the same perception which is defined by socially constructed conventions. Basically, structuralism assigns the frame for our apprehension. This certainty is due to the way our mind works; looking for an order. Therefore, structuralism provides us with a structured and bordered life. This suggests that every single person living in the same community is aware of these borders which actually forms the culture of that society. At this point, semiotics which is a field of structuralism deals with decoding the messages hidden behind the culturally accepted signs within these borders. The main aim of structuralism is to give life a meaning.

Owing to the fact that structuralism deals with life, it can easily be applied to literature which is a reflection of life. In this respect, Yuri Lotman can be listed as one of the prominent theoreticians for analysing literary texts based on structuralism. In his point of view, spatial imageries in a society; hence artistic texts, have great importance for signifying abstract and cultural concepts. Lotman asserts that spatial representations in literary texts have their own language which needs to be revealed. In other words, spatial portrayals are full of signs that reflect culturally agreed norms. Therefore, spatial imageries appear to be highly illustrative for the reader in terms of the characters and the story. As a structuralist, Lotman applies the notion of boundary to literary text and talks about the notion of textual boundaries. He claims that the boundaries in artistic texts are reflected through spatial representations that serve as binary oppositions for each other. In that sense, Lotman divides the spatial formations into three categories as *topological;* the

mathematical aspect, *topographical*; the geographical aspect and *semantical*; the cultural aspect of spaces. Basically, Lotman suggests that every text consists of a certain kind of spatial dimension.

Besides, Yuri Lotman also comments on the plot development. Even though, he accepts the fact that all the texts are originally *conservative* meaning there is no movement in the text, he thinks what makes a work of art successful is the movement which is based on the protagonist's crossing the spatial boundary. According to him, if the protagonist succeeds in changing locations and adapts to the new conditions, the characters is called *mobile* and the text is named *revolutionary*. Whereas, if they can break the boundary but cannot adjust themselves to the change, this text is considered as *confirmative*. In a way, Lotman puts forward that as a result of this transgression, the protagonist either changes and feels happy or cannot change and destroys themselves. Moreover, according to Lotman every character needs to belong to somewhere in either part of spatial compositions. Therefore, in this study, three different novels from three different periods have been analysed in order to determine if Lotman's structuralist method is still valid in post-modern world.

The first novel, *North and South* was written during the 19th century by Elizabeth Gaskell. The period this novel was written is known as the Victorian period which is recognized with industrial changes. People living in this period were quite satisfied with their lives as England was a supreme power in the world having many colonies. Thanks to the Industrial Revolution, several factories, mills and railway roads were established that made England even richer and more powerful. However, all these improvements were happening in the north of England. Therefore, while the northern part was fully urbanized, the southern part was still based on agriculture. This created a big gap between the north and south. As a result of the sudden social, economic and industrial changes in the north, people in the south started to immigrate to the north in order to find better jobs and have better living conditions. Hence, many villagers became workers in the north. However, the increase in

population caused new settlements to appear which were rather dirty and overcrowded. Unfortunately, southern people could not find what they wished since they had to work and live in unhealthy and poor conditions.

Furthermore, these industrial changes also led to new classes to appear. In addition to the working class, there were two kinds of middle classes. One is formed of educated people which is called aristocrats whereas the other is formed of uneducated people dealing with trade such as factory owners, mill owners, or merchants which is called bourgeois. This resulted in a conflict between the working class who was suffering and middle class who was living in prosperity. While every member of a working class family had to work and could not even find bread to eat, middle class people were enjoying the best of their lives. Therefore, in order to ask for their rights, workers united and formed Trade Unions. What workers wanted was to defend their rights and enhance their working and living conditions. As a result of these formations, middle class people became afraid of the fact that workers would do protests and violent acts. Therefore, it can be claimed that there was a really tense atmosphere during the 19th century in England.

In this respect, Elizabeth Gaskell tries to show this reality in her novel *North and South* in order to make the middle class people realize the inequality in their own society with realistic depictions. The reason why Gaskell divided her novel into two polarized parts from the title is a proof of Lotman's spatial theory. By creating two different spaces, Gaskell actually tries to reflect the difference in social, technological, and intellectual developments. However, in addition to the visible and physical changes, there were also cultural diversities in the north and south which can be analysed semiotically. The *topological* division of spaces in this novel actually has deeper semantic importance.

South is represented through the protagonist Margaret and her aristocratic family while the north is symbolized by a mill owner Mr Thornton and his family. In a way, the south is the portrayal of humble, peaceful, intellectual and traditional lifestyle of aristocratic people belonging to middle class while the north is the depiction of industrial,

greedy, selfish, ambitious and money-minded bourgeois. This spatial representation creates an imaginary boundary in the minds of the reader which tells a lot about the culture of either sides. North and south actually reflect the cultural codes of the people living in these parts. Basically, Gaskell wishes to prove that industrial developments changes not only physical conditions of a place, but also people's attitude, lifestyle and mentality.

Gaskell creates a social novel which reflects the difference between the north and the south after the Industrial Revolution. In this respect, the story depends on Margaret's journey from south to the north. Due to being naïve southern individuals, Margaret and his family have prejudices against northern people. After crossing the boundary between north and south and changing locations, at first, she feels extremely unhappy. However, in time, she realizes true personality of the middle class people. Therefore, she struggles to change the attitude of working class and middle class people towards each other. In a way, Margaret tries to make peace between them. At the same time, Margaret also changes her opinions about middle class people after living with them and seeing their ways.

According to Lotman's theory, this novel is revolutionary because at first Margaret is shocked at the dirty, depressing and industrial condition of Milton as being a southern and rural girl. She has totally negative thoughts about northern people before coming to the north therefore she is not pleased with coming here. She is a prejudiced woman against the north and northern people. However, in time as she travels deeper in the lives of the middle class and working class people, she breaks her prejudices and has a different perspective. At the end of the novel, she even falls in love with a northern mill owner. Margaret also wants to change the beliefs of working class and middle class people as well towards each other. She helps every individual in the novel to open their eyes and sees the reality which leads to the reconciliation between factory owners and workers. As a result, it can be suggested that Margaret definitely crosses the boundary first between north and south

and then working class and middle class. She succeeds in adapting to the life in the northern Milton. She changes her life as well as the lives of the working class and middle class. Basically, *North and South* is a good example for Lotman's topological aspect of spatial representation with a revolutionary plot and mobile protagonist.

Brave New World, on the other hand, is an example of dystopian narration which was written in the first half of the 20th century. Unlike *North and South*, in this novel, we can observe *topographical* aspect of spatial representation as we have two different worlds; World State and Savage Reservation. Semantically, it represents the binary opposition between 'self and the other'. In a way, these two spaces portray two contradictory worlds. World State is highly technological, developed, powerful and modern while the Savage Reservation is primitive, dirty and wild. The World State projects all the negative characteristics on the Savage Reservation so as to make the distinction between itself and the reservation which makes it a better place to live in. They even call the people in the reservation 'savages'. Thus, it is apparent that Aldous Huxley creates two opposing worlds with distinct living conditions.

In the World State, everything about life is performed artificially by the totalitarian government. People are produced in factories so there is no natural pregnancy. People in World State have no God but Ford. They worship the car manufacturer Ford for his technological advancements. There is caste system between people; while they are produced, they are also shaped according to the needs of a certain class. However, there is never a class conflict since every individual is happy with their living and working conditions. The reason for this constant peace is brainwashing. The authorities sleep teach people from their childhood and condition them to the regulations of the World State. They always encourage people to buy new things in order to increase consumption. Controllers never allow people to read classics, have any kind of art or feel emotions, there is no sense of family as nobody knows who their father or mother is. Therefore, they lack the family ties. People have sex with each other anytime they want just to fulfil that desire; not for having a romantic

feeling or having a baby. Women always carry pills that prevent pregnancy. Thus, the feeling of love is removed from the society. The controllers try to maintain happiness in order to create stability in the society. But everything is under their control.

Moreover, people can never be alone in order to prevent them from thinking or contemplating on the conditions in the World State. They have to be social all the time. People take a drug called soma which is good for keeping people away from stress, anxiety, pain, grief, humiliation or any feeling that society cannot control. When somebody takes soma, it numbs them and therefore they cannot feel anything as they are in a trance having moved away from the world for some time. Namely, people have passive pleasures. They cannot even feel something towards death. They are raised to take death as a usual event; therefore, they feel nothing when somebody dies. Apparently, brave new world used technology to control its citizens.

On the contrary, the binary opposition of the World State is portrayed as natural and wild through the Savage Reservation. In this place, people hunt to feed themselves; women bear children; they have family ties; people are stick to their old values, beliefs and traditions. People age in the reservation unlike the people in the World State who never gets old.

According to Lotman, the binary of 'us vs them' is created with the help of these two worlds. Hence, these topographical representations refer to many other abstract concepts. For instance, the World State is depicted as civilized thanks to technology and Savage Reservation as chaotic due to being primitive and barbaric; however, which one is more barbaric is debatable.

When John the Savage who is at first quite enthusiastic about going to the World State witnesses the artificiality of the World State, he cannot stand living there anymore. He crosses the invisible boundary between the primitive and technological worlds which symbolize the movement of him can be labelled as the movement from primitivity towards modernization. He is going from a primitive world to the superior advanced developed world. However, he gets disillusioned as he sees that

people can never feel true happiness or any kind of true feeling. He cannot stand the change as people seem soulless for him. John notices that even the feeling of romantic love is cheapened through feelies, movies or orgies. As a result of this unnatural way of living, John kills himself at the end. Therefore, he is considered to be a *mobile* character; yet, he is *confirmative*. Since he cannot adapt living in the World State and cannot accept the corrupted ways of life of the other, John destroys himself.

Finally, *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit* by Jeanette Winterson was written in the second half of the twentieth century. It mainly focuses on the gender norms and the influence of religion on an individual. This is a semi-autobiographical novel depicting mostly the life of the author who is a lesbian. Therefore, in the novel, we read the story of a young girl who turns out to be a lesbian as she grows old. Young Jeanette, the protagonist, is the daughter of an evangelist Christian mother and father who raise her to be a missionary. For sixteen years, Jeanette's life is shaped by her mother who believes in the dogmatic norms of the church. Therefore, in this novel we can observe the semantical dimension of spatial representations as religion forms the social sphere around the characters. In other words, the semiosphere in the text depends on religious convention. Since Lotman's concept of semiosphere forms an abstract notion of space instead of a physical and geographical one, religion can be taken as the entity that defines this semiosphere. The religion depicted in the novel is so oppressive that Church is the only authority that determines the boundaries for everything. There is a binary distinction between people as divine and heathen. If you follow the rules of the church, you are considered to be blessed. However, if you break the norms, you become a sinner. Thus, Jeanette's mother always tries to keep Jeanette away from committing a sin and always teaches her the norms of the church and reads her the Bible all the time. She does not send Jeanette to school or allows her to be friends with queer couples.

Moreover, in the novel, oranges symbolize the mother's obsession with singularity. In other words, she believes in one single truth which is

imposed by religion. Therefore, she always gives Jeanette oranges not any other fruit implying that she cannot have her own choices or follow her own desires. To put it another way, she needs to follow what her mother and the Church dictates. In that sense, when Jeanette falls in love with a girl, she is condemned by her mother and the Church quite tragically as the only sexual choice allowed is heterosexuality.

Contrary to the common perception of heterosexuality as the best match for women and men, Jeanette feels disillusioned because she witnesses the loveless marriages between her mother and father as well as other couples. Jeanette cannot understand why heterosexual marriage is the only way out when it creates unhappiness. For her, men are monsters as they do every kind of cruelty towards their wives yet they are the only option for women to love.

In her first affection, Jeanette has to deny her love for Melanie at the end of a painful process of exorcising, condemnation and deprivation of food and water. Nevertheless, she cannot control herself and falls in love with another girl again. This time, Jeanette does not deny and leaves home in order to follow her desires. This makes Jeanette a *mobile* and *revolutionary* character from Lotman's perspective because she crosses the abstract boundary between the religious dogmas and her desires; in a way, she breaks the walls of the semiosphere that the Church has put around her gender. She defies the traditional norms of the religion and gender. That is why, it can be claimed that *semantical* dimension can be observed in this novel since the spatial imagery is formed through culturally accepted principles.

After working in different jobs, Jeanette comes back home to visit her mother who welcomes her without any anger. Her mother is a *conservative* and *immobile* character in Lotmanian terms because she sees no problem in consorting to the norms of the church. In other words, Margaret's mother chooses to stay within the boundary of religion. However, even though it is totally against the religious conventions, in the end she never questions her daughter's sexual life. They do not contradict anymore.

This is clearly a post-structuralist thinking of the notion of boundary. Lotman formerly has believed in the fact that the only function of boundary is dividing the cultural space into two which never allows communication. Basically, the structuralist perspective of binary opposition would separate both sides and disallow the two semiospheres exist together which means either part needs to prove a change in order to have a meaningful relationship. In this respect, Lotman asserts that in order to have a healthy interaction, either the protagonists should change themselves or the antagonists due to the fact that two contradictory sides cannot exist together within the boundaries of the same semiosphere as there can only be one single truth. Lotman has observed this in the texts between the early 16th century and early 20th century. However, beginning from the second half of the twentieth century, it has been realized that this understanding does not exist anymore as two opposing sides can live together without changing their semiospheres represented in *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit.* To put it another way, in the post-modern world, two opposing worldviews belonging to two different cultural spaces can accept each other without giving off their own cultural values. Therefore, in this novel, the boundary separating the contradictory semiopsheres becomes the third space where this consensus occurs.

WORKS CITED

Akpan, Idorenyin, Emilienne Akpan and Presly Obukoadata (2013). "A Semiotic Deconstruction of Symbols in Print Advertising Contents: Implications for Consumers Purchase Decisions in Nigeria". *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. 3.(13): 13-26.

Algotsson, Anna (2014). *Transgression and Tradition: Redefining Gender Roles in Elizabeth Gaskell's North and South. Linköping University.*Literary Specialisation, Linköping University, Sweden. Available at URL: http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:818246/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Al-Sahara, Zaydun (2015). "Deconstructing Religion in Jeanette Winterson's Oranges Are not the Only Fruit: A Metacritical Study". *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. 6. (1): 238-244.

Andrews, Edna (2001). "Text and culture: Continuous Discontinuity in Lotman and Zamjatin". *Russian Literature XLIX:* 347-369.

Antosa, Silvia (2008). *Crossing Boundaries: Bodily Paradigms in Jeanette Winterson's Fiction 1985-2000.*Rome: Aracne.

Babaee, Ruzbeh, Wan Roselezam Wan Yahya, and Shivani Sivagurunathan (2013). "Manifestation of Biopower in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World"*. 7.(5): 489-497.

Barr, Bob (2010). "Aldous Huxley's Brave New World—Still A Chilling Vision After All These Years". Michigan Law Review. 108. (6): 847-857.

Blackstone, Amy M. (2003). "Gender Roles and Society". *Human Ecology: An Encyclopedia of Children, Families, Communities, and Environments*. Vol. 8: 335-338.

Bloom, Harold (2011). *Bloom's How to Write About George Orwell.* New York: Infobase Publishing.

Brantliner, Patrick, William B. Thesing (2002). *A Companion To The Victorian Novel.* UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Boas, Franz (1916). "The Development of Folk-Tales and Myths". *The Scientific Monthly*. 3.(4): 335-343.

Bolfek-Radovani, Jasmina (2012). *Space, Place And Spatial Loss In North African And Canadian Writing In French.* Dissertation, University of Westminster, London.

Carbonell, Curtis D. "Brave New World".Available at URL: https://www.academia.edu/10728195/Brave_New_World

Champagne, Roland A. (1978). "A Grammar of the Languages of Culture: Literary Theory and Yury M. Lotman's Semiotics". *New Literary History*. 9. (2): 205-210.

Chen, Xiaowei (2014).*Peeling the Orange: An Intertextual Reading of Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit.*Master Thesis, Leiden University, Holland.

Chin-Yi, Chung (2015). "Religious Satire In Winterson Jeanette's *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit"*. *Langlit*. 2. (1): 309-314.

Cornwall, Andrea, Nancy Lindisfarne (2005). *Dislocating Masculinity.* London: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Courtenay, Will H. (2000). "Constructions Of Masculinity And Their Influence On Men's Well-Being: A Theory Of Gender And Health".

Social Science & Medicine. Vol. (50): 1385- 1401.
Crawford, Amy (2009) "Historical Optimism: The Use of Utopia in the Enlightenment Era". *Colloquy: Text Theory Critique.* Vol. (17): 83-92.
Çeker, Ebru (2016)."The Representation of Evangelical Society in Winterson's *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit*". *International Journal Of Literature and Culture*. 4. (3): 56-60.
Danesi, Marcel (2013)."On the Metaphorical Connectivity of Cultural Sign Systems". *Signs and Society.* 1. (1): 33-49.
Dennis, Abigail (2009). "Mobile Narrative, Spatial Mediation, and Gaskell's Urban Rustics in North and South". *MHRA Working Papers in the Humanities*. Vol. (4): 43-54.
Donato, Eugenio (1967). "Of Structuralism and Literature". *MLN.* 82. (5): 549-574.
Fernandes, Jorge Luis Andrade (2008). *Challenging Euro-America's Politics of Identity: The Return Of The Native.* London: Routledge.
Firchow, Peter (1975). "Science and Conscience in Huxley's "Brave New World". *Contemporary Literature*, 16. (3): 301-316.
Frost, Laura (2006). "Huxley's Feelies: The Cinema of Sensation in "Brave New World". *Twentieth Century Literature*. 52. (4):443-473.
Fuchs, Michael, and Maria-Theresia Holub (2013). *Placing America: American Culture and Its Spaces.* Wetzlar: Transcript-Verlag.
Garcia, Patricia (2015). *Space and the Postmodern Fantastic in Contemporary Literature: The Architectural Void.* New York: Routledge.
Gaskell, Elizabeth (1994). *North and South.* UK: Penguin Books.
Gerondeau, Pierre (2014). *More Than A Place: Regionalism and Setting in the Short Stories of Andre Dubus II.* B.A. Thesis, University of Michigan, US.
Ghalia, Bedrani (2011). *The Representation of the 'Other' (the Poor and Women) in Elizabeth Gaskell's North and South.* Dissertation. University of Tizi-Ouzou, Algeria.
Godzich, Wlad (1978). "The Construction of Meaning". *New Literary History*. 9. (2): 389-397.
Gros, Emmeline (2007). "On and Off the Page: Mapping Space in Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice". *Graduate English Association New Voices Conference*.
Grushow, Ira (1962). "Brave New World and The Tempest". *College English*, 24. (1): 42-45.
Habib, M.A.R.(2005). *A History of Literary Criticism: From Plato to the Present.* U.K: Blackwell Publishing.
Hawkes, Terence (1977). *Structuralism and Semiotics.* U.K: Routledge.
Hadaegh, Bahee, Hamid Reza Pilehvar (2016). "Fantasy, A Means to Propagate Ideologies: A Foucauldian Reading of Albee's The Zoo Story". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature.* 5. (7): 147- 152.
Harris, Ian M. (2005).*Messages Men Hear: Constructing Masculinities.* London: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
Hess-Lüttich, Ernest W.B (2012). "Spatial turn: On the Concept of Space in Cultural Geography and Literary Theory". *Journal for Theoretical Cartography.*Vol. (5): 1-11.

Hunt, Natasha Alvandi (2010). "'A Din of Angry Voices' at Home: England's Class Conflict within North and South's Thornton House". *GRAAT On-Line*. Vol. (9): 70-87.
Huxley, Aldous (2000). *Brave New World Revisited*. New York: Rosetta Books.
Huxley, Aldous (2011). *Brave New World.* Istanbul: Pergamino Publishing.
Jaago, Tiiu. "Cultural Borders In An Autobiographical Narrative". Available at URL: http://www.folklore.ee/folklore/vol52/jaago.pdf
James, David (2008).*Contemporary British Fiction and the Artistry of Space: Style, Landscape, Perception.* London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
Janiak, Andrew (2016). "Kant's Views on Space and Time". *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-spacetime/#Bib
Kalaga, Wojciech (2016). "Against the Frame". *Sign Systems Studies.* 44. (1/2): 128–147.
Kalpaklı, Fatma (2010). "Gaskell's Questioning Of The Victorian Class System In North And South". *The Black Sea Journal of Social Sciences.* 2. (2): 1-16.
Kaufman, Michael (1987). *Beyond Patriarchy Essays By Men On Pleasure, Power, And Change.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Klooster, Jacqueline, Jo Heirman (2013).*The Ideologies Of Lived Space In Literary Texts, Ancient And Modern.*USA: Academia Press.
Knezevic, Borislav (2011). "The Novel as Cultural Geography: Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South". Studia Romanica et Anglica Zagrabiensia*. Vol. (56): 85-105.
Koivuvaara, Pirjo (2012). *Hunger, Consumption, and Identity in Elizabeth Gaskell's Novels. Dissertation,* University of Tampere, Finland.
Kotov, Kaie, Kalevi Kull. "Semiosphere Is the Relational Biosphere". Available at URL: https://www.academia.edu/2393505/Semiosphere_is_the_relational_biosphere
Kotov, Kaie (2002). "Semiosphere: A chemistry of being". *Sign Systems Studies.* 30. (1): 41-55.
Kull, Kalevi. "A semiotic theory of life: Lotman's principles of the universe of the mind". *Green Letters*. 19.3. (2015): 255-266.
Lagopoulos, Alexandros Ph., Karin Boklund-Lagopoulou (2014). "Semiotics, culture and space". *Sign Systems Studies*. 42. (4): 435-486.
Lemire, Devon (2012). "A Historiographical Survey of Literacy in Britain between 1780 and 1830". *Constellations: History & Classics Undergraduate Studet Journal.* 4. (1) 248-261.
Lotman, Yuri M. (1977).*The Structure of the Artistic Text.*(Trans. Gail Lenhoff and Ronald Vronn) USA: University of Michigan.
Lotman, Yuri M., B.A. Uspensky and George Mihaychuk (1978). "On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture". *New Literary History.* 9. (2): 211-232.
Lotman, Yuri M. (1990). *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture.* London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
Lotman, Yuri M. (2005). "On the Semiosphere". *Sign Systems Studies.* 33. (1): 205- 229.

Löve, Katharina Hansen (1994). *The Evolution of Space in Russian Literature: A Spatial Reading of 19th and 20th Century Narrative Literature.* Netherlands: Rodopi.
Majlingova, Veronika (2011). *The Use of Space in Gothic Fiction.* Master Thesis, Masaryk University, Czech Republic.
Markos, Anton (2004). "In the quest for novelty: Kauffman's biosphere and Lotman's semiosphere". *Sign Systems Studies*. 32. (1/2): 309-327.
Marov, M. Ya (2013). "Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky: The Science of the Biosphere And Astrobiology". *21st Century Science & Technology*
Martin, Gustavo A. Rodriguez (2011). "Proverb Modification in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World". *Paremia*. Vol. (20): 179-190.
Matus, Jill L. (2007). *The Cambridge Companion To Elizabeth Gaskell.*UK: Cambridge University Press.
McDowall, David (1989). *An Illustrated History of Britain.* UK: Longman.
Mendez, Francesca Castaño (2010) "The Limitless Self: Desire and Transgression in Jeanette Winterson's" Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit and Written on the Body".Available at URL: http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/handle/2445/11225
Mohr, Michael and Mikkel Abildtoft, Valdemar Stokholm, Hanna Sandvik and Hans Munck-Westh (2009)."Space & Time: Kant's Transcendental Idealism". Available at URL: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/12517608.pdf
Mucignat, Rosa (2013). *Realism and space in the novel, 1795–1869: Imagined Geographies.* USA: Ashgate.
Narain, Mona (2014).*Gender and Space in British Literature, 1660–1820.* USA: Ashgate.
Nöth, Winfried (2006). "Yuri Lotman on metaphors and culture as self-referential semiosphere". *Semoitica*. 1. (4)249-263.
Nöth, Winfried (2015). "The Topography of Yuri Lotman's Semiosphere". *International Journal of Cultural Studies.* 18. (1): 11-26.
Önal, Elif (2007). *Analysis Of The Use Of Parody In Jeanette Winterson's Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit And Boating For Beginners.* Dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
Pelaschiar, Laura (2003). "The City as Text. The Case of Belfast: from Gothic Horror-Story to Post-Modern Novel". *Prospero X.* Avaliable at URL: https://www.openstarts.units.it/dspace/bitstream/10077/7166/1/Pelaschiar_PX.pdf
Preda, Alina (2013). "Towards A New Analytical Framework: Jeanette Winterson And The *Desperado Project". The Proceedings of the International Conference Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue.* Vol. (1): 853-861.
Perenič, Urška (2012). "Space In Literature And Literature In Space". Available at URL: http://www.srl.si/sql_pdf/SRL_2012_3_02.pdf
Posner, Roland (2004)."Basic Tasks of Cultural Semiotics". *Signs of Power-Power of Signs: Essays in Honor of Jeff Bernard.* (Inst): 56-89.
Reiff, Raychel Haugrud (2010). *Aldous Huxley: Brave New World.* New York:Marchall Cavendish.
Reuschel, Anne-Kathrin, Lorenz Hurni (2011). "Mapping Literature:

Visualisation of Spatial Uncertainty in Fiction". *The Cartographic Journal*. 48. (4): 293-308.
Rosa, Alberto, Pievi Nestor (2013). "Semiotic Methodology For The Analysis Of The Cultural And Individual Dynamics Of Social Representations: A View From Cultural Psychology". *Papers on Social Representations*. Vol. (22): 1-29.
Schermer, M.H.N. (2007). "Brave New World versus Island – Utopian and Dystopian Views on Psychopharmacology". *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*. 10. (2) 119-128.
Semenenko, Aleksei (2012). *The Texture of Culture: An Introduction to Yuri Lotman's Semiotic Theory*. US: Palgrave Macmillan.
Schönle, Andreas (2006). *Lotman and Cultural Studies: Encounters and Extensions*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
Shakespeare, William (2005). *The Tempest*. USA: Icon Classics.
Sion, Ronald T. (2010). *Aldous Huxley and the Search for Meaning: A Study of the Eleven Novels*.McFarland & Company, Inc: USA. 2010.
Skulj, Jola (2004). "Literature And Space: Textual, Artistic And Cultural Spaces Of Transgressiveness". *Primerjalna književnost (Ljubljana)*. Available at URL: https://ojs.zrc-sazu.si/primerjalna_knjizevnost/article/viewFile/5102/4684
Storey, John (2009).*Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: An Introduction*. UK: Pearson Longman.
Taghizadeh, Ali (2013). "A Theory of Literary Structuralism". *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 3. (2): 285-292.
Thompson, Ewa M. (1977) "Jurij Lotman's Literary Theory and Its Contex". *The Slavic and East European Journal*. 21. (2): 225-238.
Ticha, Veronika (2008). *Modern Feminism According To Jeanette Winterson*. Bachelor Paper, University of Pardubice, Czech Republic.
Virchow, Eckart Voights, Alessandra Boller (2015). *Dystopia, Science Fiction, Post-Apocalypse*. Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag,
Tuan, Yi-Fu (1977). *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*.Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Volkmann, Jona. *Semantic Spaces and Heteropoias in Jeffrey Eugenides's Middlesex*. Available at URL: https://www.academia.edu/4688885/Bachelor_Thesis_Semantic_Spaces_and_Heterotopias_in_Jeffrey_Eugenidess_Middlesex_?auto=download
Vernadsky, Vladimir I. (1998). *The Biosphere*. New York: Fair West Institute.
V.U., Ameera (2013). "The 'Condition of England Novels' and Victorian Women Novelists". *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*. Vol. (12): 1-9.
Wilkinson, Rachel (2010). "Teaching Dystopian Literature to a Consumer Class". *The English Journal*, 99. (3): 22-26
Winterson, Jeanette (1995).*Art Objects*.US: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
Winterson, Jeanette (2014). *Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit*. London: Vintage Books.
Woiak, Joanne (2007). "Designing a Brave New World: Eugenics, Politics, and Fiction". *The Public Historian*. 29. (3): 105-129.
Wood, Irving F. (1909). "Folk-Tales in Old Testament Narrative". Journal

of Biblical Literature. 28. (1): 34-41

Yakut, Özge (2007).*Sexuality And Gender In Jeanette Winterson's Two Novels: Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit And Written On The Body.* Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Zhamurashvili, Lela (2014). "Dehumanized Society in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*". *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*. 3. (2): 139-154.

Zoran, Gabriel (1984). "Towards a Theory of Space in Narrative". *Poetics Today*. 5. (2): 309-335.

Zylko, Boguslaw (2001). "Culture and Semiotics: Notes on Lotman's Conception of Culture". New Literary History. 32. (2): 391-408.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

1989 Kocaeli doğumlu Sena Teber, 2010 yılında İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü'nü %100 burslu olarak bitirmiştir. Mezun olduğu yıl özel bir firmada İthalat-İhracat Sorumlusu olarak iki yıl çalıştıktan sonra asıl yapmak istediği mesleğe geçiş yaparak 2012-2016 Eğitim-Öğretim yılları içerisinde Kocaeli Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda dört yıl sözleşmeli İngilizce Okutmanı olarak görev yapmıştır. Halen, Kocaeli Bahçeşehir Koleji'nde Lise İngilizce Öğretmenliğine devam etmektedir. Bu esnada 2015 yılında Kocaeli Üniversitesi Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı yüksek lisans programına girmiş olup 2017 yılında bu bölümden mezun olmuştur. Aynı yıl İstanbul Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı doktora programına kabul almıştır.